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FOREWORD

These proceedings from the Off-campus Library Services Conference which took place in Knoxville, Tennessee in April 1985, continue the momentum which was established by the previous conference of the same name held in St. Louis in 1982. The reader will find here a range of articles dealing with off-campus library support representative of the diversity of off-campus academic programs and the libraries involved with the extension of information resources and services to those programs. We have come to realize that off-campus academic programs are offered by all sizes and types of institutions of higher education ranging in size from the community college to the major research university and that librarians are acknowledging the need to actively support the learning process of their institution's off-campus constituency. These articles are concerned with in-state and out-of-state programs, regional accreditation, document delivery, regional cooperation, program development, model programs, program evaluation, and other pertinent topics.
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THE OFF-CAMPUS LIBRARY SERVICES CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

Keynote Address for the

Off-campus Library Services Conference

Barton M. Lessin

Central Michigan University

I will begin this morning with a short story about perception. This is a story which Dr. Vinod Chachra, Vice President for Computing and Information Systems at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, tells in the context of selecting computers, however as a general condition it applies to our main topic here. It happened that two experienced hikers were far removed from civilization in one of our great national parks. As the two hiked down a quiet mountain trail, they spotted a grizzly bear not more than 150 yards away. The bear had also spotted our two hikers and was already moving in their direction when one of the two removed his pack, sat down on a nearby rock, and began removing his hiking boots. The second hiker, astonished at the first's coolness under threat of imminent death said to the first: "Why bother changing into your running shoes? You must know that you have absolutely no chance of out-running that bear." The first, a rather perceptive individual, replied back over his shoulder as he quickly made his way down the path, "It's not the bear that I have to out run." What one hiker perceived as a life-ending situation with no means of escape, was seen by another as a problem requiring a new approach.

In discussing off-campus library services, it seems to me that we must continually consider the perceptions of a number of involved parties if we are ever to have an expectation of success. As in all fields of endeavor, we must manage to deal effectively with several constituencies each of which has a somewhat different view of what off-campus library services are intended to accomplish.

What are these groups and how might they be generally characterized? Five are of particular importance. These are: students, faculty, librarians, administration, and external agencies.

Students use library resources largely as they are motivated to do so on the basis of assignments given them by their professors. While there are certainly exceptions to this kind of required library usage, it seems true that most students find
precious little time to accomplish all that is expected of them and thus quickly reject those activities which are seen as unnecessary. The adult non-traditional learner who pursues an academic program part-time while working and perhaps supporting a family is even less likely to use a library than an on-campus student unless such endeavor is related to the course work before him. One major advantage on-campus is the identifiable presence of the library building. Whether or not the on-campus student actually uses the library to pursue research, it is likely that she is aware that the library exists. Off-campus, for most library models, there is simply no edifice which the student can easily identify as the holding facility for printed and non-print resources. The student can then perceive of the institution as being non-supportive unless there is a concerted effort made to inform him of available library services, including any special arrangements with non-affiliated libraries local to the teaching site.

As a general rule, it seems fairly safe to suggest that the faculty person who includes the use of the library with on-campus teaching is also likely to do so with off-campus education, while the individual who chooses not to require library work on-campus is even less likely to call for it when teaching away from the primary site. When discussing library models employed with off-campus programs, my least favorite is the "trunk delivery system." This arrangement finds the faculty person responsible for teaching a course off-campus taking source materials with him in the trunk of his car to the teaching site. The teacher may follow this course of action because he perceives or understands that the library can not, will not, or perhaps should not provide service off-campus. However, in doing so a choice has been made which may severely limit the student's ability to investigate as he or she feels necessary. Fortunately, it seems that the use of this type of delivery system is decreasing as institutions such as yours make serious efforts at providing quality library services off-campus. Please note, however, that even the trunk system may have a valuable and realistic role in the provision of library services off-campus. I'll return to this idea a little later. For faculty too, a marketing effort by the library may well be necessary to make it clear exactly what services are extended to them and the students registered as part of an institution's off-campus academic program. Our experience at Central Michigan University has been most positive in this regard. As a group, our faculty teaching off-campus are grateful for the support which they receive from the library and as individuals they frequently become strong supporters of library activity, encouraging library use by their students and including library assignments as part of their classes.
For whatever reason, the provision of library services off-campus has not been a major issue for most academic librarians in the United States. It has been only during the last several years that we have seen any increase in published articles dealing with this particular type of library activity. Some and perhaps many of you are here having chosen to attend this meeting out of feeling of isolation and the need to exchange information with your counterparts at other institutions. I can assure you that those feelings of isolation were shared by those of us at Central Michigan University prior to the development of this conference, which has permitted us to meet colleagues from around the country and world with whom we share similar goals for our off-campus constituencies. Certainly, we in the United States can benefit by learning from librarians in Great Britain and Australia where there has been a long standing interest in extra-mural library services. The fact that appropriate attention is now being paid to this subject is clearly evidenced by your participation here.

There is a group of public and academic librarians which has been placed in the position of having to assist students enrolled in another institution's off-campus programs without either communication or support from the institution offering classes. This group deserves mention here. A librarian's time and a library's material resources are capable of being strained. While the use of libraries local to off-campus teaching sites by students and faculty engaged in off-campus academic programs may be fully appropriate, it is absolutely essential that those sponsoring these programs be primarily responsible for them and well aware of possible impact on local library facilities and resources. Such institutions need make a real effort to cooperate with those local libraries in such a way that all parties will be best served. My concern for this situation is particularly acute in those instances where the local library is a public facility and potentially open to all users from a given community. Too often I have heard stories of off-campus programs which have no library services and simply expect their enrollees to get all necessary assistance from the local library. Yes, these students may very well have a right to use that library. Nonetheless, this right does not absolve the academic program from assuring library support or cooperating with the local library to avoid difficulties for both users and library alike.

Discussions with librarians at institutions offering off-campus programs have led me to understand that it is not uncommon for an off-campus program to be mounted without library services, leaving the librarian in a position of having to rush to
play catch-up. The mere fact that many off-campus programs are
required to be self-supporting explains in part the sometimes
reluctant attitude of administrators to assist the funding of
student services which do not directly generate income.
Administrators of off-campus programs are put in the delicate
position of having to balance academic quality with the dreaded
bottom line. How much will all of this cost? I have had
librarians ask me how we at Central convinced our administration
that library support of the off-campus program was necessary.
Each time I ask that person the same question, "Would your
administration permit the very same class or program to be taught
on-campus without direct library support?" Of course, the answer
is generally no.

Finally, we must consider the external agencies which are
also very much a part of the off-campus educational experience.
These organizations fall into two major categories: those
responsible for oversight and evaluation, and those for whom
off-campus education is a commodity to be obtained. The oversight
group might further be divided along licensure and accreditation
lines. The role of library services in licensure studies varies
considerably from state to state. However, a recent non-decision
by the Supreme Court involving Nova University was particularly
notable, as one of the key issues was the availability and quality
of off-campus library services (Rowe, 1985). Regional
accreditation applies across-the-board and concerns all
institutions of higher education and thus their library services.
While the regional associations may not evaluate off-campus
library services in the same manner, I think it is safe to say
that the provision of quality library services off-campus is an
issue wherever an accreditation visit occurs for those
institutions teaching off-campus. Of those agencies which obtain
off-campus learning programs for their employees probably none is
more important in terms of sheer size of expenditure than the
United State military. The military faces difficulties particular
in its environment and distribution. One needs only to consider
the complexities of providing library services to ships at sea or
army posts in especially remote locations to begin to realize the
need for creativity and flexibility when attempting to develop
library support programs. In some cases, a specially designed
"trunk delivery system" may well be the most acceptable resolution
of a difficult problem. Whether for oversight or as a purchasing
agent, it is clear that these external agencies have the ability
to influence the future development of off-campus library
services, perhaps even more so than our other four groups.

Five different constituency groups, each with related yet
varied interests in off-campus library services. In each
case, as we attempt to consider the perceptions of a representative from one of these groups, we would do well to ask if the library services for an institution's off-campus constituency are equitable to those offered on-campus. Not the same necessarily, but rather comparable to the on-campus environment and designed to specifically support the kind of educational activity promoted by the off-campus curriculum. If one can honestly respond affirmatively, chances are good that each of these parties would perceive that the library services meet the needs and goals intended. However, as with our two hikers, it is important to remember that different individuals can easily perceive of the same circumstance as completely different. What is comparable to one may well not be to another. And so goes not only off-campus library services, but higher education.

In the time remaining to me I would like to turn my attention to the future of off-campus library services. I see a number of challenges which those of us involved with off-campus library support are facing and will continue to face in coming years and would like to share my thoughts on them with you.

There are basically five models for delivery of library services off-campus. These include the branch library, the use of the on-campus library for all users both on- and off-campus, the trunk system, the use of local libraries, and some combination of the previous four models. The use of the central on-campus library for all users with additional access to local libraries for specific research may be the most popular model at this time. However, we face a challenge to assure that the off-campus student has a comparable kind of access to that collection as her on-campus counterpart. The question which must be answered is this. If the off-campus student is expected to use on-campus resources, how is she to know what materials are available without actually visiting the library which may be hundreds or thousands of miles away from the teaching site? The answer is basically a technology issue related to the development of on-line catalogs and integrated on-line library systems. Unfortunately, not all on-line library systems include the same possibilities for call-in access. Perhaps the most notable in this regard is the system marketed by The Pennsylvania State University Libraries for which development was undertaken to provide communications software for major microcomputer brands to facilitate down-loading from the library database. Even if it were true that all library automation systems were equal in this regard, one might naturally ask, "Will every off-campus student be required to purchase a microcomputer in order to access the on-campus catalog, or will some alternative be made available?" Additionally, it is clear that many libraries are still years away from automation. In the
interim other means are necessary to insure that the student will have appropriate access to a library's collection.

Library instruction is another challenge for off-campus programs. Virtually every academic library in the United States and, I venture, in Canada as well, has some kind of library instruction program. The intention of these programs is to introduce the student to the library and its collections in order to help the student help himself in classes which call for research. While adult learners may be older and more mature than the eighteen to twenty-two year old college student, there is no indication that the former are any more ready to use a library than the latter. In fact, adult learners returning to the educational forum for the first time after a long hiatus are probably less likely to have usable skills than the recent high school graduate. The process of library instruction off-campus can easily be complicated by geographic distribution of teaching sites, irregular class schedules, and numerous other problems associated with the off-campus environment. Nonetheless, library instruction off-campus should well be a standard part of any library program, just as it is on-campus.

The expansion of off-campus academic programs represents a third challenge for most off-campus library service models. This challenge calls for creativity to meet the problem of a wider distribution of library resources. Let's take the one model where the on-campus library is shared by all students and faculty regardless of where classes are held. Once a student off-campus requests and receives a given monograph that book is no longer available for use on-campus and while it may certainly be recalled for another user, the chances of getting such material back very quickly may be limited. Some libraries purchase multiple copies to meet such needs, but others neither have the storage capacity, nor financial resources to consider this possibility a realistic one. Thus expansion, or at least large scale expansion, represents a challenge to continued good service both on- and off-campus. Directly related to the expansion issue is the question of impact on non-affiliated libraries. I touched on this theme earlier in my talk, but would like to add that it is my opinion that there are major differences in the ways in which off-campus students use local libraries. The off-campus student who visits a local library to use indexes, examine reference materials, and perhaps copy articles is totally different from the student who requires reference assistance or wishes to borrow materials. Off-campus library programs will need to encourage the kind of use of local libraries which does not inadvertently displace that library's immediate constituency. The library instruction I mentioned earlier coupled with strong library
support from the student's institution can go a long way in beginning to meet this challenge.

My next challenge involves something of a fuzzy line and is not a library question so much as an educational one. It is the fuzzy line which each reference librarian faces in determining exactly how much to give to a student and how much to allow him to find on his own. As there are no hard and fast rules in such determinations, this everyday occurrence is difficult enough on-campus. Indeed, on-campus the line has become murkier during the last several years with the now common use of on-line database searching at many reference desks. Off-campus this question can ultimately result in what I have come to term "auto-feed." Auto-feed results off-campus when owing to time constraints, lack of access to the library's catalog, and the easy availability of database information, the student is overdirected to specific materials. The student is most likely directed to these resources by an understanding librarian who is simply making an effort to try to save the student time and avoid frustration, remembering that these individuals often have other work and family responsibilities and that the continued use of the library program depends to some degree on the on-going success of the program to provide the kind of information which students need to do their course work. This process is not terribly different than the same decision making on-campus. However, the more remote the student, the more difficult for the librarian to draw a neat line. The challenge is to avoid as much as realistically possible the use of auto-feed in favor of an improved educational experience, but it is surely an individual decision. Each librarian will need to ask him and herself whether and how much to provide the student with extensive bibliographic research on a subject owing to a lack of pertinent resources locally, or to lead that student to the material in order to instruct him in library research.

My fifth and final challenge may be the most important of the lot. The need for improved communication regarding off-campus library services is the reason for this conference. I am personally convinced that all too few academic librarians are aware of off-campus library support as a viable possibility and that even fewer individuals employed in non-traditional higher education realize what the library can do to enhance an off-campus academic program. We would be well served by attempting to facilitate communication about off-campus library services within the library profession, within higher education generally, and to the external agencies which have such a profound impact on higher education. What can we do to facilitate this communication? Well, perhaps other conferences like this would be helpful, but certainly the emphasis must be placed on research and publication.
Substantive research on off-campus library service has been lacking and as a result we know all too little about the very field in which we find ourselves working. I can assure you that the Central Michigan University Libraries intend to meet this challenge in the coming years. I encourage you to join us in our efforts.
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Delivery Systems for Remote Communities

Off-campus Library Services at Lakehead University

Betty A. Bishop and Marshall Clinton
Lakehead University

In developing a remote delivery system for university students studying at a distance a library must first identify the overall institutional goals and objectives for the off-campus instructional program. Since it is unlikely that the institutional goals will include any reference to the level or type of library services which are desired or expected, the initiative for the specific services must be library driven. The institutional goals help to establish the framework within which the library must operate.

Once the library has identified the goals of the institution's off-campus instructional program, it is necessary to develop a broad definition of the support which is desirable. This may range from basic support to the full spectrum of resources and services and may include:

1. access to materials and the library's collection
2. research and information assistance
3. bibliographic instruction.

Defining System Characteristics

Prior to establishing goals for the library's remote delivery system, it is first necessary to define the general characteristics of the system. These provide guidance for the way in which the system must function. An effective delivery system should be:

1. people-oriented
2. flexible
3. rewarding
4. qualitatively and quantitatively effective.

The system should be designed to meet the needs of the user; it should be student-centered rather than staff-centered. The system should recognize that students vary in their preferred style of gaining access to materials, seeking research and information assistance and learning about library use, and should provide alternative delivery methods. The system should be rewarding to the user; each experience students have with the
system should be a successful one and should develop student confidence in the system. The system should be relevant to the student and reliable to use; yet, at the same time, cost effective.

There are four steps which should be taken in developing the remote delivery system. Whether these are on a formal or informal basis, they include 1) methodology planning and establishment, 2) system design and selection, 3) system implementation, and 4) system evaluation and feedback.

Planning and Methodologies

The planning of a remote delivery system consists of the four steps which are illustrated in Figure 1. While these steps are illustrated as being sequential, it should be recognized that they may be iterative. The four steps are:

Developing System Goals

In planning for a delivery system, it is important to identify the goals of the overall off-campus library support program and then develop delivery systems goals to support them. Based on these goals, the library must determine what an effective delivery system ideally accomplishes; this will be the basis for developing the system goals.

Identifying Users/User Needs

Working within the framework provided by the system goals, planning focuses next on determining users and their needs. The two primary groups are those who will receive the services of the system and those who will operate the system. The needs of these groups will differ.

Developing System Objectives

Based on system goals and user's needs system objectives can then be developed. Preparing a matrix may help to simplify this process (see Figure 2). This matrix will correlate the needs of each of the groups which have been identified. The matrix will also help in identifying potential conflicts between the needs of the various users.

Setting System Priorities

While many objectives may develop, the reality of limited resources will require that priorities be set. This ensures the
achievement of certain important goals, which subsequently provide a foundation for further efforts. Considering system objectives in conjunction with the goals of the off-campus library support program itself helps to distinguish and set priorities for the system.

System Design/Selection

Once goals and objectives have been established, priorities have been set, and characteristics of an effective system realized, the next step is to determine the type of system which will best facilitate these goals.

A look at a variety of existing systems may help during this stage. Within the literature there are some accounts of the activities of the off-campus service programs offered by libraries. Appendix A contains a summary of the activities of four libraries. These models effectively provide one or a combination of:

1. access to library materials such as books, journals, and government publications and to the tools which provide access to these materials such as indexes, catalogues, and serials lists
2. provision of research and information assistance, encompassing both manual and computerized systems
3. delivery of bibliographic instruction as required by each institution.

After examining existing systems the next step is to consider whether to adapt existing system strategies or design new ones. At this point there is often a temptation to establish a system (whether adapted or designed) which is too grandiose. Basically, if the objectives can be achieved without inclusion of particular components, those components should be omitted.

To provide further guidance, two questions should be addressed. The first concerns the relationship of the delivery system to the user's requirements. The underlying philosophy might demand that either a particular resource (e.g., access to materials and/or collection, research and information assistance, bibliographic instruction) be provided or that all resources be provided. While most theoretically agree that not all users would require all resources, there is a tendency to develop a system which is "all things to all people." The second decision to be made is whether the delivery system should be confined to the library's resources or expanded to include those of other libraries. Clearly, confining the system is administratively more
manageable, but from a user's perspective, this may not be desirable.

System Implementation

System implementation involves "putting all the pieces together." What works in theory may not work in practice, especially if new system strategies have been designed in lieu of existing ones.

A "test run" is highly desirable to ensure that the support services of external organizations such as the post office or other libraries operate according to plan. Revisions to the original plan may be necessary at this time.

Once a test has been successfully launched, the next phase involves actually setting the system into place for operation and promoting it. Promotion may involve mass mailouts of brochures, telephone and/or personal contacts with off-campus students, university representatives, faculty and cooperating institutions.

In the initial implementation period close monitoring of the daily logistics of the system is advisable to ensure that its operation is as efficient and effective as possible. It is also very important during the implementation stage to remain receptive to revising and improving the system as its use increases.

System Evaluation

System evaluation is probably the least acted upon phase of system development. Historically, within librarianship there has been little emphasis on evaluation and few librarians have formal training in evaluation techniques. There may also be a fear involved in testing/evaluating any system, especially one's own. However, without some kind of evaluation there is no way of 1) determining if the system is operating effectively and 2) knowing what to improve upon. Evaluation is essentially a means for improving decision making by providing answers to frequently asked questions.

The process of planning is crucial to the success of any evaluation. Different evaluation procedures may be explored in the planning stages but whatever the procedure, it should focus on determining what questions are relevant. Some of the areas which
must be addressed in developing the evaluation phases are:

1. Which questions are designed to guide future development?
2. Which questions will establish the validity of the system?
3. For whom are the answers intended?
4. Which questions have priority?
5. What method of evaluation is most appropriate?

Finally, evaluation of any off-campus system should consider the statement of objectives developed by the Association of College and Research Libraries (1982). It is important to remember that this is a model statement and should only serve as one of a number of checks.

Lakehead University Library

The following outlines the experience of Lakehead University Library in developing its support services for the University's off-campus instructional program.

Lakehead University sits in the heart of Thunder Bay in northwestern Ontario. It is one of two systems of higher education in the region. The other is a community college which offers a two to three year post-high school education.

Lakehead University offers live lectures at its Thunder Bay campus and throughout the 523,000 square kilometer area of northwestern Ontario. The furthest regular centre served is 700 km from campus and the average distance is 370 km (over 220 miles). Currently there are close to three hundred students enrolled off-campus.

Off-campus courses are administered through the University's Office of Continuing Education and are mounted pending registration of at least eight students and the availability of an instructor. In the past most courses have been from the arts, business, and teacher education (specifically M.Ed. courses, special Ministry of Education additional qualification courses, and in-service B.Ed. extension courses). Presently there is also a special nursing program offered in one community.

Historically, the university library had successfully supported off-campus courses through a deposit service; the library deposited required materials at the public and school libraries in off-campus communities. Yet, it was recognized that the library's existing off-campus support program was not
providing an adequate level of service for the university's off-campus students. In September 1984, under the direction of a newly appointed off-campus services librarian, the support program was expanded considerably.

In preparation for the development of an expanded library support program, a review of the literature was conducted. Leading off-campus librarians worldwide were contacted and visits were made to six Ontario universities currently offering library support to off-campus students. In addition, through meetings with continuing education administration and the previous off-campus services library assistant, the specific needs of Lakehead University off-campus students were identified. Unfortunately, due to temporal and financial restraints, it was impossible to visit the regions to assess student needs.

Based on this preliminary research and the ACRL guidelines, the following primary goals were established:

1. to provide a level of support for off-campus courses comparable to that available for on-campus at both the graduate and undergraduate levels
2. to consider the requirement of the instructional programs rather than tradition in determining the library's response to defined needs
3. to utilize existing resources, facilities, personnel, and operating systems, as a means of attaining defined objectives and increasing program effectiveness and cost-efficiency.

Secondary goals were established in areas of planning, finance, personnel, facilities, resources and services.

With goals and needs identified, the design and development of the expanded library support program remained. Since simplicity, efficiency and dependability were desirable criteria, a program similar to the successful service at the University of Victoria was designed. The resulting program combines the previously effective deposit service with a new personal library service.

This personal library service allows students to obtain materials and information on an individualized basis. To minimize the problems of communication between the students and the staff in the university library, a communications link called UNILINK was established. UNILINK allows students to call the library twenty-four hours a day; calls are answered by a telephone
answering machine which answers with a message "authorizing" it to accept calls. Students may leave requests for a wide range of services:

1. research and information services
2. computerized search services
3. book renewals
4. faculty and librarian consultation
5. delivery of books, periodical articles, and other material.

Students may also submit requests by mail by completing a request form available from local deposit libraries and Lakehead University field representatives. To help students with book selection, copies of the catalogue of the university library's collection on microfiche are available in most public libraries throughout the region. Materials may be borrowed for two weeks use; a limit of five books on a topic is allowed per person. All materials requested on deposit or by individual students are sent via Priority Post, the courier service of Canada Post. Delivery time is usually one to two days. Prepaid return labels are provided in each shipment to expedite the return of materials.

The daily routines of the library support program are handled by a library assistant. Administrative and promotional activities remain the responsibility of the off-campus services librarian. A bi-annual evaluation has been conducted and several recommendations for improvement have been undertaken successfully. Promotion of the off-campus services program has included the production of one information brochure and three fact sheets. To introduce the service these publications were initially mailed en masse to off-campus faculty, Lakehead University field representatives, students, and community libraries. The off-campus services librarian also attended course registration in fourteen of the sixteen off-campus locations in the spring of 1984 in order to meet students and university representatives personally. Ongoing promotion includes continued personal contact with off-campus faculty by the off-campus services librarian, continued endorsement by the continuing education administration and continued distribution of program brochures and fact sheets to students.

Overall the program has been very well received, internally, by faculty and students, and externally, by the Appraisals Committee of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies and by delegates of the recent Commission of Enquiry into the Future of Universities in Ontario. It is hoped that the program will
continue to improve and serve as a model to other universities contemplating off-campus library support programs.
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Appendix 1: Delivery System Models

Thatcher Memorial Library, University of Queensland, St. Lucia Brisbane, Australia

University of Queensland offers a variety of tutored off-campus undergraduate degrees and graduate degrees in educational administration, literature and local history. Students place requests for materials and reference assistance by phone or mail. The library supplies materials from its own collection and through interlibrary loan. Materials are delivered by Australian Postal Express, a courier service available at a specially negotiated price. Delivery time is usually twenty-four to thirty-six hours. Deposit collections are housed in seven University Study Centres throughout North Queensland and Queensland. Local librarians are employed to staff each centre for ten hours a week, usually evenings and weekends. Books, reprints, slides, cassettes and journals are selected for deposit based on proven need in courses regularly attracting substantial enrollments. Key reference sources are also purchased. Attempts were made to deposit other collections in small town public libraries throughout Queensland, but in general this arrangement proved unsatisfactory.

Extramural Library, Department of Extramural Studies, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, England

University of Birmingham offers approximately six hundred tutored courses per year throughout the West Midlands. Upon faculty request the library supports these courses by depositing collections of books, articles, music scores, maps, and other material at each course meeting place. Deposited materials are selected from the Extramural Library collection and through interlibrary loan. Students are also encouraged to use their local public libraries. The faculty member is responsible for the care and circulation of materials during the course.

The library also provides other facilities for off-campus faculty:

1. booking service for audio-visual aids such as slide projectors, overhead projectors and record players
2. collection of slides and a slide making service
3. collection of filmstrips, records, tapes, and overhead transparencies
4. collection of reference books and course related reference assistance
5. special collections such as photographs.
For an experimental period (October 1976 to April 1977) students did borrow directly from the library, in addition to using their class collections. Only enrolled students were entitled to borrow books (up to three) for a loan period of four weeks. This arrangement was discontinued.

The Open University Library, The Open University, Milton Keynes, England

The Open University offers undergraduate and graduate level study throughout England. Students study independently with some support from tutors and counsellors in the university's thirteen regions (undergraduate and associate students only). All required readings such as books, readers, and off-prints, are supplied at cost by the university and students are urged to use local libraries for any additional reading. The Open University Library serves students indirectly by delivering library instruction in the form of library and literature guides which include the following:

1. a general outline of the types of library or collection to which access would be useful
2. guidance in the use of libraries and special collections
3. suggestions on how to search for information
4. a list of bibliographical tools or records relevant to the course with notes on their function and examples
5. notes on organizations and associations as sources of information, advice and publications.

In addition, the Open University Library provides regional guides and regional seminars which direct students to local sources of information, and other material.

California State University at Chico, Chico, California

California State University offers two way audio-one way video delivery of courses to students at twelve centres throughout northern California. Students request reference assistance and search requests from the classroom via automatic dial telephones. Materials are supplied through local libraries (daily delivery vans throughout the region). The university library places indexes and the Subject Guide to Books in Print in each local library and supplies each student with a microfiche catalogue copy of the on-campus serials list. Since this system relies heavily on local libraries, university librarians offer workshops for local librarians and extend interlibrary loan requests to non-students throughout the region.
Figure 1. Process for the development of a remote delivery system
**Figure 2. Delivery system matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs</th>
<th>User Groups</th>
<th>Undergraduate Students</th>
<th>Graduate Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>University Representatives</th>
<th>University Library Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Pick-Up and Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Regional Coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built-in Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strike-proof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Remote User Services from a Regional Campus Library
James A. Damico and Elaine E. Wiltse
University of Southern Mississippi

The Gulf Coast Regional Campus of the University of Southern Mississippi (USM) offers courses at four locations:

1. the Gulf Park Campus in Long Beach,
2. the Keesler Center on Keesler Air Force Base in Biloxi,
3. the Jackson County Resident Center on the Jackson County Campus of the Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College in Gautier, and
4. the National Space and Technology Laboratories (NSTL) in Hancock County.

We will refer to the first location as "on-campus", and the rest as "off-campus" or "remote." The map shown in Figure 1 shows the location of each campus/center, as well as that of the main campus of USM in Hattiesburg (five). From Gulf Park to Hattiesburg is seventy-five miles, to NSTL or Jackson County about forty miles, and to Keesler fifteen miles.

The graph shown in Figure 2 shows the credit hours produced on- and off-campus since 1974-75. The relative volume of activity clearly indicates the importance of the off-campus centers as parts of the regional campus. Presently and historically, the number of hours produced at NSTL has been so small as to be considered insignificant for the purposes of this paper.

Classes have been taught on the Coast by USM since 1947. In 1974 USM-Gulf Park became a degree-granting institution and hired its first full-time librarian. The regional campus library, the Richard G. Co Library, is located on the Gulf Park Campus. The library contains approximately 16,000 volumes of printed matter, 200,000 units of microfilm, 885 units of other non-printed media, 9,000 titles in the Curriculum Lab, and 370 serials titles. The University-wide library cooperative program gives regional campus students access to all library resources of the Hattiesburg campus, including computer database searches done over the telephone. The cooperative system is facilitated by a copy of the Hattiesburg library (Cook Library) main entry card catalog which is maintained in the Cox Library. A twice weekly shuttle runs from the Hattiesburg campus to Gulf Park, carrying inter- and
intralibrary loans, campus mail, and audiovisual equipment. The same service runs once a week to Keesler and Jackson County.

The University of Southern Mississippi is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). In 1973 the first institutional self-study was done. No specific mention was made of special library services for students attending off-campus classes. In this early period attention was focused on the need for additional staffing and especially the need to upgrade the collection.

A follow-up mini-study report of USM-Gulf Park was made in 1977. In discussing the library, emphasis was again on strengthening the collection.

The library chapter of the 1983 self-study begins with the mission of the library: "...to provide resources and services which address the information needs of students, faculty and staff of the University of Southern Mississippi Gulf Coast regional campus." The "Services" section of the chapter specifically states that "materials may also be placed on reserve at Jackson County or at Keesler to allow access by students attending off-campus classes." Another service specifically related to the off-campus student is telephone reference, and the report further states that "informal agreements have been established with the Jackson County Junior College Library, the McBride Library on Keesler Air Force Base, and the Harrison County Law Library..."

Impact of Professional and Accreditation Standards

Academic libraries are aware of the consideration that must be given to professional and accreditation standards. This is especially true at the University of Southern Mississippi, which in 1984-85 is undergoing the ten-year reaffirmation of accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). The self-study report which the reaffirmation will be based on has been described above. The SACS Commission on Colleges and Schools establishes "qualitative and quantitative criteria against which an institution is evaluated to determine its effectiveness and its acceptability in the academic world and the society of which it is a part" (Standards of the college delegate assembly, 1977). In the case of off-campus library services, however, the standards in effect since 1977 offer little guidance. Aside from general statements which apply to the library as a whole, no specific mention is made of off-campus services at all. New criteria proposed in 1982 (Holley, 1983) and approved in principle in 1983, (Proceedings of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1984) emphasize educational
outcomes assessment and an ongoing planning process. "... the new criteria ask ... what effect does a college or university library have on students?/i.e., 'What difference does a college library make?'" (Holley, 1983). Revised section 5.2.1 on Services states specifically:

An institution must provide appropriate library services at off-campus locations where credit courses are offered to ensure that these courses receive the same level of library support as that given to equivalent on-campus courses. This obligation can be met by developing a branch library or by making contractual arrangements with libraries in the geographic area. Competent library personnel should be assigned the planning duties entailed in providing these services and in ascertaining their continued adequacy. When contractual agreements are reached, they must specify the level of service and type of access to be provided for students and faculty. (Holley, 1983)

The Southern Association cooperates with professional organizations in the accreditation of professional schools, departments, and divisions. For academic libraries, the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) and the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), division of the American Library Association (ALA), have established standards and guidelines

... to assist faculty, university administrators, librarians, accrediting agencies, and others in the evaluation and improvement of university library services and resources.
... these standards are not intended to establish normative prescriptions for uniform application. Rather, they are meant to provide a general framework within which informed judgement can be applied to individual circumstances. (Association of Research Libraries and Association of College and Research Libraries, 1979).

Revised "Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Services" were approved by ACRL in 1981. These guidelines specifically require:

1. planning to identify and arrange to meet the information needs of students and faculty;
2. continuing financial support;
3. employment of qualified library personnel to plan, implement, and evaluate library programs;
4. facilities and equipment sufficient in size, number, and scope to attain objectives;
5. access to library materials in sufficient number, scope, and format; and
6. services designed to meet effectively a wide range of different information and bibliographic needs (Assoc. of, 1982).

In recent years little formal planning has occurred for remote services. For 1984-85 finances do not present a serious problem, but due to lack of planning it is difficult to project continued adequacy. Public and academic libraries close to the off-campus centers have been very cooperative in arranging for facilities and equipment use. Access to the regional campus library is arranged through toll-free telephone lines from the off-campus centers and through use of the shuttle service. Presently, however, there is no bibliographic listing of Cox or Cook Library holdings available at the remote sites.

Services Presently Provided

Informal agreements between the regional campus library and other Coast academic and public libraries have included: providing and housing reserve materials, cooperative borrowing, limited cooperative collection development, and sharing material holdings lists.

With the informal agreements having been in place for some time, advantages and disadvantages to these cooperative efforts have developed.

Advantages:

1. USM Gulf Coast students have some library materials available at class meeting sites, thereby saving time and travel.
2. Faculty can encourage more outside assignments and elevate the level of scholarly research.
3. A basis for chosen cooperation is provided among Gulf Coast libraries.

Disadvantages

1. There is a lack of exposure to the full range of library materials and services offered by the regional campus library.
2. Users of the regional campus library or the main campus library are denied access to materials on
3. The regional campus library has little control over the circulation and return of library materials on reserve off-campus.
4. Delinquency and fine policies are unevenly applied.
5. Hours of operation at other libraries vary and are less extensive than those of the regional campus library.
6. Making extra copies to place on reserve at the other libraries is costly.

Survey of Faculty Opinion

Library utilization depends to a large degree on the cooperation and support of the faculty. For this reason, the resident faculty at Gulf Park was surveyed about library service to off-campus students. The responses described below represent one-third of the resident faculty.

First, the faculty was asked if adult working students (the typical student on the Coast) should be required to use the Cox Library or any other full service academic library as part of their college experience. The response was unanimously "yes", and two professors (who are also administrators) specified that the student's library experience should be a combination of in-library and delivered service.

The next question asked if the professor required his or her (a) Gulf Park, (b) Keesler, and (c) Jackson County students to use library materials and/or the Gulf Park library. Three-quarters of the respondents do require library work of all students, to be done either at Gulf Park or another full service academic library (the Hattiesburg campus, the University of South Alabama, and the universities in New Orleans are all relatively close to the Mississippi Gulf Coast). One professor plans to institute a library component once the collection is built in his area. A very honest answer was that the professor definitely required Gulf Park students to use the library, Keesler students somewhat, and that he "slacked off" the requirements for Jackson County students, due to the distance involved. This approach may be more prevalent than the responses indicate!

Finally, the faculty was asked what services the library should provide off-campus. Most did not indicate anything beyond what is currently being done, and are probably unaware of the range of services being offered by some libraries to off-campus students. More than half indicated that no more should be done:

"We spoon feed them enough as it is."
The long trip to the library is "part of the educational process."

"They're mobile enough" and can utilize weekend hours.

"We don't need separate library facilities off-campus" and have had "no complaints from off-campus students on the unavailability of resources."

"I don't think it's asking too much to come here or go to a full-scale academic library a couple of times during the semester."

Some feel that limited resources dictate the range of services and materials which can be offered off-campus, and that the on-campus library should be more fully utilized before ranching out. One faculty member/administrator feels that offering extended library services places the university in a better competitive position. Distance is identified as an important factor, and several professors mentioned that any extended services offered should be concentrated at the Jackson County Center.

Issues

Several issues must be resolved before considering more formal, closer cooperation and provision of additional services. The Richard G. Cox Library became a branch of the Cook Memorial Library on July 1, 1984. The Cook Library provides all technical services for the Cox Library. The Director of the Cox Library reports to the Director of the Cook Library on matters of policy. On matters of control, such as the budget and personnel, the Director reports to the Dean, USM-Gulf Park. The issue here is whether the Director can provide additional services or make agreements with the other facilities without adversely affecting the regional library and Cook Library.

The Cox Library's major function is to provide public services to its users. This includes circulation, inter/intralibrary loan, reference, reserves, and media service. These functions are staffed by four professional librarians and six library clerks (this includes the Media Center staff). This staff also handles requests and controls library materials sent from the regional library to the remote areas. The issue is: if more services are provided, will more staff be needed? If USM provides no library staff at remote sites, how can control of materials be maintained?
At present, inter- and intralibrary loan are provided through the Cox Library. If materials are not held at Cox, they are provided from the Cook Library if available, or from other libraries via interlibrary loan. Thus materials obtained from or through Cox Library can be placed on the reserve at the off-campus sites. At issue is: how does this affect the collections and work loads of the staff at the Cook Library?

The Media Center, part of the Cox Library, can provide audiovisual software and equipment to Keesler and Jackson County. Material can be requested by faculty for delivery by shuttle to these sites or for personal pickup. The Curriculum Lab is part of the library and it, too, services the remote areas. Although the inventory of AV materials is small (approximately 885 items), it is used extensively by the faculty on the Gulf Park campus and at the remote sites. An interesting phenomenon is taking place with regard to the types of materials that are being utilized frequently by the faculty: more "home-grown" video tapes are being used than commercial tapes. This type of media seems to be more relevant to the classroom environment and use is expected to grow dramatically in 1985-86. At issue is: the Media Center is limited in the amount of AV materials on hand for use; who has priority for use--classes on the Gulf Park campus or at the remote sites?

The literature on the provision of remote user services, and indeed on any endeavor aimed at accomplishing a stated goal, emphasizes that careful planning and budgeting must be instituted as a first and necessary step. The issues for USM here include an administrative element as above; will present operations, and more importantly, the issue of support, be adversely affected? Financial support will be required from the university, that is, the State of Mississippi. Faculty and administrative support will be required from all campuses of the university, especially those on the Gulf Coast. Finally, the support of the regional campus library staff will be important in tasks that may be new to them, and that may impose increased demands on already full schedules.

The question, "Should adult working students be required to use a full service academic library as part of their college experience?" needs to be further addressed. One of the disadvantages, as mentioned earlier, of cooperation between the regional library and the remote sites is lack of exposure to the full range of library materials and services by the users. Cooperation between the faculty and the library staff needs to be strengthened in the area of assignments and in encouraging students to use the regional library for term papers and/or
research. Some students are forced to use the library, especially graduate students, by the nature of their program of study, e.g., business, education and political science. Merely having reserve materials readily available off-campus is not enough of an incentive to explore other materials that might be available at the regional library. A major problem that faces the library staff and faculty is the distance from the remote sites to the regional library fifteen miles from Keesler and forty miles from Jackson County, one way. These adult students work all day then continue their education in the evening. Weekends are basically the only available time for extensive library use.

In order to encourage these students to utilize the full range of library materials and services, a bibliographic instruction program will be proposed in the near future. As stated earlier, close cooperation between the faculty and the library staff is mandatory for this type of program to be effective. In one of the theme papers from the ACRL Third National Conference in 1984, Gresham Riley stated the following as a "reality" of the role of an academic library.

... an academic library is less a place than an array of functions and services to be found in many locations. If bibliographic instruction is course-centered (as I believe it should be), then faculty members and professional librarians will be working together for the purpose of determining how best to integrate bibliographic instruction with the other objectives of the course...As a result, the library is wherever courses are. (Riley, 1984)

Once it has been shown how the resources and services at the regional library can help the adult students, it is felt that they will take advantage of them and consider utilization of the library as an important and necessary part of their college experience.

Conclusion

We have identified what services are presently provided to the off-campus sites and the advantages and disadvantages of the informal agreements now in effect. Several issues that must be resolved before closer cooperation can be effected were identified. These were in the areas of administration and control, including staffing, inter/intralibrary loan, and media services; professional and accreditation standards; faculty support; and the need for bibliographic instruction.
Consultation with the Dean at USM-Gulf Park, the Director of the Cook Library, and the Director of the Cox Library must take place regularly regarding services or agreements concerning use of library collections at the off-campus sites. It has been determined that as more formal agreements are reached regarding services to be provided at the remote sites, additional staff will be needed. Initially, part-time professional staff may be used.

It will be necessary to develop criteria for the placement of library materials on reserve at the remote sites. If materials must be duplicated, budgets will have to be adjusted accordingly. Inter/intra-library loans may have to be increased, but should not be so to the detriment of other services. For example, as need for AV software grows, especially for "home-grown" video tapes, it may be necessary to duplicate them for the remote sites so as not to adversely affect access of on-campus students to these materials. This is the most economical way of meeting those needs.

In the final analysis, there are several areas where we see realistic possibilities for service developing: increased direct telephone access for users between the regional campus library and the remote sites will be proposed, as will utilization of professional staff at the remote sites to identify and meet needs of students and faculty. There is a strong possibility that the Cook Library will embark on an automation project sometime in 1985. This planned integrated system will include acquisitions, circulation, a booking module, an on-line catalog and reserve. Access to the system will be available to the Gulf Park campus initially, with the possibility of limited access from the remote sites. Database searching for those students and faculty at the remote sites may eventually be provided directly by the regional campus staff. Other technological developments, as they pertain to services, will be explored where economically feasible in the future.
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Figure 1. A map of southern Mississippi.
Figure 2. Credit hour production.
The Off-Campus Library Services Conference Proceedings

Off-campus Library Services in Ohio

David C. Evans

The Ohio State University at Marion

A librarian I know has a sign in his office containing a quote from Carlyle that "the true university of these days is a collection of books." This, of course, is the library as the "heart of the university" idea that probably all of us believe in. But what happens to this idea when the university is scattered across the map far from its "collection of books?" This study provides a picture of what is being done in the way of providing library service to off-campus instructional sites in a particular area, in this case the state of Ohio. The object was to describe methods of service delivery and also the extent to which instructional sites are served. We can say at the start that there are some conscientious, well planned efforts made to provide service but that the majority of sites are ill-served if at all. It seems that many university administrators pay only lip service to the ideal of the centrality of the library to the educational enterprise.

Literature

The primary thrust of the literature is to describe programs; what various institutions are doing to provide service. One of the best examples is Fisher (1978) who traveled around the country and then described examples of programs. The Proceedings of the Off-campus Library Services Conference (Lessin, 1983) provide more program descriptions. This is necessary and desirable, especially in a newly developing field. Very little attention has been given to the extent to which these examples are typical. This study sheds some light on that question.

One aspect of the literature is interesting but disturbing. Almost all of the material about library services to off-campus programs has been written by librarians. An examination of several books and numerous articles written by educators about off-campus programs reveals that they have not considered the library related implications of these programs. They write at length about program philosophy, curriculum, faculty and administrative matters. Some articles go on at length about the efficiency of television or radio for the delivery of instruction. The provision of library type services, however, is either not mentioned or is glossed over in a perfunctory manner. Even the accrediting agencies don't pay much attention. One issue of the
North Central Association Quarterly had three articles on assessing off-campus offerings. They covered at length the various aspects to be observed but in only one of the three was there as much as a passing reference to the need to look at library resources.

Basic Statistics

I contacted the Ohio Board of Regents for information regarding what institutions were offering courses and where because I had heard that it was keeping track of off-campus programs. Its response was helpful but incomplete. I developed information about several programs and instructional sites myself. There may well be others that neither I nor the Regents' staff are aware of. Local librarians said that they had not heard of off-campus programs of several universities that the Regents' staff had listed. Doing a study of off-campus programs is much like mapping a beach; the sands keep shifting. However, I believe that the basic outlines remain the same. I counted programs and courses offered away from the offering institution's campus. They are typically housed in high schools. I did not consider programs offered by universities in their branch campuses. These branches, numbering twenty-five in Ohio, are campuses with their own permanent libraries with collections geared to the local curriculum.

I identified sixteen colleges with off-campus programs. Six of these are from outside of Ohio. They offer courses in from one to as many as nine communities. Some communities have as many as three colleges offering courses in their area. Thirty-seven local libraries, both public and academic, reported that students in the various off-campus programs used their collections and services. There were only seven reports that students in the programs did not use the local libraries. Nine librarians reported that they did not know if such usage took place.

Five librarians from universities offering off-campus courses indicated being involved in planning and implementing off-campus library services. Of local librarians near instructional sites, three reported dealing with a university librarian in setting up an arrangement, four reported dealing with some university official other than a librarian. There were thirty-five locations where local librarians reported student usage with no arrangements having been made for services.
Programs

The library services actually provided for off-campus students range from sophisticated systems down to nothing at all. The methods of service provision are essentially what has been already described in the literature; there is very little innovation to be found here. There are several instances where the university places book and journal collections in local public, school, or academic libraries for their students' use. In one fairly typical case, a college offering both bachelors and masters degrees in business at a particular location places about two hundred books in the local public library. These are kept in a separate section. The librarian reports that usage is not high. While the college librarian reports having suggested the procedure, the contact with the public librarian has been by another college official. Faculty sometimes carry materials to the teaching locations. One of these provides a nice publication (CMU, 1982) which gives basic bibliographic instruction as well as hints on using the various types of libraries to be found in the local areas.

Several provide reference service and computer literature searches. One sends ERIC document fiche to students. One has librarians in the field to help with local arrangements and to deal with reference questions via toll free calls. It is also possible to call the central campus for assistance.

Some librarians responded that while no service is provided at the local teaching sites, students are welcome to travel in to use the library on the central campus. In one case this would entail an eighty mile one-way drive. The least distance is fifteen miles.

In at least one case the university library offers distinctly different levels of service to different instructional sites. Another interesting finding is that some library services are made available at the instructional site itself. This is done by leaving materials in the building where the instruction is given. In these cases the local libraries are not contacted. Even so, the students still use the local libraries.

There are several cases where a college offers courses on a campus of another college. Since the students of the offering college have the use of the on-site library of the host college, I did not collect data on this type of arrangement. I did get some information on a few of these situations anyway. The offering college sometimes supplements the collection of the host library
in the area of need and also offers to send materials from its own library for use by its students.

One local public librarian reported serving students from off-campus programs of three colleges, none of which had made any arrangements for service for their students. He did note that one faculty member brought in personal books to put on reserve.

In one situation a college has arranged to have some of its books available in the local public library but has not contacted a college library in the area. Students from the off-campus program come to the local college library hoping to find service. The reverse situation exists in another community where a university has made arrangements with a local college but not with the local public library. This public library reports serving students from this program.

The librarians of one institution which does not provide service stated that the students are free to travel in to the central campus and that no service is necessary in the outlying locations. However, in one location the person in charge of the college's local program has asked the public library to provide closed reserve service and library use instruction. The library has complied with this request.

One university teaches graduate courses in a small community in which there is no public library. The university makes no attempt to provide library service to this location. The librarians of the nearest public library, which is eight miles away, report that the students travel there to do their library work. This is a medium sized library with a collection of about 143,000 volumes. One would have to travel quite an additional distance to reach a library substantial enough to support graduate study.

Financial and Staff Support

Only five colleges indicated that off-campus library service receives regular financial support. None of them said that the amount spent on a per student basis was comparable to that spent for on-campus students. The difference was described as "substantial" and "great." Several of the librarians noted the difficulty in estimating costs. Of the few libraries that provide off-campus support most of the work is done by people who split their time between this and other duties. As the experience of Johnson (1984) and Mount and Turpke (1980) illustrate, it is imperative that each library supporting an off-campus program
assign at least one person full time to this task. I found only one instance in which this is the case.

Standards

I asked the librarians of the colleges conducting off-campus courses if they were familiar with the ACRL guidelines for off-campus library services (ACRL, 1982). Seven knew of these guidelines, but one had not heard of the standards. Only two thought that their library support was barely or partially in conformance. Only two believed that the guidelines are relevant. One of these went on to comment that he didn't think that "there can ever be truly equal service" off-campus. Another comment was that the standards are "so vague as to be minimally useful." One believed that the guidelines have both "good features" and "unrealistic expectations."

In looking at the data on the library support programs it seems impossible to escape the conclusion that the library service at the majority of instructional sites is far below standard. Johnson (1984), from the low population density state of Wyoming, writes that the guidelines would work in "states where large populations are located throughout, and where local library resources are adequate or can be easily supplemented by the main library." Ohio is such a high population density state but still many local libraries are not adequate to support college work and it is still not easy to provide support from the central library even when there is a commitment of resources and effort. As noted elsewhere, the requirements for planning, finances, personnel, facilities, resources and services as outlined in the standards are seldom addressed.

Impact on Local Libraries

The effect on local libraries located near the instructional sites seems to be slight in most cases. Very few of the librarians I contacted expressed complaints. They provided reference, interlibrary loan and other services apparently without complaint or undue problem. This correlates with Harper (1983) who found little burden on the local librarians. However, she was describing a program where the students had been well prepared and advance work with local libraries had been done.

I did run into a few librarians who had had some difficulty such as one who testily noted that she was "very aware of demands" by the off-campus students. Another said that he would "question the ethics of off-campus programs where no library services/facilities are provided" and expressed concern over the staff time needed to assist these students. One said that it
"would be helpful" to have had contact from the university in regard to the type of materials needed.

Summary

It is clear that despite some fine library support efforts the overall level of services to off-campus instructional sites in Ohio is abysmally low. If we can assume that essentially the same situation exists nationwide, then clearly much work needs to be done. Librarians will have to educate the educators about the library support implications of their plans. We will have to tell them what should be done and what can be done. There exist examples, both in Ohio and elsewhere, that the standards are not completely unrealistic and that service can be provided. We are developing the techniques: we need to develop the backing needed to put our methodologies into action.
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The University of South Carolina system consists of the central Columbia campus, five university commuter campuses that grant associate degrees, and three four-year commuter campuses that grant baccalaureate degrees. In addition, some graduate courses in business, education, engineering, and library science are offered at each of the university and four-year campuses. Undergraduate and graduate instruction is available through television, video tape, workshops, and correspondence, as well as through the traditional classroom, both on campus and at remote sites.

Providing rapid and diverse services to all library users has been a welcomed challenge to the University of South Carolina Library System. The first step we took in improving and expanding our current services to meet all our users' informational needs was to develop an organization of campus librarians so that a forum for communications would be available. Open discussion on library services has contributed to the development of a strong network of professionals who view interlibrary cooperation and coordination as an essential ingredient for success in meeting library users' information needs.

The transition to an information and services-based economy is particularly difficult in South Carolina, where textiles, agriculture and tourism are the major economic activities. In order for our state to move successfully into this information age, we must construct networks to find and deliver needed information. We librarians are no longer just "caretakers of the books", we are information managers who depend upon effective communication with many individuals and institutions throughout the state. Educational, governmental, banking, health care, and many other service agencies rely on us in the university system to
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provide rapid and accurate information so they can deliver their services.

With these thoughts in mind, system librarians have reviewed current services and their quality. We have agreed that we have enhanced and extended services and that we have given particular attention to users distant not only from the local campus library but also from the central research library. We have considered additional methods of improving services and have developed a plan to aid us as we take our giant step into the information age.

The two key factors in providing services are the utilization of a centralized technical and user services center and a strong local and statewide communications network. First, we would like to provide an overview of the centralized technical and user services provided by our Library Processing Center, which is located in Columbia but separate from the Columbia campus library. The Processing Center's technical and services unit provides automated acquisitions, cataloging through Solinet, physical processing of library materials, and invoice payment. User services include a twice a week shuttle service to the campuses from Columbia and an interlibrary loan/reference/computer search service.

Cost saving is the most often-cited advantage of centralized processing. In our case, the Processing Center employs skilled cataloging personnel who use the OCLC network to catalog materials for all our libraries, thus avoiding duplication of personnel, equipment, telecommunications, and network charges. Similarly, the Processing Center has acquisitions personnel who verify and place materials orders and an accounting clerk who pays all invoices, again avoiding duplication at eight campuses. In addition, cost savings are realized through larger vendor discounts on books, supplies, and binding, since the Processing Center can negotiate for all libraries.

One of the greatest benefits of centralized technical processing is that, while Processing Center personnel handle the technical duties, system librarians are released for public service. The Sumter campus will be used as an example to identify some of the service areas in which our system libraries have enjoyed the greatest benefits. The Sumter campus became part of the University of South Carolina system in 1973. Prior to that date Clemson University, which governed the campus, organized the library and selected and processed the core collection. After the initial organization, all technical services were carried out on the Sumter campus. During that period a large amount of time was spent placing orders with vendors, processing new books, solving
problems with orders, paying bills, and ordering catalog cards. Patrons often waited for assistance that we could not provide unless we slowed technical processing necessary for prompt access to new materials.

Centralized processing has improved the efficiency of the Sumter Library in serving patrons. The entire staff has been able to develop reference skills so that reference services can be provided at all times. Librarians are continually learning what new types of information are available and how to assist library patrons in the utilization of appropriate materials. Librarians have additional time to determine which areas of our collection need to be upgraded and to carry out the necessary weeding of the collection. With centralized processing, librarians have additional time to meet with faculty to discuss materials selection. Formal bibliographic instruction for students, in-service training of staff, and work with ephemeral materials (such as pamphlet files, A-V materials and special collections of interest to the community) now have a higher priority. Centralized processing has given the librarians significantly more time for these critical aspects of library service.

The second key ingredient for providing services to users is an efficient communications network. University President James Holderman, a strong advocate of the system concept, is committed to making all university resources available to students at all campuses, as well as to citizens of the state of South Carolina.

In a small campus environment, the quality of instruction in individual courses depends upon an interlibrary communications network which locates and supplies the needed resource materials for the instructor and the student. The process for using this network is outlined as follows.

Before the beginning of each semester, librarians at the Sumter campus check the undergraduate, continuing education, telecommunications (either live transmissions requiring talkback capabilities or video tape), and graduate school schedules for courses to be offered at our campus. Six months in advance, the Academic Dean informs us of new courses to be offered. Librarians also determine what courses are being offered cooperatively with other area institutions. After we have surveyed the basic materials available in our library to support these course, the librarians contact faculty to discuss specific details. If the faculty member is from another campus or institution, we ask him or her to drop by the library to look at the available resources. If the faculty member indicates that he or she needs materials we do not own, we try to borrow from other system libraries through
our interlibrary loan network or purchase if possible. We also encourage the faculty member to bring the class to the library or to let a librarian talk to one of the first classes. Librarians develop bibliographies and other specialized handouts for individual courses.

Further, we keep all appropriate departments and personnel apprised of our actions. At the end of the course, we check with entire classes or individual students and with faculty members to make sure that user needs have been met. Users are provided the same quality of service, regardless of whether they are taking general courses, correspondence courses, television courses, courses at remote sites; are referred to us from other libraries; or are interested community members.

We do, however, have room for improvement. Admittedly, the above scenario is the ideal; in actuality, we are not so successful in working with faculty who travel from Columbia to teach a course one night a week at our campus. These faculty members are often rushed and do not have time to consult with a librarian concerning course needs. We have targeted this area as one that needs attention. We propose to designate a Processing Center librarian as a facilitator between the off-campus professor and the campus librarian when necessary.

The high degree of user satisfaction is due both to the system librarians' efforts and Processing Center support services, including the interlibrary loan/reference/computer search service, the twice a week shuttle service, and three main system projects. These projects, which are undertaken by committees headed by Processing Center staff, include online interlibrary loan, online library system, and online serials.

One of the most visible services offered by the Processing Center is the university's shuttle service. Traveling from Columbia to each campus twice a week since 1979, the shuttle carries both library and non-library materials from one campus to another. While this service is valuable to the entire university, it is essential to library patrons for fast delivery of requested interlibrary loan materials and new shelf-ready books.

Begun in 1977, the Processing Center's centralized interlibrary loan service handled 1270 requests during the first ten-month period and almost 4000 requests during the 1983-84 fiscal year. System librarians send three types of requests to the Processing Center: specific book requests, specific article requests, and reference requests. System librarians send all book requests directly to the Processing Center. Processing Center
staff first checks the system title file (a card catalog by title of campus library holdings) and sends the book request to the campus owning the title. If no locations are found in the title file, the Processing Center staff takes the request to the Thomas Cooper Library on the Columbia campus. If the book is not available from the Cooper Library, the Processing Center interlibrary loan librarian then checks the OCLC database (a national library database which lists library holdings) for locations and places the request to holding libraries in the state, region or country (if the requesting librarian has asked for this service). The requesting librarian promptly receives either the book or a report indicating what other steps have been taken. The procedure is the same for article requests, except the system librarians, by using the University of South Carolina at Spartanburg-produced periodicals list, can first request articles from each other without sending the request through the Processing Center.

System librarians send reference requests directly to the Processing Center's interlibrary loan/reference librarian. Reference requests vary from "Send me three books on Charlemagne" for an undergraduate writing a term paper; to "What information does the central library have on Felician Rops, a Belgian artist who specialized in book illustration" for a faculty member; to "I need some information on putting on a book sale from a library's standpoint"; to "Please look through Mohandas Ghandi's collected works for his statements concerning the Irish Republican Movement's use of violence"; to "Get me the lyrics to this song published in 1923." Also, since most of our campus libraries are small and do not own the necessary verification tools, an important part of the service is verifying article citations before requesting them outside the university system through the OCLC database.

For more than two years, the Processing Center's interlibrary loan/reference librarian has performed on-line searches using Lockheed's Dialog Information Service databases. Before this period, system patrons had access to computer searches only by traveling to the Columbia campus library (up to a three hour drive) for a reference interview. Although an in-person reference interview is definitely the preferred method, the time and distance involved for our patrons mandated that we make the service available through our local libraries and the Processing Center. Now the campus librarian conducts the reference interview, completes the request form with the patron using the appropriate database thesaurus, then sends the form to the Processing Center reference librarian, who conducts the search. Search results are sent to the requesting library via shuttle
delivery service. Actual research charges are passed through to the user, along with a two dollar service charge. The service has grown from thirty-five searches the first year to fifty-five searches during the first six months of the current year (1984/85).

Speed has always been a primary consideration. Over the years, we have been able to decrease turn-around time in several ways: (a) by using the University's twice a week shuttle service since its beginning in 1979, instead of the U.S. Mail, (b) by increasing the Processing Center interlibrary loan staff from one half-time person in September 1977 to today's staff of one professional librarian, one library technical assistant, and two students, (c) by telephoning requests from the Processing Center to other campuses rather than forwarding requests via shuttle or mail. Since we always are looking for ways to speed up service, we were delighted when the University's Computer Service Division evidenced a willingness to work with us on an online interlibrary loan system.

After a year and a half of committee planning and programming, we began testing this new on-line system with three libraries in October, 1984. The system, which resides on the University's Amdahl 470 V6, runs on CMS and a command language called REX, which is easily modified and allows the programmer to write his or her own commands. The system librarians access the on-line system using IBM PC's in their libraries or IBM terminals either in the libraries or in their campus computer rooms. By December 1984, all but two of the system libraries were using the on-line system.

The on-line interlibrary loan system is a menu-driven, user-friendly system presently composed of five files. The user first sees the main menu, which gives him or her the option either to create a request, respond to a request, or look at an archival file. If the user elects to create a request, a formatted form appears on the screen for the user to complete. The request will automatically advance from one possible lender to another (to a maximum of eight lenders) until it returns to the requester either filled or unfilled. Both responses appear in the user's "respond" file. The user checks the "respond" file daily to determine the status of requests.

The user can look directly at an individual request by inputting that request's unique number. The user can also monitor requests by looking at the three archival files. The system records each request as it is placed, thereby forming a historical file which is available to the user. It also creates a log file,
which serves as a record of daily requests. The forward file lists the user's request that have been forwarded from one campus to another.

Requests are deleted from the system if they are not answered within five days. This has been a problem only during holidays, since we ordinarily respond to requests quickly. Any response, either returning the request with a favorable response or forwarding it to another lender, starts the five day clock over at one.

Response to the system has been favorable. Most of the librarians quickly decided to use the system exclusively, dismissing the paper form we had used for five years. Decreased turn-around time for requests from one campus to another is the most obvious advantage. Since at the Processing Center we check the system morning and afternoon, it is now a common occurrence for a request from a campus to the Processing Center to another campus to be answered and the requested materials mailed, all in the same day. Previously, this might have taken from four days to two weeks.

Plans are proceeding to expand the online system. The proposed reference request form and the online search request form will further aid the interlibrary loan and reference librarians, while the technically-oriented librarians will benefit from the proposed cataloging problem form, the budget information form, and the problem book form.

In its function as coordinator of system projects, the Processing Center staff has led the development of the online library system. The first phase of the project, retrospective conversion, is the process by which book records are converted to machine readable form and tagged with campus ownership. The Processing Center staff is carrying out this phase through a contract with Solinet. The resulting online catalog will supersede the card catalogs currently used by patrons in our libraries. Problems that patrons have with card catalogs, such as the inability to decipher cataloging rules and lost or misfiled cards, will no longer exist. The patron using a terminal and typing in an author, title, call number, or subject can identify a book, determine if it is owned by any campus, and whether it is checked out or available. An additional step will initiate an interlibrary loan request to another campus. Perhaps most helpful for our commuter patrons is the remote access feature, which will allow patrons to search the system's library holdings from home or office. Both library patrons and library staffs will be able to
compile bibliographies of library holdings immediately. This system should be operational in the next three to five years.

The third project directed by the Processing Center staff is the serials project. The system libraries are fortunate to have a union list of periodicals compiled by University of South Carolina at Spartanburg librarian, Bob Perrin. This list also includes the periodical holdings of more than twenty other multi-type libraries. Now in its eighth edition, this paper list is updated annually. The Processing Center staff is leading the effort to provide initially a more frequently updated microfiche version and then an online version of the union list which would also include the serials holdings of the Columbia campus library. Patrons at all campuses would be able to check the serial holdings of all other system libraries.

In summation, we have described present services and current plans to enhance these services. We will continue to identify technical applications to support communications networks in order to improve existing services and implement new services, as required by our communities and our campuses in the emerging information age.
Off-campus Students and Readings:
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Abstract

The amount of reading undertaken by off-campus students may be an indication of the academic standard of their course program. The statistics of University of Birmingham extramural students' borrowing, and similar surveys elsewhere, reveal that off-campus students read proportionately as much as their internal counterparts. The paper outlines some of the most important factors involved in the achievement of a high-level of effective reading, with particular emphasis on the role of librarians and lecturers. The main conclusion is that close attention should be paid to these questions in off-campus courses, since reading levels are both a justification for the provision of a special library service and also a yardstick of academic standards.

University Education and Reading

The purpose of a university course is to increase students' knowledge and to train them to think analytically, and there is no doubt that carefully selected reading can play an important part in this process. The discovery of views different from those of the instructor cannot fail to stimulate further thought; and the more demands of this sort that are made on a student, the higher the academic standard of a course is likely to be. Since few would deny that one of the main objectives of any academic library service is to enable students to read more widely and beneficially on their subjects than would otherwise have been possible, it follows that in this sense a university library service has a crucial role to play in the maintenance of academic standards. This role is particularly important in the context of off-campus programs, where, because of the difficulty of providing adequate library support, it is sometimes tempting to organizers to offer courses which require a minimum amount of reading.

One of the main criticisms leveled against distance education or external courses is that they too often rely on comprehensively packaged notes, and that students are thus "spoon-fed" and, in effect, discouraged from further reading. If we accept the value of reading in education, and if we claim that
off-campus courses are, or should be, of an academic standard similar to on-campus courses, then we have to show that external students undertake as much reading as internal students on comparable courses. This paper presents some of the statistical evidence on extramural students' book borrowing gathered at the University of Birmingham over recent years and makes some comparisons both with similar surveys elsewhere and with internal students' borrowing.

Of course we have to acknowledge that borrowing a book is not the same as reading it, and that loans statistics are only a part of the picture. What is needed is not only a regular monitoring of loans statistics (to ensure that students are at least ostensibly making use of the library service provided for them) but also a constant evaluation of the use of books, the nature and effectiveness of the reading undertaken, and the extent to which students have enhanced their understanding of their subjects as a result. The second part of this paper, therefore, aims to isolate some of the most important factors involved in the achievement of a high level of reading (and a high level of effective reading) by off-campus students, with particular attention to the role of librarians and lecturers in this process.

We must be careful not to over-simplify on these questions: the context must be defined in each case. For the amount of borrowing, reading, and library involvement is bound to vary according to the nature and level of the subject being studied, the ability of the students, the time available for students to read, the location of the class or the individuals, and the suitability and availability of the reading materials.

Book Borrowing

University of Birmingham Statistics of Extramural Loans

At Birmingham most off-campus courses consist of classes of adults meeting once a week at local centers, and each class is supplied with its own mini-library, which remains at the meeting place for the duration of the course. Here we have in each case a controlled situation - a group meeting on a regular basis with a lecturer whose function is to stimulate interest in his subject, to educate his students and to monitor their progress. And because we have collected loans statistics for most classes over a period of many years, the average figures are reasonably accurate indication of the "normal" amount of book-borrowing by external students in traditional part-time classes. The controlled situations also enable lecturers to some extent to measure the effectiveness of their students' reading, and we shall return to this question.
### Table 1

University of Birmingham. Department of Extramural Studies Library.

Average loans (from class collections) per extramural student 1978-84.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology &amp; history</td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>2805</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>4523</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language &amp; literature</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy, theology, psychology</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical &amp; biological sciences</td>
<td>1462</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1627</td>
<td>2118</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual arts</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All subjects</td>
<td>5495</td>
<td>9874</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6482</td>
<td>11831</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: R = number of registered extramural students.  L = loans.  A = average number of loans per student.

R represents the total number of students enrolled; the number of "effective" students (those attending two-thirds or more of the class meetings) is lower, so that the number of loans per effective student is higher than the figures given.
What is remarkable in Table 1 is the consistency both in the overall average number of loans and in the averages by subject. We can firmly state that in the total Birmingham program an average of two books per effective student are borrowed from class libraries each year, that the highest number of loans are made in literature courses, and that the fewest loans are made in music and social sciences courses.

At first sight the overall average number of loans per student is too low for complacency, but it is not the full picture. First, the basis for it is one class meeting a week - this is very much part-time education. Second, most of the courses are non-degree (non-credit) special interest courses, so lacking the "carrot" of a qualification at the end. In addition, many books (e.g. scores in music courses, identification handbooks in biological sciences, handwriting documents in palaeography) are used in class without being recorded as loans. Also, many lecturers issue specially prepared handouts as basic reading. And many students read texts which they have bought for themselves, or borrowed from other libraries (we have not compiled statistics on these). Another important factor is that there is no official limit on the loan period - some students may retain the same book for the duration of the course. Finally, these figures take no account of other kinds of library support, such as information and photocopy services, Table 1 therefore represents the absolute minimum of book-borrowing actually undertaken.

Other Surveys of External Students' Borrowing

Statistics of this sort are rarely published. The most relevant surveys seem to be those of Massey University (Thompson, 1975), Western Australian Institute of Technology (WAIT) (Brockman and Klobas, 1983), and the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT) (Haworth, 1980). The great majority of the students covered by these surveys were part-time external degree students.

The Massey survey was concerned with borrowing by extramural students both through the University Library's postal extramural service and from non-Massey sources. Of those students who responded to the survey questionnaire only 32% used the postal service, although it was the only source of supply directly geared to their needs. This 32% borrowed an average of six books each in a year. The overall average number of loans through this system was therefore two books per student, as at Birmingham.

The WAIT survey had a different emphasis and did not aim to produce figures of average loans per student. It showed that
nearly all students, both external and internal, purchased the prescribed text-books, but that a much lower percentage, of both groups, attempted to obtain the additional recommended material. An important finding was that there was "no significant difference between the external and internal groups in the breadth of their reading. It also showed that external students in general made much more use of non-WAIT libraries that did internal students, and that external students made much heavier use of the WAIT external collections than they did of the WAIT main library. The external collections consist of a postal loan service from a special collection at Perth, an off-campus study centre library, and a system of book boxes.

At RMIT external students can either use the Central Library in person or borrow by post from the (very small) External Studies Branch Library. Not surprisingly, the survey revealed that, mainly for reasons of distance, they borrow far less from the Central Library than do internal students; and, because they also borrow little from the Branch Library, external students borrow more from non-RMIT sources than do internal students. But again the survey did not indicate average borrowing figures per student.

University of Birmingham Statistics of Internal Loans

The following Table enables us to make a direct comparison between internal and extramural students at Birmingham.
### Table 2

**University of Birmingham. Main Library.**

**Average loans per internal full-time student 1978-83.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>45,554</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>50,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>37,674</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>40,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp;</td>
<td>3552</td>
<td>31,032</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>3604</td>
<td>34,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>6525</td>
<td>114,260</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>6623</td>
<td>125,036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** R = number of registered internal students.  
L = loans.  
A = average number of loans per student.
The average of 1.8 loans per registered extramural student at Birmingham in 1978-79 (see Table 1) represents an average of 17.1 loans per student when translated into a full-time equivalent (f.t.e.). In this calculation the determining factor is student contact hours. In 1978-79 the 472 extramural courses to which books were supplied represented approximately 202,200 student hours. When divided by 350 (the estimated norm of internal student contact hours in any one year), this gives a total of 578 f.t.e. students. The total number of extramural loans divided by 578 gives us the average of 17.1 loans per f.t.e. student. And the 1.9 average for 1983-84 is equivalent to 18.0 loans per full-time student. The figures for each category are therefore very similar, i.e. external and internal students borrow proportionately about the same number of books in a year in connection with their courses.

It should be pointed out that the average number of loans in Table 2 are somewhat inflated because the figures include loans to post-graduate students, who tend to borrow more than under-graduates (the issue system at Birmingham does not distinguish between these two categories). This makes the comparison with external students even more favourable. The in-class use of books by extramural students is largely balanced out by the in-library use of books by full-time students.

Some Conclusions from the Surveys

On the evidence of the above surveys and comparisons we may conclude the following:

1. For reasons of distance off-campus students prefer (and make more use of, where it exists) a library (books) service which is specially geared to their needs and location, such as a postal loans system or local deposit collections (see also Orton and Wiseman, 1977).

2. From this off-campus service only (i.e. excluding all other sources) the average loans for all students is two books in a year.

3. On average external students borrow proportionately as many books (from all sources) in a year as do internal students. This implies that in terms of reading requirements off-campus courses are generally as academically demanding as on-campus courses.
Reading: Quantity and Quality

It now remains to look at possible ways both of improving on the number of loans stated in number 2 above, and also of achieving a high level of effective reading. There are three main questions to ask:

1. How can a lecturer stimulate his or her students to read?
2. How can a lecturer guide students in what they read?
3. How can a lecturer measure the effectiveness of students' reading?

We have to think all the time of two main possibilities: (a) individual reading (each student reading something different) and (b) group reading (all students reading the same text at the time).

It is strange that librarians rarely concern themselves with student reading, as such, although in a sense it is our reason d'être. We concentrate on having the right materials available, and on their "use" in terms of numbers of loans, but we rarely ask questions about reading as an educational process. This may be because, while we can try to measure the effectiveness of our service, it is much more difficult to measure the effectiveness of students' reading. However, the latter is an objective which both librarians and teachers share, and librarians have an important role to play in training lecturers how to get the best out of their students, in terms of library usage, and how to monitor their progress. Lecturers can themselves be "educated" in the various techniques of stimulating students to read, and guiding their reading.

Stimulating Students to Read

Clearly stimulating an interest in the subject is the first requirement. It is when student interest is at its highest, perhaps when a teacher has posed a problem which students then want to solve for themselves, that he or she should suggest appropriate sources and not leave them to fend for themselves. In general, the following course of action by a lecturer is the most likely to encourage students to read:

1. To state on the syllabus what reading he plans students to do, as a group, during the course.
2. To provide, before the course, an annotated list of the required reading, indicating which parts of which books are the most helpful on the topics to be covered.
3. To introduce these books at the first meeting, showing copies to the class and commenting on their merits and demerits.
4. To refer to books in his teaching, quoting from them where appropriate.
5. To relate particular books to written assignments and to possible examination questions; these are likely to be the strongest stimuli.
6. To "reward" students for their reading by discussing with them, individually or in class, books which they have read. Most of these suggestions may seem elementary or common sense, but it is surprising how often they are overlooked by lecturers. One of the librarian's tasks is to remind teaching staff of them.

Guided Reading

The reading process is complex, and both librarians and teachers should try to understand the possible problems involved if they are to guide students' reading effectively. There are two main facets: the reading material itself, which has difficulties and differences and experiences to the printed word. Within these two facets there is an enormous range of possible combinations and variables, so that in a sense the reading process is a unique experience for each person. One generalization is possible: with a few exceptions (e.g. a literature text, or a specialized journal article) it is rarely necessary to read a book from cover to cover - students are usually pursuing a topic rather than "reading a book" as such, and need to be selective.

Apart from this question of how to read a book, the main problems likely to be encountered by lecturers in this context are (a) relating the difficulty of the reading material to the ability of the students, and (b) relating the amount of reading required to the time available to do it and to the availability of the texts. (a) implies that a lecturer may need to take some account of the level at which students "normally" read. At the undergraduate level there is little point in suggesting books which are either highly specialized or indigestible (or both), or too elementary. A student wishing to learn about ancient Greek theatre production should start with H. C. Baldry The Greek tragic theatre (1971), and, for more detail, move on to A. Pickard-Cambridge The dramatic festivals of Athens (1968); T. B. L. Webster's heavyweight Greek theatre production (1970) should be avoided except at postgraduate level. (b) implies that lecturer should remember that most adult students are busy people, so that he or she should not require an excessive amount of reading, nor expect students to spend a great deal of time trying to obtain texts. In a course on Victorian literature it would be unrealistic to expect a student to read, in a 10 week term, more
than four novels such as Middlemarch, Great expectations, Jane Eyre, and Mary Barton - in terms of numbers of pages (2400 in the Penguin editions) this is equivalent to reading 20 plays such as Death of a salesman, or Who's afraid of Virginia Woolf?, or 12 texts of the length of A. J. Ayer's Language, truth and logic which seems excessive. Clearly adjustments have to be made according to how "difficult" or "easy" to read the texts are. In addition, all titles recommended should be in print or easily obtainable through the library service - again there is little point in listing as essential a book which has been out of print for 30 years and of which there is only one copy in the region.

The Effectiveness of Reading

How can a lecturer discover what benefits students have derived from their reading? The most obvious evidence will be shown in their written work and in examinations. Apart from this, the evidence may be rather nebulous. Some indications will emerge from class discussion, and a lecturer should make a point of basing some discussion questions on what students have been asked to read. Perhaps better still students could be asked, either collectively or individually, what they think of books they have read; this has already been mentioned as a possible stimulus to reading in the first place. And the lecturer could also report on his or her assessment at the end of the course. At Birmingham we ask all lecturers to submit written comments on a number of question, two of which are "Was good use made of the books?" and "Was reading planned or haphazard?" and many of the answers are helpful to the library staff in future planning and collection development.

Conclusion

The upshot of all this is that both librarians and lecturers equally should be concerned about the quantity and quality of what students read, and that these concerns are particularly important in off-campus programs. Librarians can usefully contribute to briefing sessions held for teaching staff, aimed at training them in the special techniques required for teaching adults. There are many different types of library service possible in the context of off-campus programmes, different methods of delivery and ways of encouraging library use, and this paper has touched on only a few of the more traditional ones. The main point is that, whatever library or information system used, we should show that we are making as many demands academically on our off-campus students as are made on full-time students on-campus; the methods outlined in this paper should be seen to be working, both as a justification for the provision of a special library service and also as a yardstick of academic standards.
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The Design and Conduct of Off-Campus Library Program Reviews Based on Effectiveness Models

Edward D. Garten
Tennessee Tech University

Introduction

Most academic libraries and library managers are familiar with a variety of review processes. Some of those processes are locally developed and refined to meet local needs while other review processes are somewhat imposed upon the library and its parent institution by the system level or by a regional accreditation body. What many of the present approaches to review lack, however, is an explicit emphasis on outcomes and performance questions and concerns that need to be addressed early on in an off-campus library program review and on linking those questions and concerns to other questions which are grounded in the need to gain outcomes and performance effectiveness data.

Basic Issues in Program Review

Often managers are far from explicit with the very basic questions of program review. In any review of off-campus library programs it is critical that the reviewer or review committee actively addresses the following questions:

1. When will off-campus programs be reviewed?
2. Who will be involved in the review process?
3. What aspects of the program will be considered in the review?

Many program reviews have failed from the outset because such basic considerations were not adequately explored and decisions made and adequately communicated to all library staff members. When determining when off-campus library programs will be reviewed, a review committee should ask whether an annual review is preferred or whether a fixed multi-year schedule is preferred. Other points of review might occur when problems are detected or when major curricular shifts within the university occur. When considering who will be involved in the review process one should consider whether top-level administrators will be immediately involved with the process and to what degree middle-level administrators, e.g., deans and departmental chairs, will be involved. Should faculty who are major users of the
off-campus library program be immediately involved in the review? And should students, the primary consumers of the off-campus library program, be involved at some level? How will consultants be involved and when should they be involved? Finally, when considering what aspects of the off-campus library program are to be reviewed it is valuable to detail what type of cost effectiveness questions will be explored. Need/demand questions should be considered as well as the quality of other support services provided by the university which interface with the off-campus library support programs.

Such questions should be incorporated into a systematic approach to program review. One such approach, suggested in the diagram on the last page of this paper, has been found useful by the writer as a means of aiding an off-campus library review team conceptualize its work.

Process Concerns Underlying Reviews

Apart from the primary questions that need to be addressed from the outset of program review, team members often share a common set of concerns which are process in nature. Members of the review team will often be concerned about whether the process will be fair to all concerned with the off-campus library program. Will the process uphold the principles of good communication and will the process carry an overall positive emphasis? Members of a review body are often implicitly concerned about the objectivity, credibility, and utility of the review once it is completed. The design and conduct of any good off-campus library program review must conscientiously deal with these spoken or unspoken issues.

A central obligation of a library administrator giving leadership to an off-campus library program review is that of clearly stating the benefits of program review, especially those benefits which go beyond cost savings and economics. It is beneficial to state a broader definition of benefits to be gained and the clarification of such benefits may result in a number of the following:

1. The improvement in off-campus library support program quality
2. The development of priorities among programs being offered by the library
3. Identification of funds available for reallocation
4. Assurance of some degree of consumer (student) protection
5. Heightened morale and optimism about the library's ability to respond to changing off-campus learning conditions
6. Increased consideration of alternative ways of developing and delivering off-campus library services
7. Improved opportunities for intra-campus comparisons of quality in the deliverance of services
8. Improved capacity for planning and for decisions on the allocation of library resources
9. Improved "early warning" of impending difficulties in the particular off-campus library program
10. Encouragement of inter-institutional cooperation especially among competing college or university off-campus and extended service programs
11. Provision of data to senior-level administrators as a means of clarifying what is being accomplished in the off-campus library effort.

Linking Basic Issues to Questions of Effectiveness

With any discussion of program effectiveness must go a concurrent discussion of overall organizational effectiveness. Those managing an off-campus library program review should avoid talking about the off-campus programs outside of the context of the overall library and university organizations. The following observations are offered as a means of avoiding such a mistake and as guidance in helping off-campus library program review committees structure their assumptions and responses in the critical area of program effectiveness. No standard set of criteria for the evaluation of off-campus library programs exists. Definitional problems surrounding organizational effectiveness and unit effectiveness are many simply because academic organizations are complex entities. Their goals and objectives are frequently multiple, contradictory, and difficult to identify. This complexity often prohibits the identification of specific indicators of effectiveness on the unit level because organizations, as well as competing units, often pursue contradictory aims.

There are four basic models for assessing effectiveness in off-campus programs. Library review committees should discuss the options and select that alternative or combination of alternatives most appropriate to their review and self-study.

1. The model which links off-campus library program effectiveness to the accomplishment of unit goals. This model assumes that the library unit under study
has identified its goals and that progress toward goal attainment can be measured. The focus is on the outputs approximating goals; thus the more effective the unit is judged to be.

2. The model which approaches effectiveness of the off-campus library unit from a system-resource method. Here the unit is not assumed to have clear-cut goals, nor is goal attainment a relevant consideration. Rather, the academic unit under review is considered effective insofar as it is able to acquire needed resources to maintain itself. Thus, the more optimal the level of needed resources the off-campus library program can gain from its environment, the more effective it is judged to be. This model is a highly competitive one.

3. The model which focuses on the internal processes of the off-campus library program. In this approach effective programs are those without evidence of internal strain. Those associated with the program are highly integrated into the program; there is little friction; and communication lines are open with information flowing smoothly both vertically and horizontally. This is a "healthy systems" way of looking at program effectiveness. If a review group uses this approach it is holding the assumption that units are more effective if they possess greater degrees of these traits. Such an approach to the illumination of program effectiveness is highly process oriented.

4. The model which focuses on primary constituencies and participant satisfaction. In such an approach one focuses on whether or not the primary clientele of the program are satisfied with what they get. Goals, outputs, and processes are not the central consideration; rather one is looking at the people or organizations who have a fundamental stake in what the off-campus library program is doing and accomplishing.

A review committee can use elements of all four models in approaching assessment of effectiveness; however, each of the models works best in certain contexts. The goal model works best when unit goals are clear, consensual, and easily measurable. The system-resource model works best when there is a clear connection between resources taken in by the program and the end products of
the program. The process approach works best when the internal
day-to-day processes of the program are closely linked with what
the program produces or with its primary tasks. Finally, the
participant satisfaction approach is most appropriate when
students, alumni, business and industry, or external agencies have
a powerful influence over what the library program does and where
it is deemed important to react to these constituencies.

Once a model or a combination of models has been chosen by a
review committee, there are six critical decisions that need to be
agreed upon if an assessment of library program effectiveness is
to be focused and critical. These decision points follow:

Decision Point One: What activities of the off-campus library
program will be the focus of evaluation as evidence of its
effectiveness is sought? Most academic and administrative units
operate in a variety of domains. The research tends to indicate
that most units within higher education cannot be completely
effective in all their domains of activity. Effectiveness in one
area often mitigates against effectiveness in another, i.e., all
programs experience "trade-offs." The importance and relevance of
program domains of activity often change over time. Focus
carefully on those activities to be explored in terms of
effectiveness. Focusing on outdated or inappropriate activities
not only prevents accurate assessments of effectiveness, but may
have negative consequences for the review itself.

Decision Point Two: Whose perspective is being considered when the
review committee is debating concerns of program effectiveness?
Any review of effectiveness always reflects the values of those
people conducting the review. Increased unit performance and
effectiveness from one reviewer's perspective may result in
lowered effectiveness from another reviewer's perspective. The
review body may not resolve this question but an organizational
unit seldom satisfies all constituencies. Moreover, certain
viewpoints will, for a host of reasons, be more influential than
others.

Decision Point Three: What level of analysis of effectiveness is
being used? There are at least three levels that can be used when
evaluating the effectiveness of an area: the effectiveness of
individuals within the off-campus library program; the
effectiveness of advisory groups, faculty groups, or committees
which operate within the program; and the effectiveness of the
overall program. Keep in mind that effectiveness of each of these
three levels may be compatible; however, effectiveness on one
level may well mitigate against effectiveness on another level.
The review team should exercise care in selecting the appropriate level(s) of analysis.

Decision Point Four: What time frame is being employed when considering questions of effectiveness? Keep in mind that effectiveness over the long run is sometimes incompatible with effectiveness in the short run. The committee's choice of a time frame is critical because academic and administrative units often trade off short term effectiveness in order to guarantee long term effectiveness. The converse is also true: units may emphasize short term effectiveness without considering the long term.

Decision Point Five: What data is to be used in the evaluation of effectiveness? The review committee really has only two choices in gathering data to support evidence of program effectiveness: (1) Is objective data going to be relied on, i.e., statistics such as circulation, outreach contacts completed, businesses and industries served, and reference queries addressed; or (2) is perceptual data going to be relied on, i.e., interviews or questionnaire responses? Objective data has the advantage of being quantifiable and potentially less biased. Conversely, such data is frequently based only on "official" effectiveness criteria, representative of the official organizational perspective or position. The advantage of subjective or perceptual data is that a broader set of criteria of effectiveness can be assessed from a wider variety of perspectives. On the other side, however, bias, dishonesty, and lack of information on the part of respondents may hinder the reliability and validity of data. The selection of data by which to measure effectiveness is critical because a unit may be judged effective on the basis of subjective perceptions while objective data may indicate that the program is ineffective. The converse is also true.

Decision Point Six: What reference is being used in the evaluation of program effectiveness? Once the review team has selected indicators of effectiveness it can employ a variety of referents against which to judge those criteria. One alternative is to compare the performance of two different organizational approaches against a common set of indicators (comparative evaluation). In essence we are asking: "Are we more effective than our competitor who may be organized in a different fashion?" A second alternative is to select a standard or an ideal performance and then compare the program's performance against the standard (normative evaluation). Here the question would be asked: "How are we performing relative to a theoretical ideal?" A third alternative is to compare organizational unit performance against the stated goals of the overall library organization.
(goal-centered evaluation). In essence we are asking: "Did we reach our stated goals?" A fourth alternative is to compare a program's performance on the indicators against its own past performance on the same indicators (improvement evaluation). Here we are asking: "How have we improved over time?" A fifth approach is to evaluate the unit on the basis of static characteristics it possesses, independent of past performance on certain indicators (trait evaluation). In this approach, one identifies desirable organizational and program characteristics. The evaluation reflects the extent to which the program possesses these characteristics.

Conclusion

Addressing certain basic questions is fundamental to a successful and well communicated review of off-campus library programs. This paper has suggested many of those questions and has offered a scheme for a comprehensive review process. It has been suggested that once a set of basic questions has been addressed, program evaluators will need to link that process with a set of questions which illuminate the concern with program effectiveness.

Evaluators of off-campus library program effectiveness will never measure all of the relevant aspects of effectiveness from all points of view. It is, however, imperative that review teams make explicit certain choices when measuring effectiveness. These choices reveal what is being measured and how effectiveness is being defined.
Appendix

I. PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT STAGE

1. Needs assessment and identifying goals and objectives

2. Conceptualizing the off-campus review plan

3. Developing consensus among all involved

II. REVIEW STAGE

4. Collection of data

5. Selection of consultants (if any)

6. Conducting the review

III. ASSESSMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION STAGE

7. Assessing the data

8. Developing recommendations

9. Implementing and using the results

10. Evaluation of the review process
Microfiche and Telephone Accessible Catalogs:
Problems and Possibilities

Kelly Gordon
Central Michigan University

With a significant program of off-campus library support already in place, Central Michigan University has in many areas been innovative in its approach to providing document delivery, bibliographic instruction and reference services to those removed from the campus. However, lack of access to the home library's card catalog has increasingly become an obstacle in providing quality library service. I think some parallels can be drawn to a quote by Augustine Birrell; as "good as it is to inherit a library, it is better to collect one." In other words, in our enthusiastic attempts to provide library materials to non-traditional students, we may have made it too easy for them, and in the process lost part of the academic and fulfilling experience of library research. In this paper, I will discuss why it is strongly felt that access to the campus collection is necessary for off-campus students. I will also outline one solution based on the particular environmental constraints of a campus library not yet living the new age experience of being on-line. Other libraries may find themselves in similar situations, years away from an automated catalog when off-campus students need access now. The exciting possibilities for remote access to an on-line catalog by off-campus students will also be explored as a reality of the near future.

Central Michigan University through its Institute for Personal and Career Development (IPCD) offers a graduate degree program in administration as well as undergraduate courses to non-traditional learners. The programs are administered by fifty local program centers throughout the country. Although courses run in varying time lengths and formats, in the three month period from January to March of 1985, 256 classes were scheduled. Given the wide distribution of students (New York to Hawaii and Michigan to Florida and Canada) and the large number of classes being taught, coordinating library service can be complicated.

The library program has evolved over the years to meet the needs of the IPCD students as geographical distributions and course concentrations have changed. Currently, the program consists of an IPCD office at the campus library that coordinates
delivery of material, plus four regional librarians, two in Fairfax, Virginia, and two on the CMU campus. Almost from its inception, the library program had students call toll-free telephone numbers to request books, photocopies of journal articles and government documents. Usually within twenty-four hours the materials requested have been gathered, photocopied, processed and sent out by first class mail. It is the job of the librarians to ensure that students and faculty are aware of the document delivery service, provide reference, create course bibliographies, visit classes, and teach bibliographic instruction.

From the students' point of view the library program is designed ultimately to work as a process. The student hears a presentation by a regional librarian in class at a distant location. The presentation includes bibliographic instruction that enhances the CMU Library Guide that all students receive. The librarian discusses reference materials that may be appropriate for class projects or term papers and how they can be found in local libraries. When it comes time to do his research, the student may call the librarian to discuss his topic. She will direct him to appropriate periodical indexes or abstracts available in his local library. The student goes to the library and uses the indexes to identify journal articles. He then calls the toll-free number and requests that the material be sent to him. This scenario, of course, is the ideal. Librarians do not get to visit every class in all locations. In many areas, libraries and the necessary reference tools do not exist. Increasingly librarians have come to depend on database search services, especially for students in remote areas. To save time, the librarian may request the articles from campus instead of having the student wait until the print-out is received. When classes last only a month, waiting three or four days for a computer print-out can be crucial.

But what about books? For several years now students have not had access to a current catalog of books owned by the CMU Library. Presently, library staff conduct subject searches for books at the students' request, checking the shelves and relaying information about what books are available to the student by phone. Librarians put together extensive course bibliographies and actively work with instructors to make sure that course reading lists reflect material available from the library. Certainly, these solutions for getting library material to students have the quality of expediency and are often the easiest for all concerned (Haworth, 1982). However, none of the librarians would argue that these methods border on spoon feeding, especially at the graduate level. When students call and request
books from campus, they are only given the opportunity to choose from what is actually on the shelves. In preparation for an upcoming class, a student may request books on managerial finance to help him brush up. Although he may use the bibliography attached to the syllabus, he should have the opportunity to know about all of the books the library has to offer on managerial finance. Librarians at CMU are concerned that students are not getting the full academic and library experience—the opportunity to gain knowledge of the full range of library material available, the opportunity to browse, the opportunity to make choices and to make decisions.

It is partly for the above reasons that the library does not maintain or attempt to set up satellite libraries or mini-collections of books at remote locations. Besides the fact that it would be difficult to provide mini-collections in all of the geographical locations, the expense of buying multiple copies enormous and maintenance of such collections tedious, it is felt that it is not in the best interest of students to limit them to such inevitably narrow collections. Many off-campus programs do depend on satellite libraries or collections set up at the beginning of each term. In our case, however, where the same graduate course may be taught in ten locations at the same time, equal and comprehensive access becomes an important issue. The availability of materials through the library program has been a significant contributing factor to the instructors' willingness to require graduate level performance. Some might be surprised at the number of IPCD classes where in-depth research papers, case studies and class presentations require students to find outside material. However, part of that experience has been lost if the material is gathered for them, without gaining an appreciation for the whole of the material available or the opportunity to make decisions about what is valuable.

The idea of making available at least a selective listing of the CMU card catalog is not new. In 1978, the library program produced a Book Catalog for Management and Supervision. The soft bound, 153 page catalog cost the library $12,000 for a run of 8,700 copies. It took so long to complete that the catalog was out-of-date before it rolled off the press and it was difficult if not impossible to provide timely supplements.

The solution to providing off-campus students, faculty and librarians better access to the collection seemed to be the production of an on-line and microfiche catalog. Ideally, the entire collection as well as serials holdings would be made available. In reality, the catalog will be selective, limited by subject heading as well as by publication date.
In libraries where the catalog or functions such as circulation have already been automated, production of additional microfiche products may not be a complicated procedure. Many libraries have converted the traditional card catalog to microfiche for use on and off campus. Although complicated, it is encouraging that there has been success using the UNIX™ microcomputer system to strip OCLC tapes and create microfiche products (Blair, 1984).

At CMU, except for administrative functions, the campus library is virtually unautomated. Optimistically, it will be at least three years before the campus library begins to implement an on-line catalog as part of an integrated system. Microcomputer applications, however, such as word processing, spreadsheets and database management systems have been operating in the library for several years. We have decided to take advantage of what we have and provide the best access we can to off-campus students until the time when the entire library is on-line.

Our goal is to use the microcomputers available and database management system (DBMS) software to produce a selective on-line catalog at minimal expense. At first, off-campus access will be through the use of computer output microfiche (COM). In the future, we envision remote access to the catalog through the use of personal computers.

We chose microfiche because it is extremely economical. Having the fiche commercially produced from computer tape costs only two dollars per master plus eighteen cents per additional copy. This will allow updates to the catalog as frequently as three to four times per year. The library also has a fiche to fiche copier so that copies can be made and distributed to students and faculty as they are individually needed.

As public service librarians we have only a little trepidation about the use of microfiche in remote locations, but there are potential problems. The fiche catalog will be placed in local libraries where microfiche readers are generally available. It will also be placed in each of CMU's off-campus program offices. In situations where a location does not have a microfiche reader, we probably will buy one. Wherever there is machinery, there is maintenance. This means that field staff will be responsible for getting machines repaired and for general upkeep.

We are fairly confident that students will readily accept a catalog on microfiche. In their article "Survey of a Microfiche
Catalog," authors Simmons and Foster (1983) document a generally positive attitude by student users. An article titled "A Microfiche Catalog in a College Library" by Rollins and Witney (1983) also reports that students found the COM catalog easy to use and had no difficulty operating machines. The Simmons and Foster study is also significant because it suggests that certain bibliographic information found on catalog cards could be eliminated thus reducing production time and cost. Although the importance and use of subject tracings is documented, we are considering leaving them out due to these time/cost factors. Persuading students to use the catalog may present a more difficult problem. After years of simply being able to pick up the phone and have library staff do the work for them, we expect some resistance. The catalog will also still be selective. Although new headings will continually be added, students will still have to request a search from campus when their subject does not appear on microfiche. In all, we hope that the benefits of having the opportunity for access to the campus collection far outweigh problems. Always looking for new ways to market the library program, we hope that the catalog will increase the library's visibility among students, strengthening their link to campus.

Once the microfiche is produced, the task of distributing them to remote locations will be the responsibility of each librarian for her region. This will involve determining sites, the availability of microfiche readers and negotiation with public and academic libraries local to our students. Instructions for use of the catalog will then have to be incorporated into class presentations and into the CMU Library Guide.

At CMU we have installed a complicated multi-user operating system called XENIX®, a derivative of the increasingly popular UNIX® system. This system allows several users to simultaneously access the applications programs. The database management system however, that runs on XENIX is Profile®, which is available for several types of Radio Shack computers. Database management systems are software products that control data structure containing interrelated data so as to optimize accessibility, control redundancy and offer multiple views of the data to multiple applications programs (Sippl & Sippl, 1980). Most DBMS offer options for input and output formats, indexing and sorting routines, and boolean or string searching. The number and variety of DBMS is almost overwhelming; the DataPro Directory of Microcomputer Software listed 167 different Database Management Systems as of January 1985 (DataPro Research Corporation, 1985). Almost every microcomputer on the market today has DBMS software available, but the complexity may range from a system that simply
produces mailing labels costing thirty-nine dollars to a complex relational DBMS costing seven hundred dollars or more.

Looking for packaged DBMS software that handles bibliographic records easily will entail a long search, and will most likely end in disappointment. Most DBMS are designed to handle other kinds of records such as mailing lists, employee records and customer accounts where output in the form of columns or charts is desirable. This is not to say that they cannot accommodate or be manipulated to do what is wanted of them. If the powerful organizing and record keeping applications that most DBMS have to offer for library administrative functions such as mailing labels, bindery records, and student time sheets, is put to use, this can be an advantage. At the CMU Library, Profile is used for several other applications besides the on-line catalog. When we began the project several DBMS and other types of software were investigated. Programs designed to handle bibliographic records nicely such as the Personal Bibliographic System (Rosenberg, 1984) simply were not powerful enough and did not handle enough records to meet our needs. Besides the obvious considerations such as compatibility with hardware and cost, there are several aspects that must be considered when contemplating the purchase of a database management system.

1. structure whether relational, network or hierarchical
2. number of records which the database and hardware can hold
3. record size, definition of fields within the record and whether the records are fixed or variable in length
4. indexing and sorting routines including the software's ability to sort bibliographic entries with commas, dashes, and parentheses
5. updating and purging of records
6. access to records including whether this is sequential, random, or both
7. requirement for programming knowledge
8. output which is possible and output formats

The CMU Microcatalog

The first step in the process of creating a selective catalog was to identify subject headings relevant to our users. This was done by the four regional librarians based on course syllabi and on years of experience in fielding student requests. An on-line subject heading list including "see" and "see also" references was created in the Profile database. This will be used not only as a tool for data entry but to assist students using the
microfiche product with identification of subject headings (Appendix A).

The process of creating the database using Profile was not especially difficult. Defining files, input screens and output formats is relatively straightforward if a little is known about databases and a manual is available (Appendix B). Bibliographic elements are individually defined as fields, similar to the way they are tagged in an OCLC record. There was simple programming involved in getting the output format to sort entries correctly and print them out in a desirable format. This consisted of a series of IF/THEN statements that, as the author can testify, even a nonprogrammer can figure out.

The records are entered directly from catalog cards onto a data entry screen (Appendix C). Once all of the records are entered, the file will be sent to the campus computer center to be converted to computer tape and sent to a commercial microfiche producer. Procedures have been coordinated with the technical services staff so that continuous updating can take place as new books are processed. We expect that revision and updating of the online catalog will take approximately fifteen to twenty hours per month.

The project of creating a bibliographic database with pre-packaged software is admittedly an experiment, but one we feel is worth pursuing. For the time being, selective access is better than no access. While librarians may be deciding what subject headings get into the catalog, they will be offering students more of a role in the process of library research. We will continue to explore options for producing the catalog including other database management systems, as we change from a Radio Shack to an Altos hardware environment in the near future.

Remote Access

When librarians talk about the day when students can sit in their living rooms and browse the campus library's catalog via their personal computer, they are no longer being the optimistic futurists and dreamers that some might believe. Such access is a reality and it has important ramifications for off-campus library use. The Pennsylvania State University Libraries already have in place a program for remote access to the libraries' integrated on-line catalog called LIAS. I suspect that as other academic libraries bring their catalogs on-line, remote access will seem the next logical step in providing access to an increasingly computer literate population. In her paper, "Remote Access to
On-line Catalogs: A Public Services Perspective," Sarah Kalin notes that the majority of users of remote access at Pennsylvania State University were faculty because they are most likely to own their own terminal or have access to one, and because they would be more likely to seek out alternative methods of library research. The second largest group were non-university users from business and industry (Kalin, 1984). Given the fact that most of our students work in middle management positions in both the corporate sector and the military where access to computers is common, we anticipate that remote access to an on-line catalog would quickly become popular, especially since the problem for many of our students is finding time between a full time job and family to access even the local library.

One interesting point that Kalin makes is the need for public service staff that can answer sometimes complicated telecommunications questions. Guides and manuals explaining communications parameters, telephone requirements and log on procedures must be developed. However, if the instructions do not work, there is nothing more frustrating for a computer user than not having someone to call. Librarians will have to become adept at answering queries about parity errors, baud settings, terminal types and other technical questions.

In our program, the librarians in Virginia will use the on-line catalog not only to browse the entire database by subject heading but will be able to use boolean operators such as AND/OR/NOR and to limit their searches by connectives such as greater than, less than and equal to. The on-line catalog will enable them to respond to student and instructor requests more quickly, create and update bibliographies and help in collection development.

The technology for access by one remote user is already in place. It is expected that offering remote access to students and faculty across the country would require three to six additional communications ports and expanded answering equipment. To make the on-line catalog more user friendly, and for security reasons, user menus that allow callers to bypass the main system and see only the catalog menus must be developed.

Conclusion

There are many different approaches to providing library service to off-campus students. At Central Michigan University, we feel that the level of graduate study demands that students have access to the campus collection. Until the time that the
campus library supports an on-line catalog, we are trying to provide that access by means of a selective, cost effective online and microfiche catalog. By using a database management system in a multi-user environment, several users can simultaneously access the catalog. Records are easily entered and updated through the use of menus and screens. Random access and boolean searching makes searching on individual files within records a simple procedure. It is hoped that the catalog will increase access to the parts of the collection supporting our off-campus programs and increase awareness of off-campus library services. Those who serve off-campus students have taken advantage of technology to provide better service and bring those students closer to the academic library experience. It seems that the technology for bringing the library into the homes and work places of students by means of remote access is here, waiting for us to make it happen.
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Appendix A

Subject Heading List

ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION

ACID RAIN
- ENVIRONMENTAL ASPECTS

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES

ADVERTISING
- AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY AND TRADE
- CIGARETTES
- LAWYERS
- MEDICINE

see also Marketing surveys
    Marketing
    Public relations
    Sex in advertising
    Television advertising

ADVERTISING LAWS
see also Advertising - Cigarettes
    Advertising - Lawyers
    Advertising - Medicine
    Competition, Unfair
    Television advertising - Law & legislature

ADVERTISING MANAGEMENT

ADVERTISING MEDIA PLANNING

ADVERTISING RESEARCH
see also Market surveys
Appendix B

Defining Files

Apr 14 13:48 1985 File Name: cardcat1 Page 1

Number -------------Field Heading-------Len ----Type---

key segment:

1 mainheading 40 *
2 crossref1 40 *
3 crossref2 40 *
4 crossref3 40 *
5 crossref4 40 *
6 crossref5 40 *
7 subhead1 40 *
8 subhead2 40 *
9 subhead3 40 *
10 subhead4 40 *
11 subhead5 40 *
12 see1 35 *
13 see2 35 *

Key segment record length: 510
There is no data segment.

Apr 14 13:49 1985 File Name: cardcat2 Page 1

Number -------------Field Heading-------- Len ----Type---

key segment:

1 mainheading 40 *
2 subhead 40 *
3 author 40 *
4 title 125 *
5 pubdate 4 *
6 description 15 *
7 pages 6 *
8 callno 29 *
9 permsave 3 *
10 heading2 40 *
11 heading3 40 *

Key segment record length: 373
there is no data segment.
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Appendix C

Data Entry Screens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>Screen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr 14 13:51 1985</td>
<td>cardcat1</td>
<td>#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 14 13:52 1985</td>
<td>cardcat2</td>
<td>#1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MAINHEADINGS:**

- see references: *12
- *13

- see also references: *2
  - *3
  - *4
  - *5
  - *6

**SUBHEADINGS:**

- *7
- *8
- *9
- *10
- *11

**RECORD NO:** GRN

**MAINHEADING:** *1

**SUBHEADING:** *2

**AUTHOR:** *3

**TITLE:** *4

**PUBDATE:** *5  **DESCRIPT:** *6  **PAGES:** *7

**CALLNO:** *8

**HEADINGS2:** *10

**HEADING3:** *11

**PERMSAVE:** *9

**LASTUPDATE:** GUD
Appendix D

Sample Output

ACID RAIN

Boyle, Robert H. and R. Alexander Boyle
Acid rain
1983 bibl pages 146
TD 196 .A25 B69 1983

Calvert, Jack
Acid deposition: atmospheric processes in eastern North America:
a review of scientific understanding.
1983 maps, bibl. pages 375
TD 196 .A25 A18 1983

Keith, Lawrence H. ed.
Energy and environmental chemistry.
1982 illus. bibl. pages
TD 195 .E49 E5 1982

Luoma, Jon R.
Troubled skies, troubled waters: the story of acid rain.
1984 pages 178
TD 196 .A25 L86 1984

Ostmann, Robert
Acid rain: a plague upon the waters
1982 illus. bibl. pages 209
TD 196 .A25 077 1982

ACID RAIN - ENVIRONMENTAL ASPECTS

Carroll, John E.
Acid rain: an issue in Canadian-American relations.
1982 map bibl. pages 80
QH 545 .A17 C37 1982
Serving a Field-Based Graduate Education Curricula

Paula Hubbard

Maryville College of St. Louis, Missouri

Maryville College is an independent, liberal arts college located in west St. Louis County, Missouri. Its heritage dates back to 1872 when the Religious of the Sacred Heart established the college for women in the city of St. Louis. In 1960 the college moved to its present location. During the late 1960's men were admitted to college courses and in 1972 the college ownership was turned over to a lay board of trustees.

Today the college offers career-oriented liberal arts majors in a variety of subjects. A weekend college program at the main campus and one other location in the county has been quite successful. At this time the campus offers graduate degrees in education and in management. Both these programs are aimed at the working professional and each requires a research-oriented master's project. The courses run in intensive eight week sessions, which allows the student to complete two courses during the time of a normal semester course.

The Field-Based Program

In the fall of 1983 Maryville College in St. Louis, Missouri, developed a graduate program for professional educators to be offered at convenient off-campus locations. Participants in the program are primarily elementary and secondary school personnel. Often they are associated with a central school district and the students meet as a group throughout the duration of the thirty semester-hour program. Members of the group determine the time, day, and place for scheduled class meetings. Usually they elect to meet once a week in a school building within the central district. The team of Maryville instructors travels once a week to the group's location for the class. Currently there are eight groups with 136 students functioning in this manner. One group meets on campus, but most groups are distributed within a seventy-five mile radius of St. Louis.

The program focuses upon enlightening the teachers about recent information that they can utilize in their teaching. Research is a major emphasis. Because of the off-campus locations and the research orientation of the program, the provision of library services to these geographically diverse groups is critical. By its very nature the program attracts those students
who are more geographically isolated and where there are few or no library services.

Bibliographic Instruction

Originally the college's plan was to provide additional library personnel especially in the reference area to serve these students directly on site, but this idea did not prove feasible. What did seem to be paramount was that the field-based students needed bibliographic instruction. With the cooperation of the Education Division, the Maryville College Library serves the field-based program in a variety of ways.

Initially, we made arrangements with the instructor to bring the entire field-based class to the Maryville Library for an introductory session. The students obtained student identification cards and basic information about the library. The reference librarian would then utilize slides and transparencies to provide the students with a working knowledge of ERIC, Resources in Education, Current Index to Journals in Education, and Education Index as well as the card catalog. After this the students could utilize these reference sources in a hands-on experience session. This usually involved five or six hours of the time in the library.

After a few sessions we changed the format of the initial sessions. The instructors for the course prepared the students in regular class sessions on some preliminary information about ERIC, library usage, and research techniques. Then, at the library, we divided the class into three groups with a professional librarian heading each group. The instructors were also present. The three groups focused on the card catalog and the library, the indexes, and an automated searching demonstration. After the three groups met the students had a chance to begin working on their projects with assistance from the librarians and instructors.

Information Packets

The reference librarians devised two sets of information packets to give the students for the intensive sessions and for reference. One packet consists of sample catalog cards, a step-by-step information sheet on looking up materials in the card catalog, sample subject headings, general information about ERIC, sample index and citation pages from both Resources in Education and Current Index to Journals in Education, a step-by-step information sheet on using ERIC documents, as well as information on Education Index and locating periodical articles. We tried to make the information as simple as possible and we encouraged
repetition. The other packet consisted mainly of the forms necessary to receive information in the various formats. We filled out the sample forms with hypothetical requests to show the students how to fill out the forms. Some of these forms pertained to interlibrary loan while others involved requests for in-house materials and services. We even went as far as duplicating the pages in the same color as the form the students would be using.

Students also received an information sheet with a list of the services provided to the field-based students. The list also includes the names of library personnel and the service they provide to the students. Our library is fortunate to have a secretary who is able to coordinate the phone calls from the students. In addition to general information and reference assistance, the library does automated literature searching, interlibrary loan, duplication of microfiche, and delivery of the items to the students.

Library Services

Originally the plan involving automated literature searching was to bring the portable data terminal to the classroom and perform searches at the site. The library can perform the searches by talking to the students on the phone, although we encourage them to come into the library. The printed results are either mailed or delivered by the instructor. Students are most interested in searches in ERIC, ECER (Exceptional Child Education Resources), and PSYCH (Psychinfo).

We do a tremendous amount of interlibrary loan. Our library has two librarians involved in borrowing items; one concentrates on books and the other on periodical articles. Students may mail completed request forms to the appropriate person. Then the item is either mailed to the requesting student or delivered by the instructor on the night of the scheduled class.

Since ERIC documents are primarily on microfiche and students use this collection so heavily, we purchased a microfiche duplicator when the field-based program began. Students may request a microfiche copy of ERIC documents for fifteen cents a fiche, and then they own a copy of the document. Some of them have access to microfiche readers in their schools, although not all do. One enterprising student was able to borrow a reader from a bank to use at home. We have recently purchased a collection of portable microfiche readers, which should give more students access. We also photocopy journal articles or sections of reference books for students which are distributed in the same way as interlibrary loans.
Delivery of Materials

The delivery of materials is accomplished by the professor on the day of class. To facilitate carrying the materials, the library purchased a dairy crate for each geographic location. The crates are labelled in calligraphy; our favorite is Arnold because of its anthropomorphic connotations. The crates provide an amazing amount of storage space, as the muscular field-based instructors can attest to. Fortunately, however, each delivery trip does not involve a full load. Items are returned in the crates as well. Paper items can be mailed, and automated searching and interlibrary loan fees are handled by the instructor.

Evaluation

The major problem, as far as the library is concerned, has been with lost books and with the delivery of interlibrary loan books. It is inevitable that some books are lost in the delivery process, but the rate of loss has been minimal. The interlibrary loan books have been more of a problem because the loan period is not sufficient to allow for the delivery service with its frequency of only once a week. We do not charge students fines for late books.

The program has been a success for a variety of reasons. First of all, the personnel involved have been exceptional—both the education faculty and the library personnel. The library personnel have made every attempt to personalize the service to the students. The librarians know most of the students by name, and have worked quite closely with them. The library has a professional reference librarian on duty during all of its operational time, so a field-based student may visit the library in the evenings and weekends and receive reference service and advice on automated literature searching. A private office allows the space and privacy for designing automated search strategies. The teaching faculty has been excellent in communicating with the library about circulation of items and the need for services, and it has been extremely cooperative about collecting fees for library services and physically carrying the crates. It has been excellent about retrieving all of the delivered materials.

In addition to the quality of the personnel and its superb communication, the program has also functioned well because the groups, although somewhat distant, do have access to the library upon occasion. The furthest group is seventy-five miles away, and that distance seems to be comfortable. Anything further and the library would probably have to develop a satellite facility.
The limitations of the program are such that the program has to contend with time and space. The more geographically distant students do rely heavily upon the mail and the delivery service, but they know that maximum service is available by visiting the library. At this point students absorb some of the long distance telephone costs, although money was originally budgeted to allow them to communicate with the library through collect calls. Perhaps because that involves an extra step, they have consistently refrained from using that privilege. The weekly frequency of the delivery service makes the time constraints of borrowing on interlibrary loan particularly troublesome.

Future

Recommendations that we would make for off-campus library programs of this nature would be to hire qualified personnel and to consider the personnel needs in ratio to the students to insure personalized service. It is essential to have qualified reference personnel available in the evenings and weekends when the working student is more likely to use the library. Perhaps it might be necessary to have one reference librarian, for example, per seventy-five students.

Some equipment also makes the program more feasible. The microfiche duplicator and the portable microfiche machines certainly enhance the program. The bibliographic instruction program and the delivery system need to be highly organized. Although our students utilize the phone and the mail, it is clear that future students can benefit from the use of computers. An automated circulation system and on-line catalog would greatly facilitate library usage for these students. And microcomputer access, particularly if it were in the students' homes, would make communication between the student and the library very easy through electronic mail.

Much of the success of such a program, however, hinges upon people rather than equipment. The quantity and quality of personnel contribute to the overall harmony. And finally the intrainstitutional communication among the students, the instructors, and the librarians strongly influences the effectiveness of the program.
The Impact On The Campus Library

By An Off-campus Academic Program

Darrell L. Jenkins *

Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

I am in the most enviable position of being the after-lunch speaker on the last day of the conference. The only people who are in a more enviable position are the presenters at the next session—the last event on the last day of the conference.

Before I begin, however, I would like to thank Barton Lessin, members of the Planning Group, and other individuals at Central Michigan University for producing a well-orchestrated conference and to thank the presenters who have brought interesting insights and views into our discussion of off-campus library services.

Let me begin with my definition of an "off-campus program." I am using this term in an all inclusive way which refers to any academic program beyond the main campus.

During the past one and one-half days we have heard about and discussed a wide range of off-campus academic programs and recognized differing levels and types of library services to off-campus students and faculty. The best way to describe these situations is by their diversity and their variety.

Let me be a devil's advocate of sorts, switch things around at the conference, and turn our attention back home to the parent institution. What is the impact on the on-campus library by an off-campus academic program? Just as with off-campus programs, on-campus library services and activities can be characterized in terms of their diversity and variety. Because of these differences the best way to describe the effect on the on-campus library is by saying "it depends." I don't mean to hedge my bet and not be clear. I mean to say that this effect can be influenced by many factors and influenced differently at different institutions. What I would like to do today is discuss seven of these factors.

* Mr. Jenkins was a featured speaker at the Off-campus Library Services Conference.
Philosophy and Emphasis of the Institution

First, and foremost in my thinking is the "Philosophy and Emphasis of the Institution." The college or university's general philosophy determines its mission. The mission in turn should determine the level and type of library and information service provided to the academic community. I purposely used the word "should" since a philosophical approach toward teaching, research, or service might not be consistently applied to the library. By that, I mean an institution may emphasize a certain facet of the educational program, perhaps off-campus education, but not furnish the on-campus library with the ability to satisfy the information needs of the student and faculty involved in that program.

What do I mean by the ability to satisfy needs? I mean funding, I mean money. Since we don't do all the things we do gratis and publishers and vendors aren't fond of giving us library materials and communications systems free-of-charge, we need money, but more on that later.

Priorities of the On-campus Library

The second factor which can influence the on-campus library by an off-campus academic program is the "Priorities of the On-campus Library." The establishment of priorities for the on-campus library to support on-campus programs has a direct impact upon the type and level of library support to off-campus programs. You will say that this statement is the reverse of the topic of my paper, "The Impact on the On-campus Library by an Off-campus Academic Program." So which one really influences the other? Well, they influence each other, but if new or expanded on-campus degree programs or research initiatives are being instituted without sufficient new funds for the library, then the support of off-campus programs may very well suffer. Library administrators are often more receptive to users personally knocking on their doors or button-holing them on campus than to off-campus, more remote, and often, less vocal patrons. Keep in mind the saying, "The squeaky wheel gets the oil."

Is this true? Do the library services for off-campus programs always suffer when put in competition with on-campus needs? I don't know, but you should think about your own institution and your own situation. I mentioned the "squeaky wheel" theory. In our context here who is the "squeaky wheel" for off-campus programs? Who is the advocate? You and people like you at other colleges and universities who are responsible for or directly involved with the off-campus program. You know and can articulate the benefits of your programs to your colleagues on
campus including the library administrators who don't work with these activities every day. That I see as one of your major responsibilities.

Library Public Services Support for the Off-campus Programs

A third influence on the on-campus library is the "Library Public Services Support for the Off-campus Program." I mentioned earlier that new or expanded on-campus programs most often required new funds for the library. If the on-campus library intends to be directly involved in the delivery of library services to off-campus academic programs, additional funds are also required, but I needn't tell you that. The question is what type of services.

If the off-campus program is in close proximity to the main campus, the library may "shuttle" existing reference staff to the off-campus site to provide direct, personal reference assistance. Generally speaking, in the eyes of many library administrators, this is an expensive venture and not an efficient use of library staff. However, if this type of personal service is used, the demand on the staff must be taken into account when the institution allocates positions to the library.

Should this type of shuttled or shared staffing be used, attention should be given to the perceptions of the entire library staff. I feel that this is important. Do members of the staff feel that they are being raided in order to provide service to off-campus programs? Are staff scheduling difficulties encountered when members of the staff are away at the off-campus facility? I emphasize the word "perceptions" since a problem may not exist at all, but it may be perceived as such. An effective library administrator will recognize this situation and address it. It may be addressed in several ways—by clearly describing the role that the on-campus library has vis-à-vis the off-campus programs, by outlining the library services and programs provided to the off-campus students and faculty, and by documenting the effectiveness of the library staff at the off-campus setting. To be most effective, however, the library staff providing these services—the people in the trenches, so to speak—should be presenting its information to the rest of the staff. It's one thing hearing an administrator telling the staff how wonderful and necessary an off-campus activity may be, but it's quite another hearing the justification come from a member of the staff, the person who actually does the work. While these off-campus library staff members should make this presentation to the on-campus library staff, the library administration needs to be vocal in its support of the importance of the off-campus activities.
With regard to evaluation and review efforts, I found very helpful information in Ed Garten's presentation at this conference and I encourage you to read his paper in these conference proceedings.

I would like to repeat a point mentioned yesterday regarding visits to the off-campus facility. While it is expensive, some of the on-campus library staff members need to be supported with travel funds to visit the off-campus site and talk to off-campus library staff, students and faculty, and simply observe. They will return to the on-campus library with a better understanding and appreciation of what is going on at the off-campus facility. If your institution maintains a large number of off-campus programs, spread to the four points of the compass, library staff obviously can't get to all of them, but any efforts that can be made in this area will help.

Let me continue with other thoughts regarding the more common situation when the off-campus program is some distance from the main campus. A number of non-face-to-face public services activities are used by the on-campus library in order to provide information to off-campus participants. A common activity, described in different ways, basically is an (SDI) Selective Dissemination of Information service. In this service the on-campus library may be expected to devote much time and energy to furnishing the off-campus faculty with tailored instructional packages. This had its beginning with reserve reading lists, but has expanded to online bibliographic search services and other activities.

If the on-campus library staff is expected to perform these searches, collect necessary materials and transmit them in some way to the off-campus site or sites, the same activities for on-campus users may be delayed. Here again, is a need for public relations efforts and clear justification of the off-campus activity in order to attempt to satisfy and satiate an often unsatisfied and unsatiated on-campus library user.
Library Technical Services Support for the Off-campus Program

Let us move away from the library public services support to identify a fourth influence on the on-campus library, namely "Library Technical Services Support for the Off-campus Program." This is an area that can have a profound impact on the on-campus library. By this, I refer to the acquisitions, cataloging, processing, serials control, and preservation activities for the off-campus program. These types of activities are needed if even a core library collection is maintained at the off-campus facility.

We readily recognize the value of and need for having library materials housed at the off-campus program and likewise I am sure that we all recognize the complexity and staff effort necessary to acquire, catalog, process, and preserve a collection outside the main library. Depending upon unique, local requirements and practices needed (or preferred) by the off-campus library users, technical services functions can be expensive and time-consuming on the on-campus library staff when per-term cost calculations are made comparing materials processed for the on-campus library with materials for the off-campus facility.

The key here is my reference to unique, local requirements or exceptions to the norm practiced in the main library. Any exception is a change in practice and procedures, which becomes an additional step in the technical services workflow. The question should be asked whether the cataloging or processing change is actually necessary. If it is, fine, but be prepared to pay for it.

I don't mean to cast all the technical services functions in a negative light when discussing off-campus library collections. There are many excellent examples of regional processing centers, many using OCLC or other bibliographic utilities, which provide bibliographic control over library materials. We have heard about some of these at this conference. My thrust in this section is to address technical services and processing in a situation where the on-campus library is expected to perform these functions with existing staff.

Here is another case where the on-campus library's priorities come into play. Once the decision has been made to serve as the technical services department, so to speak, for the off-campus collection, these activities and their staffing, equipment, telecommunications, and supplies needs should be determined and incorporated into the priority ranking in their proper position to meet needs of the off-campus program.
We have discussed the public and technical services aspects of the on-campus facility. Let us now look at the matter of delivering the materials and information to the off-campus user, which is my fifth influence on the on-campus library by an off-campus academic program.

Delivery of Library Materials and Information to the Off-campus Program

I will divide my comments in this section into two areas. First, delivery of actual physical materials and second, delivery of information via electronic means.

In an ideal situation, a direct van-type delivery service, totally controlled by the on-campus library, is preferred. By totally controlled, I mean that the delivery of library material is not one of several commodities being delivered to numerous sites beyond the main campus. In the direct service arrangement, the on-campus library, in obvious consultation with off-campus users, determines the frequency of delivery schedules and length of loan periods for various types of library materials. By controlling these aspects of the service, the delivery schedule can be easily changed in order to meet unique and fluctuating needs of the off-campus library users.

On the other side of the coin, the delivery schedule can be modified should a legitimate demand for materials at the off-campus facility develop at the on-campus library. This flexibility needs to go both ways.

Of course, the exclusive use of such a van service to deliver library materials to off-campus users can only be justified by a sufficiently high volume of business. In more common situations, the delivery services might be part of a delivery arrangement designed to serve a region or an entire state. Some excellent examples of these types exist around the country.

What is the impact on the on-campus library by a delivery system? Here again, it depends. However, the on-campus library administration needs to be cognizant of four issues, namely (1) the needs of the on-campus library user (Are they being met?); (2) the needs of the off-campus library user (Are they being met?); (3) preservation and proper transportation of the library materials; and (4) cost of the delivery service. These four matters need to be viewed together and evaluated often in order to insure that they are all kept in proper perspective.
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Traditional interlibrary loan procedures would also be needed to obtain materials for the off-campus library user. Interlibrary loan requests from the off-campus facility should be handled procedurally in the same way as requests from on-campus patrons. As with the technical services activities discussed earlier exceptions to and changes in workflow procedures can result in higher per-item or per-transaction costs. Here again, if you want these requests to be placed at the top of the pile and given higher priority due to the distances involved to the off-campus sites, do so but inform on-campus library staff of this decision and the reason for it.

The second aspect of delivery to the off-campus library user relates to the electronic transmission of information. Here is the single most important development which has today and will tomorrow influence how on-campus interact with off-campus academic programs. On-line library catalogs have changed the way off-campus library patrons view and learn of the contents of the on-campus library. Telefacsimile transmission capabilities are changing the way off-campus library patrons obtain hard copy material from the on-campus library. Expanded and more user friendly on-line search databases and procedures increase the off-campus library users' access to information. These developments are happening now and will only improve in the future.

What does (and will) all this mean for the on-campus library? An immediate response by some would be that the importance of the on-campus library is lessened; off-campus library users are getting their information on their own. I would suggest, however, that we shouldn't be so hasty. The opposite might very well be more accurate. A greater and more all encompassing dependence upon the on-campus library may exist. This dependence is (and will) take the form of increased efforts to develop, maintain, and enhance bibliographic control, communications and information-delivery systems. As remote library users continue to have their collective appetites whetted with expanded access, the demand for even better technologies will be there.

This gets me to my sixth influence on the on-campus library by an off-campus academic program.

Arrangements with Non-affiliated Neighboring Libraries

The need for these arrangements has been made by several speakers during this conference and rightly so. Such arrangements
should result in easier and more direct access to nearby library materials by off-campus library users. However, these arrangements may not lessen the demand on the on-campus library, but that's all right. The library staffs on- and off-campus should have the same goal in mind—to assist the off-campus users in satisfying their information needs. Some hard work and negotiation with these non-affiliated, neighboring libraries on the front end before a program is operating can be time consuming, but the effort is well worth it in the long run.

Funding

This leads me to my seventh, and last influence on the on-campus library, namely "Funding." You may or may not agree that there is often a bias by on-campus library administrators, on-campus library staff, and on-campus library users that on-campus library programs are more important than off-campus activities. If such a bias exists, it can only begin to be addressed effectively if the requirements of the off-campus programs are clearly stated and the respective roles of the different players—on-campus and off-campus—are understood and agreed upon. I realize many, if not all of you, are involved with developing "creative financing" to support off-campus programs, simply because you may be provided with few if any funds from the institutional budget to support your activities. With regard to additional funding for library support, the responsibility to achieve this goal is shared by all parties and must play a part.
Promotion and Purpose:
Marketing the Off-campus Library Program
Jeaneane Johanningmeier
Central Michigan University

It is now more than fifteen years since Philip Kotler and Sidney J. Levy put it to us bluntly:

The choice facing those who manage nonbusiness organizations is not whether to market or not to market for no organization can avoid marketing. The choice is whether to do it well or poorly, and on this necessity the case for organizational marketing is basically founded. (1969)

The case for organizational marketing is now so firmly established that it is difficult to remember a time when hospitals, museums, social agencies, zoological gardens, symphony orchestras, charities, and universities as well as libraries, did not pay at least lip service to the notion of marketing. And yet, as O. Gene Norman reports in the introduction to his excellent annotated guide to the literature of marketing libraries and information services (1982), the use of marketing techniques in the library has not developed unopposed. Critics have complained that there are significant distinctions to be made between commercial enterprises and public service institutions and that we place our libraries in jeopardy when we try to market them.

One suspects, however, that some if not all of the indignant voices that object to the "marketization" of libraries (Berry, 1981) are in truth raised against aggressive promotion, the likes of which Kotler himself condemns (1979). Still the misconception lingers that marketing equals selling equals promotion equals hucksterism. Even in organizations where the concept is not tainted, marketing is often considered to be a peripheral function distinct from what the organization is about.

But if we understand that organizations are engaged in exchange processes with other organizations or individuals and that marketing is a way to approach and plan for service delivery (Moulton, 1981), then we can appreciate the significance of marketing library services.
In their seminal article, "Broadening the Concept of Marketing," Kotler and Levy (1969) identified nine concepts essential for effective marketing management and demonstrated each of those concepts in a nonbusiness setting. It seems useful here to re-examine those concepts in the context of off-campus library services.

**Generic Product Definition**

When the newspaper vendor leans out of his kiosk to advise, between loud claps of thunder, a shivering, rained upon, bedraggled customer, "You need to get some hot soup in you, sonny!" we know the generic product definition agreed upon by Campbell's. Their product is nourishment, in the fullest sense of the term, not soup. By broadening the product definition, any organization can recognize the needs it fulfills and the real product or service it can offer.

What is our generic product? A quick glance through the list of graduate library programs reveals that we are schools of library information science, or information services, or information management, or information studies, but rarely in 1985 does the library stand alone. We are moving away from our traditional links with colleges of education and graduate schools of arts and sciences toward new relationships with still emerging disciplines and we are forming those new alliances in controversial and as yet undetermined ways (Berry, 1985).

If there is one absolute in the midst of all this change, it is the certainty that libraries provide information. It is hoped that they do more, that the academic library especially presents the occasion to participate in what Alfred North Whitehead described as "the imaginative consideration of learning" (Budd, 1984), but if there ever was a time when librarians narrowly defined their product as printed materials, that time is not now.

**Target Group Definition**

Because a generic product definition of information results in an infinite market (who doesn't need information?), we must now target the group that we want to serve within that market. Our presence at this conference indicates that we know that group. It is comprised of the students, faculty and administrators who participate in off-campus education. The characteristics of the participants are, of course, specific to the program offered by each institution.
Differential Marketing

Within that target group are three distinct publics that require different messages from us delivered with differing frequencies. For instance, our appeals to students need to be timed to coincide with the beginning of courses and the schedule of assignments and must always be immediate. Our work with faculty, although based on the same academic rhythms, is more continuous and provides more of an opportunity to plan. With administrators, we take a still longer view and address matters of direction and focus.

Consumer Behavior Analysis

Library literature abounds in user studies. Who are they? Where are they? What do they need? What do they want? How do they live? Why do they come to us? What do they expect? While there is useful information to be gained from many of these studies, there are almost no examples of off-campus user analysis. It is for this reason that there is special value in the work by Jean Johnson and her colleagues that is being presented at this conference: "Library Use and Preferences: A Comparison of On-campus and Off-campus Students at the University of Wyoming."

Differential Advantages

By differential advantage, Kotler and Levy mean "some dramatic value that competitive organizations lack." (1969, p.14) In the case of off-campus library services that differential advantage might take several forms: convenient delivery of materials and services; special knowledge of the information needs of the user; or quick response time.

At Central Michigan, one of our earliest promotional efforts directed toward students was a bookmark outlining the materials delivery and reference services we offered. We concluded that copy with this paragraph:

You won't have to explain that you are working full-time—or that your paper is due within a month. We know. That's why we're here.

Our differential advantage? We understand our students needs and are prepared to meet their immediate demands.
Multiple Marketing Tools

Although advertising is one of the most easily identifiable marketing tools used by business and nonprofit organizations, it is important to realize that it is only one of a variety of ways to reach a market. Those of us working in off-campus library programs need to be aware of the opportunities we have to piggyback on the shoulders of the educational administration.

For instance, is there a newsletter that is mailed to students that could carry library news? Is the person who registers students for classes aware of the library program? Could textbooks be stuffed with fliers or bookmarks as they are sold to students? Does the promotional material distributed to prospective students or sponsors contain information about the library? Are faculty and advisors informed about the range and quality of library support?

Integrated Marketing Planning

It is on this point that the nonbusiness organization differs most radically from its commercial counterpart. Even if the off-campus library program is forward-looking enough to employ multiple marketing tools, it is rare that such an effort is centrally coordinated. Unfortunately, unless one person is designated to assume responsibility for the distribution of information about the program, marketing efforts will be at best haphazard and at worst contradictory.

Continuous Marketing Feedback

Perhaps it is in our nature to nitpick, but librarians generally keep good statistics. We know how many books have been circulated, how many have been answered and how many databases have been searched for how many minutes. We are not quite so good, however, at using the data we collect. Perhaps that too is part of our nature. But unless we review the information we have gathered and risk conclusions about what it means and act on those conclusions, we might as well forget about keeping statistics and conduct our business blindfolded or have it conducted for us by someone else in the organization.

We must remember too that our own data are just one source of marketing feedback. We should also be monitoring the information collected by the academic programs we serve as well as reading the activity of other library resources available to our students.
Marketing Audit

A marketing audit is a periodic review of the organization's objectives, resources, and opportunities. Without pausing to realize and to assess the changes that have occurred perhaps unnoticed on a daily basis, an organization can find itself performing work it never meant to do in ways that may not suit its mission.

For example, some of us began to serve off-campus students before database searching became a significant aspect of reference service. We have, over the years, incorporated it into our programs until now it is, for most of us, an integral part of what we offer.

In many cases, however, we have not assessed its impact on the other services we deliver, such as bibliographic instruction; nor have we evaluated the meaning of heightened user expectations that often accompany database searching; and we have not always looked at how ever-increasing search loads may affect the kinds of librarians we need and are able to attract to off-campus services. A librarian who can organize and direct outreach efforts is not necessarily the best candidate to perform large numbers of searches.

Increased reliance on database searching is only one example of a consideration that might emerge in a marketing audit of off-campus library services. It is used to illustrate the importance of conducting a systematic, periodic review of all that is central to the organization.

Conclusion

Because the models of off-campus education are various and because the responsibilities for designing and implementing library support services have tended to fall randomly within libraries, the profession has lacked a cohesive approach to direct these services. Marketing can help us to know what we are about and how to continue to improve our delivery of services to distant learners.
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What can be done in providing library services when there are as many students scattered over a 97,000 square mile area as there are on the main campus in the southeast corner of the state? Prior to July 1, 1983, the University of Wyoming Libraries were providing little if any service to off-campus students and faculty. Since that time, a concerted effort has been made to develop a major program in off-campus library services. A full-time senior librarian and twenty hours of student help, plus the cooperation of other library departments, have been assigned for that purpose.

Because UW is the only four-year institution in Wyoming, it has a strong commitment to providing extensive higher education programs in the state. It works cooperatively with the state's seven community colleges as well as local communities and school districts to provide courses through on-site instruction and, since last fall, teleconferencing.

During the academic year 1983-84, approximately 11,000 students participated in UW extension classes and external degree programs around the state, in addition to 2,000-2,500 enrolled in correspondence study. During the same year, approximately 10,200 students were enrolled on the main campus in Laramie. This level of off-campus activity has resulted in a growing demand for university library services to be extended throughout the state in support of the various individual courses and the extended degree programs.

In December of 1983, the Council on Library Resources awarded a faculty/librarian grant to Keith Miller and myself to study the differences and similarities between traditional (main campus), non-traditional (UW-Casper), and non-traditional
(extension) students and their library needs. To share some of the results of that study is the purpose of this presentation.

In planning to deliver library services, it was realized that different student populations may have different needs as well as different opinions and perceptions about library services. What differences, if any, are there between "traditional" and "non-traditional" students in their perceptions and opinions about library services? Since very little data had ever been collected on the main campus about library services, we speculated that we may not know as much about the needs, opinions, and preferences of that population as we have a tendency to believe we know.

The current research was undertaken not only to gather data about student perceptions concerning library services, but also to establish baseline data concerning the characteristics of traditional, on-campus students in Laramie and nontraditional, off-campus students throughout the state. The specific research questions which interested us, then, was whether there existed differences between traditional, on-campus students and nontraditional, off-campus students with regard to needs, preferences, and opinions concerning library services; motivations for attending school; personality characteristics; and basic demographic characteristics. The latter three areas of research interest were included to provide a heuristic baseline for further study as the university refines its extended educational mission.

A questionnaire was developed and administered to a sample of three distinct student populations: (a) Traditional, on-campus students attending classes in Laramie; (b) Nontraditional students attending classes at UW-Casper; and (c) Nontraditional, off-campus students attending extension classes throughout the state. The survey instrument was divided into four sections: Section A. Demographic Information; B. Reasons for Attending College; C. Library Services Needs and Opinions; and D. Vocational Preference Inventory. Only sections A and C will be discussed in this presentation. It will focus primarily on the results which bear most directly on library services, although aspects of the other information collected were important to the interpretations drawn concerning library services.

A total of 1,022 questionnaires were administered; 80 were discarded as being too incomplete to use in the analysis, leaving 942 questionnaires as the basis for the analysis of the results (Table 1). To insure comparability over all three groups, only upper-division and graduate courses on the main campus were included in the sample.
Table I

Groups and Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Relative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Laramie)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Outstate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW-Casper</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>942</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results were analyzed by three principle means: (a) overall frequencies; (b) cross tabulations; and (c) discriminant analysis.

In this study the terms "traditional students" and "nontraditional students" were rather loosely defined by site of enrollment. "Traditional" referred to those who enrolled either in extension classes or through UW-Casper. This mode of definition was intentionally global since the study, in part, was intended to be a foundation effort in refining our sense of just what is meant by the terms "traditional" and "nontraditional" students and in letting the data guide that definitional task.

(As a point of information, UW-Casper is a resident learning center in Casper--Wyoming's largest city of about 51,000 located rather centrally in the state. UW-Casper operates in cooperation with Casper College, offering upper-division and graduate coursework while relying upon Casper College to deliver the lower-division coursework.)

Discussion of Results

Demographic Data

Were we correct about the "nontraditional" student? At a general level, the results of the demographic data confirmed the commonly held stereotype of the "nontraditional" student--older, female, married, dependent children, working full-time (often in a professional occupation), relatively high personal income, and attending school part-time.

However, there seems to be a third category of student that became apparent in the demographic data. The UW-Casper group consistently showed up as "in-between" the other two groups. For
the most part, this relationship held throughout the study not only in regard to the demographic data, but also in all other aspects of the study—motivations for attending school, opinions and perceptions concerning library services, and the personality profiles.

This apparent distinction between the UW-Casper group and the extension group suggests that some refinement needs to be made in our global definition of "nontraditional" students. We evidently have at least two different sets of nontraditional students in the UW student body. If the "in-between" relationship had held only for the demographic portion of the data, one might be inclined to attribute it to simply age and position on the occupational ladder (older than traditional students but younger than extension students, so would naturally have fewer children, be less far along in their professions, making less money, etc.). However, since the relationship (or the suggestion of a relationship) seemed to appear throughout, one is inclined to look to site as a contributing factor. Perhaps something about UW-Casper has attracted a somewhat different person than traditional extension sites. Or, more intriguingly if more speculatively, perhaps the site itself is an important factor in determining some of the qualities of "traditionalness" of the student body. In this sample, the question is whether the UW-Casper students themselves were "in-between" extension and Laramie students or whether the site tended to modify attitudes and perceptions. That is, rather than the student body being different in any absolute sense, perhaps the site itself tends to define the students. If so, one wonders whether so-called "nontraditional" students would become (except for unalterable demographic considerations) more like "traditional" students as the site becomes more "traditional."

The following tables include the results as cumulated groups as well as by the three individual groups—Laramie, extension, and UW-Casper.

Table 2 shows that extension students were nearly eleven years older than the Laramie students and six and one-half years older than UW-Casper students. While almost 50% of the Laramie students were in the eighteen to twenty-two age bracket, almost that percentage of extension students fell into the twenty-seven to thirty-five age bracket and about the same percentage of UW-Casper students were eighteen to twenty-six.
Table 2

Respondent Age

All Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-22 yrs.</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-26</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-35</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-39</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-49</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Laramie</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>UW-Casper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-22</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-26</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-35</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>382</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| X       | 24.1 yrs. | 34.9 yrs. | 28.4 yrs. |

The nontraditional student population as seen in Table 3 tended to be heavily female (4 to 1 for extension and 2 to 1 for UW-Casper) while the traditional population was roughly an equal gender split.
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>All Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>932</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Group</th>
<th>Laramie</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>UW-Casper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>383</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we expected, in Table 4 we can see that the Laramie students were mostly single and never married (72%) while the extension students were mostly married (81%). Somewhat surprising was the relatively high percentage of UW-Casper students that were single and never married (39%).
### Table 4

**Marital Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single (Never Married)</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (Divorced, Widowed, Separated)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>926</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**By Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Laramie</th>
<th></th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th></th>
<th>UW-Casper</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (Never Married)</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (Divorced, Widowed, Separated)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>385</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extension respondents had the largest households (Table 5), with an average of 3.31 persons, while the Laramie group had the smallest with an average of 2.54. Nearly two-thirds of the Laramie group had no dependent children in the household (Table 6). By contrast, more than two-thirds of the extension group and nearly one half of the Casper group had one or more children.
Table 5

Number of Persons Living in Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>930</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\bar{x} = 3.02$
### By Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Laramie</th>
<th></th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th></th>
<th>UW-Casper</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>384</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100.2%</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \bar{x} = 2.54 \quad \bar{x} = 3.31 \quad \bar{x} = 3.09 \]
Table 6

Number of Dependent Children in Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>936</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \bar{x} = 1.06 \]

By Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Child.</th>
<th>Laramie</th>
<th></th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th></th>
<th>UW-Casper</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>388</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>100.1%</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \bar{x} = 0.71 \]

\[ \bar{x} = 1.41 \]

\[ \bar{x} = 1.13 \]
The large, overall percentage of graduate-level students (40%) in Table 7 was obviously due to the preponderance of graduate students in the extension sample. The relatively small numbers of lower-division students were inherent to the study design. Since the majority of courses offered through extension and at UW-Casper are upper-division courses, only those comparable courses on the main campus were selected for the sample pool. Similarly, while the Laramie and Casper respondents were using the coursework to apply to a degree program (Table 8), fully one-third of the extension respondents were not using the course in a degree program. This larger proportion of "No" responses from the extension group undoubtedly reflects the greater proportion of those students who were taking the course to meet recertification and/or salary level requirements for practicing teachers.

Table 7

Year in College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>933</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Laramie</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>UW-Casper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>387</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8
Taking UW Class to Use Toward a Degree

All Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>925</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Laramie</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>UW-Casper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>371</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>384</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As might be expected, the majority of the respondents work, if only part-time (Table 9). In two categories, the traditional, main-campus students and the off-campus students were similar: having another employed adult in the household and in family income (Tables 10 and 11). Approximately three-quarters of all groups had at least one other employed adult in the household. Given the marital status data, that other adult in the traditional student household tended to be a non-spouse, while, for the nontraditional students, it tended to be a spouse.
Table 9

Current Employment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working full-time</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working part-time</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>927</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Laramie</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>UW-Casper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working full-time</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working part-time</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>384</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

Respondent is the Only Employed Adult in Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Laramie</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>UW-Casper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

Family Income in 1983

All Groups

Overall $\bar{X} = $25,221

By Group

Laramie $\bar{X} = $25,221
Extension $\bar{X} = $30,418
UW-Casper $\bar{X} = $26,355

The average personal income for the Laramie students was substantially lower than that for the other two groups, as would be expected, because of the greater number of unemployed persons (Table 12). However, the gap was much smaller for family income.

Table 12

Personal Income in 1983

All Groups

Overall $\bar{X} = $9,692

By Group

Laramie $\bar{X} = $5,552
Extension $\bar{X} = $13,234
UW-Casper $\bar{X} = $12,057

As one would anticipate, because of the academic climate inherent in the survey, the largest number of employed respondents were in professional occupations (Table 13).
Table 13

Current Occupations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Labor</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Labor</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Laramie f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Extension f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>UW-Casper f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Labor</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Labor</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>381</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>100.1%</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opinions and Perceptions Concerning Library Services

The overall survey was fourteen pages long, with four being devoted to questions concerning the respondents' opinions about library services. A Likert scale was used for the answers. The results for the twenty-three questions are too extensive to go into at this time, so we will only summarize the highlights.

Do students feel that the use of the library is important? There was general agreement throughout all of the groups that the use of the library and library materials is an important part of a college education. There was also the general feeling that the library materials which have been used (both UW and non-UW libraries) have been useful, though extension and Casper groups were somewhat less inclined to feel this way. All groups agreed that other, non-UW libraries are important to them in meeting their needs, although, understandably, the outstate students felt a little more strongly that this is the case.

More persons in all groups agreed that their college courses do require outside library materials than agree that the courses should require such reading. That response fits nicely with the fact that most students in all groups "would like to read more widely on related subjects, but...."

Respondents all appeared to disagree slightly that students at sites remote from Laramie have equal educational opportunities. How important is access to the main campus library? While everyone agreed that it is important to have access to the main campus library, those in the extension and Casper groups were less sure of its importance than the Laramie group.

Predictably, the extension and UW-Casper groups were more inclined that the Laramie group to believe it is important for the UW Library to provide materials at the course sites, although all groups believed it to be important. None of the groups was particularly sure whether it is important for the UW library to send alternative or substitute materials.

Members of all groups believed slightly that they could use more guidance in using reference materials, but also believed generally that they knew library systems well enough to be able to meet their own needs.

The extension group apparently experienced a bit more difficulty and was slightly more discouraged from using the library's services that either Laramie or Casper students, but the difficulty didn't appear to be great.
The generally neutral answers by all groups to the question concerning the speed and timeliness in obtaining materials from the university library may have indicated some concern for timeliness in obtaining materials or it may simply have indicated that none of the groups request such material, therefore suggesting no strong opinion about the matter. On the other hand, responses to another question seemed to indicate a possible need for an increased loan period for the nontraditional, outstate students, especially those in extension.

Finally, the Laramie group seemed reasonably happy with the main campus library hours of operation, while extension and UW-Casper groups were somewhat less agreeable about the hours of the libraries they use.

Location and Use of the Most Used Library

Now to some specifics about the use of the library. Understandably, location determined the test groups' most used library (Table 14). What can be done when more than 75% of the UW-Casper students do not use the UW-Casper Library? More than 50% of the students used the Casper College Library most often while nearly 27% used the Natrona County Public Library most often. Only 15% claimed to have used the UW-Casper Library most often.
Table 14

Most Often Used Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Laramie</th>
<th></th>
<th>Extension*</th>
<th></th>
<th>UW-Casper**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coe (main library)</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany County Pub.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW-Casper</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natrona Cnty. Pub.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casper College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>259*</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

383 100.0%  339 100.0%  195 100.1%

Some background information is needed concerning the relationship between the UW-Casper Library and the Casper College Library. Up until nine months prior to the administering of the survey, the UW collection of approximately eight thousand volumes was housed in the Casper College Library and very few reference materials were purchased by UW. Since the time that the collection was moved to the basement of the Natrona County Public Library, the UW reference collection has grown substantially, but is primarily current with very little retrospective indexing. Also, because many of the UW-Casper students are current or former Casper College students, they tend to use the library with which they are most familiar. In both locations the library has been located several miles from where UW classes are taught.

The point of using the most familiar or most convenient library is also true in the case of extension students (Table 14a). For instance, Sheridan College and the Sheridan County Public Library receive about equal usage, as do Rock Springs Public and Western Wyoming College. Students also obviously use their local school or hospital library if that should be convenient to where they work or appear to have what they need.
Table 14a

**Most Often Used Library**

The computer allowed for only the libraries listed on the following table. Tallies from the individual questionnaires resulted in the following breakdown of libraries in the other category under Extension. Tallies from the individual questionnaires also resulted in the following breakdown under UW-Casper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>UW-Casper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFIT (Air Force Base)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Laramie Cnty. Pub. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Horn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Own Library 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Cnty. Pub.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Parks Cnty Pub. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Wy. College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Platte Cnty. Pub. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Montana Col.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Riverton Pub. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Wy. Col.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rock Springs Pub. 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Scottsbluff (Neb.) 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont Cnty. Pub.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sheridan 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goshen Cnty. Pub.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sheridan College 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sheridan Cnty. Pub. 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sweetwater Cnty. Pub. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Cnty. Pub.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VA Medical 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Western Wy. Col. 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laramie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly 36% of the extension group and 22% of the UW-Casper group apparently did not know if their most often used library contains UW materials (Table 15). This would seem to indicate a need for such information by these groups. Also, nearly one-fifth of the extension groups and one-quarter of the UW-Casper groups indicated that the library they most often use does not have UW materials. Thus, over half of the extension respondents and
nearly half of the UW-Casper respondents apparently take their UW courses without using UW library materials. One of the most difficult situations to handle when sending reserve materials to off-campus sites goes back to the problem seen in Table 14a. How is it determined which library should house reserve materials when extension students do not all use the same library? Thus far, we have been sending reserve materials to the community college library, or to the public library if a community does not have a community college, but this certainly does not satisfy the use patterns of all students.

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Most Often Used Library Have UW Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laramie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385 (99.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of persons in all groups live within five miles of their most-used library, although the proportion is much smaller for the extension groups than either Laramie or Casper (Table 16). Virtually all the Laramie students and nearly all the UW-Casper students live within ten miles, while just over three-quarters of the extension students live within ten miles. Significantly, more than 14% of the extension students live more than fifty miles from their most-used library. Perhaps some special effort ought to be expended in developing convenient means for these students to access UW library holdings in their areas (extended hours, "at class" borrowing privileges, etc.)
Table 16

How Far Do You Live From the Library You Use Most Often for UW Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Laramie f</th>
<th>Laramie %</th>
<th>Extension f</th>
<th>Extension %</th>
<th>UW-Casper f</th>
<th>UW-Casper %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 mile</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 miles</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 miles</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 miles</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-25 miles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50 miles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100 miles</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

391 100.1%   356 100.0%   195 100.1%

Use of UW Library Materials

Data in Table 17 indicate the need for the continued development of the library system's outreach efforts. More than 44% of the extension groups and nearly 38% of the UW-Casper groups rarely use UW library materials compared to the Laramie group's 11.4%. Since use of UW materials most often depends upon either professor assignment or term paper assignment for all three groups (Table 18), it is possible that the nontraditional students have found other means of obtaining the needed materials than through the UW library (other libraries, professors taking materials to the students, etc.) or that they haven't needed the same sort of materials as students on the main campus (professors altering their assignments to fit the situation, "winging it", etc.). The data in Table 19 suggest that extension and UW-Casper students have relied heavily upon other local libraries to meet their needs. The same data also indicates that the interlibrary loan...
process from the main campus to remote sites has not been used as much as it could have been.

Table 17

How Often Do You Use UW Library Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Groups</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Laramie</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>UW-Casper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>43 11.4%</td>
<td>150 44.6%</td>
<td>72 37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>164 43.4</td>
<td>127 37.8</td>
<td>70 36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>110 29.1</td>
<td>41 12.2</td>
<td>34 17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>61 16.1</td>
<td>18 5.4</td>
<td>14 7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>378 100.0%</td>
<td>336 100.0%</td>
<td>190 100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18
Use of the UW Library Collection Most Often Depends Upon What

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Curiosity</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Assignment</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term Paper</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to Read Beyond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned Text</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>784</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Laramie</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>UW-Casper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Curiosity</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Assignment</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term Paper</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to Read Beyond</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>338</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19

If the Local UW Library Collection Does Not Have the Materials Needed for a Course, I Most Often Obtain Them From ..... 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Another local library</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary loan</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Request from UW Library</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can't Get Them</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>881</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Laramie</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>UW-Casper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another Local Library</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary Loan</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Direct Request from UW Library | 19| 5.1 | 30 | 9.5 | 6 | 3.1%
| Don't Know           | 97 | 26.0%| 43 | 13.6%| 14 | 7.3%|
| Can't Get Them       | 38 | 10.2%| 12 | 3.8% | 9 | 4.7%|
| **Total**            | 373| 100.0%| 317| 100.1%| 191| 100.0%|
The data given in Tables 20 and 21 show that the greatest difference in usage rates and in borrowing rates lay with those who did not use the library at all and who did not borrow any materials. Approximately one-fifth of the Laramie group, one-half of the extension group, and one-third of the Casper group did not borrow any UW library materials. The fact that fewer people than that in each group did not use any UW library materials may be an indication of in-library use of materials as opposed to borrowing them for use outside the library. If so, it would appear that the Extension and Casper groups used the materials in the library far less than the Laramie group. Whether this was due to proximity, convenience, available hours, or inherent predisposition cannot be determined from these data, but would be an important factor to consider in the further development of the library outreach effort.
Table 20

In the Span of a Semester, I Use UW Materials Approximately

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Many Times</th>
<th>All Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Times</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 times</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 times</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 times</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 times</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 times</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50 times</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 50</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Times</th>
<th>Laramie</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>UW-Casper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 times</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 times</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 times</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 times</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 times</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50 times</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>374</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21

Borrowed Approximately How Many Books, Periodicals, or Other Materials from the UW Library During Last Full Semester of Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Items</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 items</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 items</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 items</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 items</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 items</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50 items</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Items</th>
<th>Laramie</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>UW-Casper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 items</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 items</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 items</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 items</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 items</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50 items</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preferred Hours for Use

Nearly 70% of the Extension group and more than 75% of both the Laramie and UW-Casper groups indicated they would visit their local UW library most during the hours of 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. on weekdays with a slight preference for 5-10 p.m. on weeknights (Table 22). Additionally, a large majority of all three groups indicated they could visit their local library most days and most evenings if they chose to do so (Table 23). Significantly, however, 22.5% of the UW-Casper students indicated they could only visit once per month.
Table 22

**I Would Visit the Local UW Library Collection Most During Which Hours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Times</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-5 Weekdays</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 Weeknights</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-5 Saturdays</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 Saturday Nights</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-5 Sundays</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 Sunday Nights</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>896</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**By Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Times</th>
<th>Laramie</th>
<th></th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th></th>
<th>UW-Casper</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-5 Weekdays</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 Weeknights</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-5 Saturdays</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 Saturday Nights</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-5 Sundays</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 Sunday Nights</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>387</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>320</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 23

How Often Could You Visit the Library You Use Most Often for UW Courses if You Chose to Do So

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Times</th>
<th>Laramie f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Extension f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>UW-Casper f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most Days</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Evenings</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Weekends</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once per month</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few times per year</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>323</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Library Information

Well over half of all respondents at all sites indicated they had not received information concerning the UW library. Of those who did receive information, however, the vast majority found it to be useful (Tables 24-25). This points to an obvious need for more information flow from the UW library system to all students it serves, both on the main campus and off-campus at remote sites.
Table 24

I Have Received Information about UW Libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Laramie</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>UW-Casper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25

I Have Found That Information to be Useful

All Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>919</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Laramie</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>UW-Casper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>378</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Toll-Free Assistance

A year ago, the libraries added a toll-free number that the students can call for reference help and to request materials be sent to them. Table 26 shows that very few students are aware of this service and indicates yet another area where publicity is necessary.
Table 26

Do You Know About the Toll-free Telephone Number You Can Use to Obtain Information About UW Libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>90.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>931</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Laramie</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>UW-Casper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>386</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bibliographic Database Searches

A great majority of respondents at all locations indicated they did not know about the database search services available through the UW library. Somewhat fewer students (but still well over half) indicated they do not have a need for such a service (Tables 27-28). This might indicate that students do not know what the service is or how it might be useful to them or it might indicate a true lack of need, in which case UW library resources might well be placed elsewhere.
Table 27

Do You Know About the Bibliographic Database Searches that Can Be Done for You for A Fee

All Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>927</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Laramie</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>UW-Casper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>387</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28
Do You Have a Need for a Database Search for Your Class

All Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Laramie</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>UW-Casper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most Needed Services from UW Library

The last library related question on the survey--"What do you need most from your University of Wyoming Library to assist you with your courses?"--produced such a broad range of responses that no real pattern could be determined. There were almost as many different answers as there were respondents. Table 29 does show that almost a third of the students did not respond to the question at all. This was one time where the extension group tended to fall between the Laramie and UW-Casper groups in the area of no responses and nothing being needed from the university library. The Laramie groups had the smallest number of no responses (12%) with only 3% needing nothing. The UW-Casper group, on the other hand, had the largest number of no responses (44%) with 7% needing nothing while the extension group responded with 42% and 3% respectively.
Table 29
What is Needed Most from Your University Library to Assist You With Your Classes

All Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing needed</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>942</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Laramie</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>UW-Casper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing needed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>391</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

The purpose of the project was to study two groups of students, "traditional" and "nontraditional," but the results showed that, in fact, there are three groups of students in Wyoming, "traditional" (Laramie campus), "nontraditional" (extension), and the "in between" group (UW-Casper). The results lead to speculation as to what factors are involved in determining traditional and nontraditional students.

While the Laramie students might sometimes use libraries other than campus ones, a large proportion of UW-Casper and
extension respondents used public libraries rather than academic libraries, thus posing problems as where to send needed reserve materials. In the case of UW-Casper where the students have access to college and public libraries as well as a UW library, they tended to use the college library the most with the UW library coming in third. This is probably due, in part, to the fact that up until August 1983 the UW collection was housed in the college library and is now housed in the basement of the public library.

As is the case with many college and university students, too large a proportion of both on-campus and off-campus students do not seem to need to use the library for their course work. The implication is to increase the publicity on what UW can do for students, particularly those off campus.

Because over half of the respondents in all groups indicated a need for information about the UW library system more work definitely needs to be done in that area. Since UW only began providing library services to off-campus students in the latter part of 1983 this study was particularly timely in giving an indication of what the students need. More information provided directly to the students is certainly indicated, beyond contact with instructors.

This study is particularly useful in the development of a model for providing library services to off-campus students. What has been done thus far in providing reserve materials to local libraries for student use and in providing direct services to students needing library materials is only the tip of the iceberg in what could yet be done for those students who are taking a UW course in a small community that may or may not have a community college library and probably has only a small public library.

The results of the study have proved so useful that we are making plans to administer it again in the spring. We would then wait several years and administer it one more time in order to develop a composite picture, over time, of trends or shifts in information needs.
Regional Accreditation Standards and Off-Campus Library Service

Toni Kania
Somerset County College

The purpose of this paper will be to describe the status of regional accreditation standards for academic libraries as they relate to off-campus library services. The research on which this paper is based was conducted as part of a dissertation study entitled The Development of a Model Set of Regional Accreditation Standards for Academic Libraries (1984). Although the dissertation focused on academic library standards for regional accreditation in general, data was generated from the study that relates specifically to off-campus library services. The situation the data describes is both revealing and disconcerting.

The purpose of the original study was to develop a model set of regional accreditation library standards which would encompass both qualitative standards for purposes of self-evaluation, and corresponding quantitative performance measures suggested for local use. The goal was to make the standards more "outcomes" or performance oriented and to differentiate between the standards that ought to be mandatory, professionally obligatory, or simply advisable for accreditation through the use of the verbs "must", "should" or "may."

The project was conducted in two parts. First, a content analysis was performed on the existing academic library standards of the seven regional accreditation commissions of higher education in 1982. Second, three survey instruments were developed and used to collect expert opinion from academic librarians, accreditation officials and performance measures experts in the process of creating a new and more useful set of regional accreditation standards and in linking these standards to appropriate performance measures.

In performing the content analysis, ten major subject areas and fifty-seven subtopics were identified, reviewed and reorganized in order to develop a cohesive draft of forty-five representative standards. The first survey instrument was developed to solicit expert opinion on this newly created composite set of standards. In the instrument the verbal was removed from each statement and the respondents were asked to select the appropriate verbal "must", "should" or "may." The participants' selection of a particular verbal was to indicate
what they felt ought to be the appropriate level of adherence to that standard for regional accreditation for their own type of institution. The sample to receive this instrument was a purposefully selected national group of sixty-five academic library directors with evaluation team experience and regional accreditation staff members. An attempt was made to balance the sample by region (Middle States, North Central, Western, etc.) and by sector, two-year college, four-year college, and university.

The respondents' ratings of the forty-five items in the instrument were gathered and the relative frequency with which the respondents felt that one of the verballas, "must", "should", or "may" was appropriate for each potential standard statement was computed. In all instances, the verbal selected most frequently (by 50% or more of the respondents), became the verb for that standard in the second draft. The second survey instrument was derived from an analysis of the responses to the first and was then sent to those who had responded to the first instrument to seek their consensus on the reformulated standards which now included nine standards using the verbal "must" and twenty-three, now called guidelines, using the verballas "should" and "may."

The third instrument was actually a request for expert advice on the applicability and practicality of selected library performance measures that had been tentatively linked to the newly developed individual standards and guidelines. Some sixty methods of evaluating libraries against the standards had been identified from the literature. Sixteen experts in the field, selected because they had either developed performance measures themselves or had utilized some of the methods in their own libraries and published the results, were asked to comment critically.

Some of the results of the study are interesting to note. The content analysis indicated that the regional accreditation commissions agreed on only half of the major topics mentioned in their standards and less than 50% of the overall fifty-seven subtopics existed in any one commission's standards. Only 10% of the topics and 9% of the subtopics suggested any output orientation according to DuMont's (1980) systems model definitions for inputs, processes, and outputs.

From the data from the first instrument it appeared that separate standards for each of the college sectors was not warranted. There was a very high level of agreement (96%) among the sectors on the verballas where at least three of the four sectors agreed. All sectors designed approximately 63% of the standards as "should", 33% as "must" and 3% as "may" to indicate the level of adherence to be required.
The overall acceptability rating for the reformulated standards in the second instrument was over 90%, so that the second draft of the standards became the model set. As a result of the third instrument, twenty-four performance measures were substantiated by experts as applicable and reasonably practical to replicate in academic library self-study and evaluation.

It appeared, therefore, from this original study, that academic libraries are being examined through a wide variety of requirements for regional accreditation. The standards against which they are evaluated were found to differ across the region not only in length and style, but also in content by as much as 50%. This turns out to also be true for off-campus library service specifically as we shall see a little later. The standards were also found to be primarily input and process oriented with little emphasis given to the outcomes’ dimension.

Through this project, it was possible to develop one set of academic library standards that could accommodate the three major library sectors with increased overall content coverage more representative of concerns of practitioners and with greatly increased outcomes’ orientation. Library performance measures were identified and verified as applicable to the new standards as well as practical to use in a real library setting.

Although this study dealt with all aspects of regional accreditation library standards, the data that was generated on the individual elements of those standards made for interesting study for our purposes here today particularly in the area of accreditation standards for off-campus library services.

The content analysis of the standards of the seven regional accreditation commissions (there is one commission for each of the six regions with the exception of two in the Western Association of Schools and Colleges) revealed the degree to which off-campus library services were and were not specifically addressed in 1982 when the original study was conducted. Only three of seven commissions, representing only two of six agencies, specifically referred to the need to provide off-campus library services. Two of the commissions who specifically referred to off-campus library services are the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (1978) and the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities (1979) both of the Western Association and both, in fact, utilizing very similar language. Standard 6C of the Commission for Community and Junior Colleges says that
Learning Resources are readily available and used by staff and students both on and off-campus (p. 27) and, in addition to that, a sub-statement, Standard 6C.3 says that

If off-campus programs exist, provision [is made] for students to have ready access to resource collections or their equivalents as well as the equipment for using these materials.

Standard 5C and 5C.3 of the Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities essentially say the same thing. Both Commissions are, of course, part of the same regional accreditation association.

Standard IV of the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges, Commission on Colleges (1982), say under Library and Learning Resources that

wherever an institution provides programs, it must demonstrate that library and learning resources, fully adequate to the programs, are conveniently available and used by students and faculty (p. 6).

Since 1982, the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, has proposed a major revision of its Criteria for Accreditation (Holley, 1983), adding what amounts to as the most comprehensive accreditation standard on off-campus library services to date. Under Section 5, Library, Part 5.2.1, Services, it says that

An institution must provide appropriate library services at off-campus locations where credit courses are offered to insure that these courses receive the same level of library support as that given to equivalent on-campus courses (p. 73).

The standard goes on to suggest the type and quality of library service that may be developed such as a branch library or a contractual arrangement with another library as well as the need for qualified personnel. With the Southern Association's addition of a standard on off-campus services, the number of accreditation commissions to do so will have been increased to just over half.

The academic library standards of the higher education commissions of the three other regions, the Middle States, North Central and New England Associations (1982, 1982, 1980), while
making no specific reference to off-campus library services, at least refer in passing to the need for relationships with other libraries for collection enhancement and exchange of learning resources. In these contexts reference to off-campus library services may be implied.

With the relatively minimal requirements in existing regional accreditation standards for the provision of library materials and services for students and faculty at off-campus sites, it is somewhat surprising to note the level of importance placed on that particular standard by not only the practitioners in the field, but also the regional accreditation staff members in their responses to the composite set of standards developed by this author in the original study described earlier. In that study each respondent was asked to provide the verbal "must", "should" or "may" for each standard statement to indicate its degree of importance for institutional accreditation purposes for his own type of institution. Fifty-three percent (53%), or just over half of the respondents, including all sectors (two-year and four-year college, and university library directors and accreditation agency staff), designated the verbal "must" for the standard.

Provision must be made for library users in off-campus locations to have adequate access to library resources and equipment.

Thirty-eight percent (38%) of all respondents selected "should" as the appropriate verbal for a grand total of 91% who felt that such services, where indicated, must be required or, at least, considered as professionally obligatory for regional accreditation purposes. Yet today, three out of seven sets of higher education commissions' standards do not even mention that a college or university should provide or consider providing library services for its students enrolled in its off-campus programs.

In fact, of all the sectors, it was the accreditation officials for whom the greatest majority of respondents (80%) selected the verbal "must." That is somewhat incongruous given the facts. Two of the commissions having no library standards for off-campus services indicated that they felt that those services "must" be provided for accreditation purposes. Yet their own agencies don't require them.

In the second instrument, designed to gather opinion on the general acceptability of the reformulated standards based on the responses to the first instrument, only five, or 10%, of the respondents indicated that the standards on off-campus services
were "generally unacceptable." Their reasons for feeling that way were included in remarks which spoke to the need for more clarity in wording, the fact that the statement was too strong and the fact that the statement made requirements that were too difficult to attain.

What we find with the regional accreditation standards for academic libraries nationally is an inconsistency regarding required and recommended criteria for accreditation. Commissions of higher education do not seem to agree on what constitutes the major areas to be evaluated so that the libraries in colleges and universities across the country are evaluating themselves and being examined by outsiders against a variety of requirements for accreditation. This became evident through the initial research on this project and was further substantiated when looked at from the specific point of view of our concerns here today, off-campus library services.

Colleges and universities have continued to develop and increase their program offerings at off-campus sites, and academic libraries have been attempting to address their users' needs at those locations. However, they will need more support, guidance and encouragement; from each other, as we are doing here at this conference; from their professional associations, one of which, the Association of College and Research Libraries, has recently revised and published its "Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Services" (ACRL, 1982); and from their own institutions, who in seeking accreditation or reaccreditation for their colleges and universities must respond to the standards of their own regional accreditation association. If that association is moot on the topic, guidance for developing and responsibility for supporting the operation and maintenance of those services is missing at a critical level in the educational process. I would encourage academic librarians to seek out their respective regional accreditation officials, especially in those regions where off-campus library services are not addressed in the standards, to promote the importance of these special services for accreditation and to request their inclusion in the standards when they are next revised.
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Library Privileges For Off-campus Faculty and Students:
The View From An Impacted Library
Patricia M. Kelley
George Washington University

Introduction

Lured by internships, fieldwork, and employment opportunities, students and faculty members who are normally on campus often find themselves far from their home campuses and wanting to use university library collections and services. At the same time, university libraries which are heavily used by these visiting researchers are becoming increasingly reluctant to provide them with free services or free on-site use or library access of any kind. The academic libraries in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area traditionally have maintained policies of free on-site use of collections and assistance at service desks and have selectively granted borrowing privileges. However, the increase in library use by their own university communities and the dramatically increased use of their libraries by unaffiliated individuals in recent years have created serious dilemmas regarding effective allocation of resources—collections, space, and service staff.

One noticeable group of affiliated users is the off-campus population composed of faculty members who are on leave from their home universities, graduate students who are working on their theses and dissertations, and both undergraduate and graduate students who are engaged in internships, independent study or fieldwork in the Washington Area. They interest me greatly and are the subject of this paper because there is such a heavy concentration of them in the Washington Area, where many request library privileges in the Gelman Library at George Washington University and in other libraries of the Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area (hereafter simply called the Consortium). I have spent considerable time over the past twenty months trying to define fair and workable policies regarding their use of the Gelman Library.
Local Situation

The situation at GWU is fairly typical of Consortium institutions. However, the proximity of Gelman Library to federal office buildings and the offices of consulting and research firms and its easy access via public transportation cause it to be one of the most heavily used by unaffiliated researchers. Although GWU is a private university, most of its collections are available for in-house use by anyone who can produce a current photo-identification card and sign his/her name on the register at the front door. Our entrance statistics indicate that approximately one out of every ten people who walk through the front door is not affiliated with GWU. We are considering restricting reference assistance and already limit the use of some collections to students at GWU and other Consortium universities. Unless demands for service stop growing, we will probably increase the restrictions on non-GWU (that is, non-Consortium) library users. I estimate that we currently turn away twenty requesters for every person who is granted borrowing privileges.

A noticeable proportion of the non-GWU people who request borrowing privileges or use materials on-site are students at non-Consortium universities. The magnitude of the problem is hidden by the fact that employed students use their employee identification cards to gain entrance to the building, so they appear on our register as employees of firms and government agencies. It may be that as we investigate appropriate fee-based services or other restrictions that would affect firms, we will find that more of those people start to identify themselves as students.

Ours is a true library of the eighties--strongly supporting resource sharing while planning to expand the use of fees as an alternative to either unlimited free service or denial of service to external users. Therefore, it is very important to consider where the needs of unaffiliated off-campus students and faculty who use Gelman as their "away" library fit into our service philosophy.

Most off-campus requesters fit into the following groups, presented here in order of our willingness to provide services. I will explain how we respond to their needs and why.

1. Faculty members on sabbatical
2. Doctoral students writing dissertations
3. Master's candidates writing theses and students engaged in independent study related to our special collections

4. Administrators of off-campus programs who want to negotiate library services for students and faculty enrolled in their programs; and individual faculty members in those programs who have the same purpose

5. Individual interns seeking borrowing privileges; or the library directors, provosts, or program directors who want to arrange for library privileges for their Washington interns

Privileges for Off-campus Faculty

Recognizing that our stated library mission includes service to the broader academic community as well as to the GWU community, we are most receptive to external faculty and graduate students engaged in genuine scholarly research. As a professional courtesy, we are happy to permit faculty members who are on sabbatical to use our collections and borrow circulating materials. Our only requirement is that we receive a letter or phone call from the home library directors verifying university affiliation and status as borrowers-in-good-standing. The library director who denies a professor or student the necessary letter of recommendation is not to be envied. However, because we do not require the home institution to guarantee payment of fines and replacement of materials, we must ask them to screen out anyone who may cause us problems.

Problems arise in categorizing faculty who are on leave to work in government agencies, international organizations, etc. Some may be on loan, in effect, or have earned an appointment as an academic honor. Others, however, have taken leave to work as consultants, or contracted to conduct research programs and, in our view, should be subject to the same service restrictions and fees as other employees, consultants, and free-lance researchers. Washington is filled with researchers and consultants, many of whom are faculty members either temporarily or sporadically working there. Our difficulty is finding a way to distinguish between off-campus faculty who are in Washington to pursue scholarly research and those who are engaging in free enterprise.

We deny requests for courtesy privileges in cases where we feel that the faculty member is using it for business purposes. As a researcher's use of our library crosses that fuzzy gray line separating scholarly endeavor from business, we become less
generous with our collections and staff time. The greatest threat to our liberal policy concerning off-campus faculty is abuse of the privilege. As we impose fees and limit free services to the non-academic research community, I anticipate the need to require verification of the faculty requester's research status. Surely, the home library director will not be in a position to provide that verification. But who would be willing to provide that information?

Privileges for Off-campus Doctoral and Masters Candidates

Our liberal policy on borrowing privileges extends to doctoral candidates and is our way of offering them encouragement and support, just as we hope that someone is providing assistance to our doctoral candidates wherever they have wandered. Some students apply for borrowing privileges or building passes (which simply eases their entrance to the building) because we have strong collections in their fields. In most cases, however, they select Gelman Library because they need an academic library that is conveniently located.

For a short time, we tried to restrict borrowing privileges to students who were working in fields where we felt we had a research level collection. But that required such time consuming negotiations, not to mention the risk of having some sensitive person at GW learn about and feel offended by our judgment that a collection in his/her field is not research level, that we quickly abandoned the process. Most important, the practice seemed to be an unnecessary barrier for students who, in most instances, have gone to Washington because they have found jobs there and now carry the burden of working all day and writing a dissertation all night.

Following the same policy we use for faculty, we require a letter from the library director verifying that the applicant is a doctoral candidate and a borrower-in-good-standing. Only students who have reached the dissertation stage of their studies are granted borrowing privileges. On the application form, they sign a statement agreeing to acknowledge their use of the Gelman Library in dissertation research. In that way, the library receives a little public recognition in return. Finally, we supply some incentive for working diligently on the dissertation: free borrowing privileges expire after one year and cannot be renewed. After that time, the student may obtain limited borrowing privileges by joining the Friends of the Libraries and paying a fee.
Students sometimes consider the request for the letter to be a barrier to obtaining borrowing privileges. Some will try to substitute letters from dissertation advisors or general letters of introduction. Both are unacceptable because they fail to answer the crucial question, "Is this person a reliable library user?" The advisor does not have to face our university librarian twice a year at meetings of the American Library Association or may not realize that a bad experience would jeopardize library privileges for other students from that university. The library director, on the other hand, has any number of sound professional reasons for screening unreliable borrowers. At least, I hope that's the reason why some students fail to complete the application process. Sometimes there is considerable delay in receipt of letters. On occasion the letter is so insistent that the home library accepts no financial responsibility for the student borrowers, I wonder if there is a warning there somewhere.

We receive requests from master's candidates who are doing research for their theses or from students who are engaged in independent study projects. If the student is truly writing a thesis or if the research relates to one of our special collections, and upon receipt of the necessary letter from the home library director, we grant full access and borrowing privileges for one semester. The more typical requester, however, is the student who claims to be working on a thesis or engaged in independent study or fieldwork, but is in fact engaged in an internship with a government agency or professional association. It would seem that the word "thesis" can be a generic term used loosely to describe any long research paper or report; and "fieldwork" is research conducted in a new environment. But we have adopted a very firm line in denying borrowing privileges or use of restricted collections unless we are convinced that the student is engaged in scholarly research.

So far, we have had excellent cooperation from the students who have borrowing privileges and only mild protest about our renewal policy. At the first sign of a problem, however, we would notify the home library director and cancel borrowing privileges or, in the case of a general behavioral problem, bar a student from our library. As the lending library, we take all of the risks in granting any privilege because the home university typically accepts no responsibility. If it is important for students and faculty to obtain privileges off-campus, perhaps we should reconsider the home institution's responsibilities for the member its librarians and academic department or advisors supply with letters of reference. What should a letter of introduction mean?
Interns as Off-campus Students

Only under the most exceptional circumstances do we grant borrowing privileges to other masters candidates or to undergraduates. We are confident that the demand from interns and non-Consortium off-campus students is far greater than we could handle without detracting from the service our own students have the right to expect in their own library. We have been unsuccessful in devising objective criteria for granting privileges to some, while denying others, and we are unwilling to invest in the time required to negotiate hundreds of individual requests.

Interns, for example, number in the thousands in Washington. There seems to be no estimate in print of the number of internships available in the Washington area; but I can assure you that private firms, government agencies at all levels, international organizations, and trade and professional associations regularly accept interns. To give some idea of the number, the Directory of Internships, Work Experience Programs, and On-the-Job Training Opportunities (1976) and its 1978 supplement together list nearly two hundred organizational sponsors in Washington, not including Maryland and Virginia. Each organization sponsors from a few interns to several hundred each year.

There are two types of internships. The first, usually held by undergraduates, is administered by a college or university. The school places students and usually gives course credit for the experience. A program director or librarian from the home institution is likely to try to arrange for borrowing privileges or building passes for the whole group. Based on my conversations with these requesters, however, I find no convincing reason to grant either privilege. It seems that the argument made by the program director is that interns may receive research assignments, so they need to use a library. Moreover, the director feels they may need to feel welcome on a college campus, where they can mix with others their own age in their spare time.

While both concerns seem valid, the second one is not a legitimate library service need. Certainly the Gelman Library has no need to encourage anyone to participate in the social aspects of undergraduate library life. It already has more participants than it needs. While the research assignments certainly will require use of a library, the student will be engaged in research as a staff member in the sponsoring organization and should have the same access to this library as his/her fellow employees. If the purpose of an internship is to gain practical experience in a
chosen field, then learning the constraints of the position is a valuable part of the lesson.

The second type of internship, filled by both graduate and undergraduate students who frequently are paid for their work, is individually negotiated by the student. He/she, more obviously than the first intern, is an employee of the agency. He/she is also likely to arrive with a letter of introduction from a reference librarian or faculty advisor and does not give up easily when denied borrowing privileges.

It seems to me that the off-campus status of interns is deserving of some attention within the colleges and universities that sponsor them. If there is a legitimate need for academic library services that is different from their library needs as employees, that should be identified and provided. The two most frequently articulated reasons given by students who want borrowing privileges are: they have term papers to write as a result of their carrying incompletes from the previous semester; and interlibrary loan is not fast enough to serve their purposes. Perhaps students who have incompletes pending should not be eligible for internships. Certainly unwillingness to use the agency's interlibrary loan service is not sufficient reason for us to grant borrowing privileges.

In short, colleges and universities need to define more clearly to students the purpose and conditions of the internship and take the initiative to deny the letter of introduction unless some legitimate reason for a student to use a specific library can be stated in the letter. Hand-carried letters addressed to no specific library, giving no reason for library use, failing to vouch for the student as a library user, and sometimes signed by a research assistant or someone else whose position is totally unclear give the impression that no one at the home institution has taken the time to determine whether or not this intern needs library privileges in an academic library.

"Traditional" Off-campus Students

Finally, although they are outside the main focus of this paper, a little needs to be said about our service to students enrolled in non-Consortium off-campus programs. I would like to explain very briefly why we seldom contract with other universities to provide services even though contractual arrangements would seem to be a practical way of coping with the demand for service by that group. Under very unusual circumstances we do contract for services. Throughout 1984, for
example, more than two hundred of these off-campus students were eligible for full student privileges in Gelman Library under our agreements with three universities. The identity of the individuals changed from semester to semester, but the total remained fairly constant. Three-quarters of those eligible actually registered as borrowers. Two universities paid fees which were based on the number of students expected to enroll in the program. On an experimental basis, the third university gave us some special interlibrary loan privileges in exchange. Although that is not an even exchange by any means, for the present we are willing to make the agreement for political reasons.

While I would be reluctant to enter into service agreements with additional institutions on the same bases as we have with those three, I feel certain we could devise contractual services that would provide for the needs of those off-campus students without creating service delays for our own students and faculty. From a library service perspective, our primary concern about the number of unaffiliated users of our library is that GWU and Consortium students find themselves queuing for reference service and high-demand materials. We have not devised contractual services because that would not be in the best interest of other parts of the university.

Member universities of the Consortium offer extensive evening programs both on and off campus. There is terrific competition in recruitment of part-time students throughout the Washington Area, which is considered one of the best off-campus markets in the country because of the high concentration of middle and upper level civilian and military government positions. In recent years, the competition has increased significantly as more universities have opened off-campus programs there or expanded programs already in place. Since access to library resources is a prerequisite for state accreditation of most off-campus programs, our contracts to supply library privileges could undermine our own university's competitive edge in this region's off-campus marketplace. Of course, mutual support is the underpinning of a consortium, so we also have to be careful not to undermine our partners' offerings. As a result, we do not enter into agreements with universities which offer off-campus courses that compete with programs offered by any consortium member institution.

Recently, state universities in Maryland and Virginia joined the Consortium. Because their public responsibilities may differ from those of the private colleges and universities in the District of Columbia, the whole question of who can be denied privileges probably will have to be addressed through new
agreements. Meanwhile, what might be possible or desirable from a purely library service perspective is a moot question. In the absence of defined and enforced limits to access, the academic libraries in the Washington Area remain open for on-site use by off-campus students regardless of their home affiliations.

That on-site use is not satisfactory or sufficient is evident in the barrage of requests for borrowing privileges received at public service desks at the beginning of the semester. Our unverified impression, based on observations of service staff and some evidence from the entrance registry, is that Gelman has a significant population of non-GWU off-campus students. This is not surprising since part-time students are particularly prone to use the most convenient library (Whitlatch, 1981). Convenience is a Gelman Library hallmark.

Conclusion

As we grapple daily with the influx of unaffiliated users, it is easy to begin viewing them as a single "problem" that we could solve by charging discouraging fees or limiting the hours during which they would be permitted to use our libraries. In reality, that group consists of several different types of users, some of whom we feel we have a professional obligation to serve as a means of encouraging reciprocity in resource sharing. After all, our students and faculty use libraries far and wide—if they can get in. There are limits, however, to our ability to provide for so many. Only with the cooperation of other universities will we be able to sort out the needs it is reasonable for us to address from the ones that might better be directed elsewhere. We are sensitive to the needs of off-campus individuals, but the concentration of them in this geographical region makes it impossible for us to serve them all.
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Development of Off-campus Library Services
in the Vermont State Colleges

Dennis Lindberg
Vermont State College
Eileen Chalfoun
Community College of Vermont

Developing library services for off-campus students in the Vermont State Colleges has been conceived as an integral part of the development of library services generally in the system. Concern for services not on campuses has led to choices which emphasize technology, coordination, and cooperation between existing college libraries. This paper examines the planning process and its results first in the system as a whole, and then in the Community College of Vermont, a non-campus, non-traditional college without a library.

Background

The Vermont State Colleges (VSC) is a public corporation which includes three four-year institutions with small graduate programs in education (Castleton, Johnson and Lyndon State Colleges), a two-year technical college (Vermont Technical College--VTC), and the Community College of Vermont (CCV). Total head count is about 7,500 amounting to about 5,000 F.T.E. (see Appendixes A and B).

The Community College operates state-wide from twelve site offices and does not have campuses or full-time faculty. With about 2,500 it is the largest in head count, but the smallest in FTE (about 750). The four campus-based colleges also operate off-campus programs, involving in several cases significant numbers of students. The four campus colleges have libraries that provide services on campus. The community college does not have a library or librarians working as librarians.

Though blessed with a romantic image, one reality of Vermont is that it is a small, rural and relatively poor state. State support for the State Colleges is the lowest in the nation while
tuition levels are the highest in the nation for such colleges. VSC receives a one line appropriation from the legislature which in recent years accounts for about twenty-eight percent of total revenues. The balance is from student charges and Federal grants.

The system experienced a major financial crisis in the late 1970's as reality intruded upon the dreams of the 1960's and early 70's. New, tough-minded managers were brought in to get the system back on its feet. After the roofs were fixed, the life-safety problems corrected, under-enrolled degree programs pruned, damage to accreditation statuses controlled and corrected, common financial and personnel systems put in place, and adequate, if unsophisticated, administrative computer systems installed, it was time, in 1982, to deal with the "library problem" and begin the process of improving academic quality generally.

With the fires out, the late Chancellor Richard E. Bjork reorganized his office in the summer of 1982. Recognizing the convergence of information technology, Bjork gave one person (Lindberg) system-wide responsibility for computing, library development and institutional research. He saw that the library problem was large, that it would take time to correct, and that investment in information technology might reduce the need for additional fixed assets like books and buildings for their storage.

Planning Process

To produce real results, planning cannot take place in a vacuum. It is not enough to figure out what ought to be done. In Vermont at least, a plan of action, and the assumptions underlying it, need to be perceived as reasonable, rational, practical and soundly conceived. The realities of the structure, politics and personalities of the organization are a factor in planning, as are the realities of the relationships between the organization and the external environment.

The Library Assessment group

For these reasons and because other issues were at center stage in the fall of 1982, the library project began quietly. A system-wide Library Assessment Group (with the unfortunate acronym LAG) was assembled by the Chancellor to conduct a detailed assessment of VSC library and information services. Members were the four librarians from the campus colleges, an associate academic dean from one college who has an M.L.S., the Director of CCV's Northern Region who chaired the college's Resource
Committee, a staff member from CCV (Chalfoun), also an M.L.S. but not working as a librarian, and Lindberg, as chair and staff.

The assessment took nearly a year. Librarians reported in detail their judgments of the quality, quantity, adequacy, appropriateness, currentness, and rate of use of the collection supporting each degree program and the college's general education program. Reference and bibliographic instruction programs, automation and technical processing, staffing and facilities were also described.

Two peer groups were developed, one of about twenty-five smaller, public, four-year institutions (all members of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities) and another of about twelve smaller, state-supported, two-year technical colleges. No non-campus community colleges with predominately classroom-based, coursework instruction could be found. CCV appeared to be unique and truly without peers. A two-page questionnaire was developed asking about enrollment, number of degree programs offered, reference and bibliographic instruction staffing and services, automation and technical processing, and facilities. Librarians were also asked to attach the most recent HEGIS survey with its data on holdings, staffing and expenditures.

In July 1982, the Group produced a thirty-eight page report for the Priorities (Executive) Committee of the Board of Trustees. Copies were distributed to all trustees and senior VSC administrators. The report was low-key and measured in tone, but candid and frank. It confirmed in detail what many knew to be generally true. Several presidents were concerned that the report not get into the press and affect recruiting.

The report concluded that collections are generally small, have significant gaps, are of uneven quality, often inappropriate, and not particularly current. Students come to VSC institutions knowing little about the use of libraries and there are few requirements built into the curriculum for students to use libraries. Bibliographic instruction is rudimentary and professional reference services are minimal at three of the four libraries. There is some use of on-line searching in the libraries, but no other significant use of information technology. Technical processing is not automated. Virtually no library services are provided to non-campus and off-campus students who make up about one-third of the system's students on a head count basis.
VSC institutions are weak when compared to ACRL standards. The four year institutions are also weak when compared to their peers. VTC looks strong in comparison to the other technical colleges, but only because, as a group, their libraries are so poor. Applying standards, CCV ought to have 95,000 volumes and three professionals in its library. Instead, it has claimed to rely on local public libraries, which in Vermont vary widely in size and quality, are generally unsuitable for supporting college level work, and are open an average of seventeen hours per week. While awarding CCV the maximum ten year renewal of its accreditation, it is not surprising that the New England Association had library support first on its list of problems to be addressed by the college before the next visit.

The informal work of the Assessment Group was perhaps as important as the formal work. Analysis of problems often leads to preliminary consideration of solutions, formally and informally, in and out of meetings. By the end of the process, there was general agreement that solutions would have to be system-wide solutions that serve CCV's non-campus students and the off-campus students of other colleges as well as those on campus. The group also began to think of the libraries as a single, though decentralized resource--four branches, but no main.

Progress reports were regularly made to the Council of Presidents and the Council of Chief Academic Officers during the Assessment Groups' work. While little action resulted, a sense that "we're going to have to do something about the libraries" began to develop.

As the assessment process proceeded, VSC became an informal participant in a planning process under way among the University of Vermont, Middlebury College and the Vermont Department of Libraries to develop a joint, distributed network including on-line catalogs, circulation and serials subsystems. VSC librarians participated in several of the technical sub-committees. A joint VSC system is expected to be one node in the network.

The assessment report was received by the Priorities Committee of the board. It was mentioned, but not discussed in meetings of the full Board. Those Board members who read it were convinced by the weight of the evidence that the problem was large and must be addressed.
The Task Force on Library Development

The next step was for the Chancellor to appoint a system-wide Task Force on Library Development in the Fall of 1983, again related to the Priorities Committee. To underscore the importance of the task, the presidents of the five colleges were appointed. Two of the librarians, two faculty members, an academic dean, a business manager, a CCV regional director, a CCV staff member (Chalfoun), a library staff member and a student were the other members. Members represented themselves, their college and their function. The Task Force was chaired by Lindberg, who was also its staff.

The Task Force met six times during the year, weighing courses of action in dealing with reference services and bibliographic instruction, automation, and collection development and maintenance as well as the realities of VSC funding. Consensus developed with time. The range of points of view represented and the individual credibility of the participants at their college and within their system-wide functional groups (deans, business managers, etc.) gave the process general credibility throughout the system.

The Priorities Committee received all the Task Force materials, including background readings. Written and verbal progress reports were made at monthly meetings of the full board. The chairman of the board was particularly interested and began early to prepare the Board for what he knew would come. "Listen up folks," he said at one meeting. "Fixing this problem is going to cost real money."

In August 1984 the Task Force's recommendations were submitted to the board. Major points were:

1. appropriate information competencies in general education and degree programs

2. parity between on-campus and off-campus programs in requirements for and use of library/information resources

3. a single, joint on-line catalog as one node in a network also including the University of Vermont, Middlebury College and the State Department of Libraries. OCLC will be implemented and retrospective conversion performed on existing collections. The system will be accessible for off-campus and non-campus
students and faculty through dial-up lines and will have full Boolean capabilities

4. increased reference services including reference librarians for the Community College of Vermont (CCV). CCV will have responsibility for references services for off-campus students system-wide and will have incoming WATS lines

5. a joint serials list, increased use of online searching especially at CCV, and digital facsimile transverse for the four libraries and the three CCV regional offices

6. a five year coordinated collection catch-up program to add 15,000 volumes per year to system holdings, including small reference collections for CCV site offices

7. increased funding for collection renewal to reduce the book replacement cycle from 32.3 years at present to 20 years at the four-year colleges and 12 years at the technical college

Costs are projected to $2.6 million in one-time (capital) funds and increments to the annual operating budget totaling $561,000. The report was received by the Board and endorsed in principle.

The decision to combine the catalogs in a single on-line system is particularly important for non-campus and off-campus students and faculty as there will be one point of access for all VSC holdings and electronic mail capability within the system for ordering materials.

Implementation

Implementation is under way. Tasks have been divided into three categories: those requiring little or no funds, those covered in the FY 1985 budget, and those requiring additional funding—including FY 1986 tasks needing $766,000 for full funding. Non-economic tasks include academic policy issues and cooperation between libraries to develop the joint serials list (done), target collection development efforts (in process) and developing a common policy for on-line searches (in process). Budgeted funds exist in FY 1985 to implement OCLC, contract for retroconversion, and install digital facsimile machines. The former has begun.
State appropriations have been requested for the full amount of the project. Initial signs are mixed. The need is understood and accepted by the Governor-elect. She is, however, working to eliminate a budget deficit left by her predecessor. Revenue collections through March will affect success. Prospects for support in FY 1987 are much better. Fund raising from private sources is also underway and tuition increases may also be sought.

While full implementation of the recommendations is down the road, the planning process has also stirred the pot in each of the colleges. The Community College of Vermont, particularly, because of its accreditation report and the system-wide process has begun to rethink its approach to delivering library and information services to its students.

Community College of Vermont

How to provide library services to the community College of Vermont was one of the principle questions driving the VSC library development project. Founded in 1970 as a non-campus college, CCV has always seen itself as in the vanguard of higher education. It has received national recognition as one of the most creative, innovative, nontraditional institutions in the country.

One of the basic assumptions underlying the structure of this new institution was that many of the educational needs of the citizenry, particularly the rural and disadvantaged, could be met through the utilization and coordination of existing resources. No new buildings were to be constructed, no library to be purchased, and no cafeteria services provided. Resources within local communities were to be used to accomplish the college's mission. Thus, flexibility became its greatest strength.

The problem which has constantly faced CCV is how to secure the educational resources to provide equal opportunity throughout the state to all of the students. Given a limited budget and minimal staffing, how can the college provide students the opportunity to fulfill its goals: a variety of choices, use of community resources, individually designed programs, transferability to other institutions, vocational guidance, recognition of experiential learning, staff development, alternative educational programs, regular evaluation, developmental programs and student support services. The list is replete with expensive items demanding careful and creative attention.
In order to explore creative answers to the college's problems, the structure of the institution must be understood. CCV site offices stretch from the Canadian border in the north to the Massachusetts' state line in the south, and hug the border of New Hampshire and New York on either side. Newport, St. Albans, Brattleboro, Bennington and White River Junction are the visible markers that outline the college's boundaries within the state. Within the state are many other site offices which maintain communication with central administration in Waterbury.

Few site offices are within comfortable reach of research facilities and the college maintains no permanent library collections. In truth the public library system is the college's library system. With branches in virtually every Vermont community, students, in theory, have access through interlibrary loan to one million titles in the state including those held in the twenty-two college and university libraries. But sharing the woes of Tantalus, a student has little means of identifying relevant materials and usually finds the interlibrary loan process slow if not painful. Students throughout the state do not have equal access to the resources needed to do college-level research. Those writing a term paper may indeed have to wait a term in order to do a bibliographic search and access materials.

The college has attempted to develop a college-wide resource system to help instructors and students identify and locate print, audiovisual and human resources identified in college records. Distance and poor communication facilities have prevented that system from ever being used effectively. By the time information was collected, stored and disseminated, it was archaic.

In 1982 a concerted effort was made to share professional materials and create an educational resource system which could benefit off-campus students all over the state. Not just CCV, but also off-campus students from Johnson, Castleton, and Vermont Technical College were able to benefit from the preliminary efforts to collect and store information relevant to the classes they were taking in local communities. The system still awaits full development and implementation.

VSC library development plans are important to CCV. In the proposed system, each student will have access to a single, joint on-line catalog in a network which includes the libraries of Castleton State College, Johnson State College, Lyndon State College, and Vermont Technical College as well as the University of Vermont, Middlebury College and the State Department of Libraries. It also means participation in a joint serials list, increased use of on-line searching, and digital facsimile
transceivers in each of three CCV regional offices. At some time in the near future, through automation, each CCV student, instructor and staff member may be able to know what all VSC libraries hold and have on order. Interlibrary loan within the joint system should improve in efficiency and volume. In summary, automation will provide some of the answers to how the college can provide access to information and materials not normally available locally.

CCV's initial attempt to implement the VSC goal of insuring that all graduates will be able to make efficient and effective use of information resources has led to the formation of a Resource Task Force designed to help students, instructors and staff do effective research.

Formed in the summer of 1984, the Task Force will publish a Resource/Bibliographic Instruction Manual in March 1985. It will complement the college's degree program manual which sets the following expectation for students' research skills:

1. develop appropriate topics or questions as a basis for the research

2. locate and use resource materials such as library catalogs, bibliographies, indexes, abstracts, and computer databases

3. set up a research paper in correct form using an outline, footnotes, and a bibliography

The manual will cover the following topics in order to help students develop these skills:

1. The self-reliant learner: The essential difference between CCV and many other colleges lies in what CCV believes about education and learning, and most particularly, in what it believes about students. Self-reliant learners are people who can assess what they know and what they need to learn; they can use learning skills; and they can plan their studies to meet educational and career goals. In short, they are in charge of their own learning.

   a. What is the importance of research to this goal
   b. What are the expectations for the college-educated person

2. The reasons for seeking information
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a. How does one form a research question
b. What is the relationship between research questions and the individual quest for knowledge

3. What is information
   a. How information is collected and disseminated in our society
   b. The common sources of information: libraries, other organizations, human resources

4. What are the skills one develops for finding information
   a. Description of research methods and search strategies
   b. The difference between quantitative versus qualitative research

5. The appropriate uses and some of the misuses of information
   a. A description of the concepts of copyrights and fair use
   b. A discussion of academic honesty, scholarly apparatus, and plagiarism

6. The particular skills needed for library research
   a. The differences between high school and college libraries
   b. How interlibrary loan systems operate
   c. A description of OCLC and other search systems

7. Some of the strategies to use in the library
   a. Familiarity with common reference materials
   b. The use of catalogs and cataloging systems
   c. Ways to use library resources to both formulate and answer research questions

8. The relevant aspects of computerization and databases

9. A glossary of terms related to information, research, and libraries

10. Sample diagram of a local resource information center.

11. Index
The library manual will be approximately fifty pages, and designed to be used by all CCV degree students as part of a course entitled "Degree Planning Seminar." This seminar is designed to take students step by step through the process of developing an individualized degree. In addition, it will be strongly recommended as a supplementary resource in selected curriculum offerings. The manual will further strengthen the institution's philosophy that education is an on-going process and that a student's studies help with the development of thinking and learning skills. It is designed to help students determine how they learn best, and how to locate the appropriate resources for learning.

Since the VSC system plan is based on the notion of sharing information state-wide, it is important for CCV to find ways of collecting, classifying, and making available for use the educational resources employed by staff, instructors, and students throughout the state. The college has attempted to develop an internal supplementary resource system to include a collection of college-level textbooks, programmed materials, occupational and career journals and newspapers, filmstrips, slides, ERIC microfiche, audiovisual equipment, catalogs of books, fIms located at other institutions, bibliographies and staff development materials. The attempts have failed primarily because once collected and classified, the educational resources rested in their respective locations never to be resurrected. The present Resource Task Force hopes that an automated system using Zenith 100 computers, and an Infostar database will allow the staff to enter and retrieve data efficiently and conveniently, and that the system will be used daily throughout the state.

The college's instructional resource system rests on the assumption that much information related to instructional effectiveness has been collected college-wide, and much more needs to be collected, classified and made available for distribution. A computerized system for accomplishing this task is sorely needed. The content is to be used primarily to improve instructional methods in every CCV class throughout the state, particularly in those rural and economically deprived areas which might otherwise have no access to current educational resources.

The system can be described as:

1. Easy to use, requiring minimal staff training to input and access information

2. Equally available to students, instructors and staff in all site offices
3. Classified by use of Library of Congress subject headings
4. Reviewed, updated and changed easily
5. Designed to encourage search strategies
6. Not coordinator-dependent
7. Having the capacity to transmit a file
8. Interfaced with a broader-based communications system
9. Preserving hierarchical sorts while having clear, simple points of entry
10. Storing course as well as topical information

The general structure of the CCV database system will include CONTENT, FORM, USE, IDENTIFICATION and ANNOTATION. Information will be entered and sorted in a variety of fields and a user manual will be prepared to ensure early success. The process will be structured to encourage an increasing sophistication in search strategies. In the ideal, the system will have tutorial capacity.

Members of the Resources Task Force have developed a format to be used for entering data into the file. There now remains the task of collecting information currently on hand, entering the data, training the staff, and final implementation in each CCV site office. The staff is hopeful that the system will grow to be a useful and exciting learning tool for the entire college community. It will allow users to share "best teaching practice techniques" in standardized college courses throughout the state. Since the college's collections are particularly rich in books and articles related to current theory on adult learning, this material should be shared throughout the greater VSC system as part of CCV's continuing efforts to contribute as well as use resources in the larger network.

In addition to the publication of a library manual and development of a computerized resource file, the college is planning to build small reference collections in each of its site offices. Plans and funding for this project have been outlined in the VSC Task Force Report. It will be the next task of the Community College Task Force to plan for the selection and purchase of those collections as well as cataloging. Increased
reference service is to include two reference librarians for the college.

Inclusion in the Vermont State College system's plans for library development has monumental implications for the Community College of Vermont. Working alone to raise the funds for automation would make it impossible for the college to share in a state library network. Combining its efforts with four other colleges makes possible the impossible dream of securing the educational resources to provide equal opportunity throughout the state to all of the students who wish to take CCV courses. It means that instructors in small communities can do the research necessary to prepare for and teach their courses. It means that staff at a reasonable cost, and with a minimal amount of inconvenience can work toward improving the college curriculum. In summary, it means that the college community can work continually to improve the quality and quantity of its course offerings to those rural, disadvantaged Vermonters for whom the college was founded.
Appendix A

COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF VERMONT
FALL ENROLLMENT
as of October 12, 1984

SITE OFFICES

• St. Albans (323)
• Newport (117)
• Canaan (48)

• Morrisville (152)

• Chittenden County (416)
• St. Johnsbury (167)

• Waterbury (C.O.)

• Barre (446)

• Rutland (63)
• White River Junction (85)

• Springfield (175)

• Bennington (168)

• Brattleboro (184)

(Students Enrolled)

***Grand Total: 2,344

-170-
Appendix B

VERMONT STATE COLLEGES
CREDIT HOUR ENROLLMENT BY VERMONT COUNTY WHERE TAUGHT
FALL 1984

VSC offers instruction at many sites statewide. The map shows the number of student credit hours taught (one student taking one credit hour) in each Vermont county during Fall 1984. While the majority of student credit hours are taught in those counties where campuses are located, instruction in other counties is significant.
Library Service for Off-campus Institutions

Gerard B. McCabe
Clarion University of Pennsylvania

Introduction

Off-campus continuing education has a long tradition in our country. Early pioneering efforts, especially among land grant institutions, had the objective of carrying service to farmers and others in rural, primarily agricultural areas. Certainly this is very important and today it is well established and viewed as essential. Agricultural extension service is a primary component of American rural life. To meet another type of need some universities and colleges situated in typical college or university towns established branches in major cities, the so-called downtown campuses, serving those who couldn't afford to come to the main campus. The educational program was slanted heavily to evening courses. In the early 1970's a new trend began of going where students are. Now with the tightening economy of the 1980's, with main campus enrollments dropping, this trend has accelerated. Continuing education is expanding and rapidly so.

The Fallacy

Naturally, just as at the home campus, there are associated costs involved. One of these costs is library service. In considering financial support, as for any expense for proposed services, questions are raised such as, is it essential? Are substitutes available or other alternatives? In the case of library service, it would appear that alternatives are available and the service thus not so essential. And so a fallacy develops. The United States has one of the best systems of public library service in the world. While not every area of our country has public library service, it is sufficient enough that it can be safely assumed that any reasonable concentration of people in a geographic area undoubtedly has some sort of public library service. This same assumption can be expanded to include the possibility of an academic institution and hence a library being in the general vicinity. Logically, the fallacy continues, if there is a local public library or perhaps another academic library near where a proposal is being considered for the offering of off-campus continuing education courses surely it is a sufficient resource for outside readings, undoubtedly from its own collections. A number of states have extensive community college systems and senior institutions offer their programs on these
campuses. Whether or not their collections have been evaluated for purposes of supporting such programs, the presence of some types of libraries adds to the risk that further support from the senior institution will be minimal; then all that needs to be done is to have the faculty work from a well planned syllabus and mimeographed notes. Therefore, instructional courses and programs offered away from their home campuses by colleges and universities will not require any great depth of library service. This idea is appealing because it has the advantage, obviously, of relatively low cost with very little effort required, so the trap is sprung. This concept is so pervasive that it is found in large and small institutions. In some states it has led to controversy and finally firm establishment of regulations for any institution offering off-campus courses in that state, as in Virginia, for one good example. In Wyoming, as we shall see shortly, another approach developed.

Not everyone in the field of continuing education subscribes to this belief. There is an increasing concern on the part of responsible continuing education administrators and librarians that good library service must be provided regardless of where courses and programs are taught off campus (Langston, 1983). This concern extends to those programs and courses offered in another part of the city for an urban institution, or even in another part of the state no matter how remote.

Turning to the actual state of affairs in current practice, one significant article is "The Wyoming Experience with the ACRL Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Services,"(Johnson, 1984). The author, Jean S. Johnson, describes efforts at the University of Wyoming Libraries to provide library service for off-campus courses. She notes that Wyoming has only its one university and seven community colleges. To meet the particular needs of Wyoming citizens for such instruction, the university developed "a flexible delivery model for extended degree programs around the state." Johnson explains the university commitment and the response of the libraries. In developing the service plan, the ACRL "Guidelines for extended campus library services" were followed. Cooperative arrangements with other libraries when required and possible were made; some library services were added such as a toll-free telephone line to the university library's reference department; in one distant city a branch library collection was established. Such thorough arrangements develop from careful planning and genuine concern for the potential students. The Wyoming plan was the result of considerable investigation of current practice, and it appears to be a well conceived program.
Solutions

There is no one successful solution to the problem of providing library service at off-campus instructional locations. A standard formula does not exist because each situation has its own unique concerns. There is some commonality of practice, however, but where this is identifiable variations caused by local considerations exist (see appendix A). Often, a good model for such service cannot be identified, but ideas leading to a good solution can be found in the literature. Examples can be seen in the bibliography following this paper. Two good compilations for this purpose are Extended Campus Library Services and The Off-campus Library Services Conference Proceedings, papers of the first convening of this conference. The former is a microfiche compilation of presentations by the libraries of several colleges and universities describing their solutions to this question. The latter is a paperbound collection in which some innovative ideas are presented. Both of these are "must" readings for any librarian who is or is becoming involved in this work.

Other articles listed in the bibliography, covering in scope almost the entire United State and Canada, describe the relative inadequacies of library service for off-campus continuing education programs in these areas and offer remedies, local solutions to the problem (Mount and Turple, 1980).

In developing a solution to this question, one of the first concerns of the librarian who has the responsibility for either planning or the provision of library service to off-campus continuing education should be direct head-to-head contact with the teaching faculty. Johnson mentions following the ACRL Guidelines in this regard. If they are faculty chosen from the parent campus, this is relatively easy. If they are not, or if they are adjunct faculty, chosen from business and industry, then the task becomes very, very difficult. These adjunct faculty chosen from the professions have little or no understanding of the services available in the parent library. It is unlikely that they will have any idea at all of available library services in the immediate neighborhood of their instruction. Johnson describes the Wyoming solution, noting especially the need to cooperate with other departments of the institution. These may also be involved in the off-campus efforts, and their common interest should keep them united with the library in the provision of good service.

This situation of using adjunct faculty can have an adverse effect on the welfare of students enrolled in these programs. The enrollee at an off-campus program has no advantages at all such as
those offered to the main campus student who has the services of professional counselors, faculty advisors, and others who can guide and assist in the development of a worthwhile academic program leading the student to a satisfactory conclusion. No one is leading that student to library resources, the librarians must do this. Our objective, if we are to provide bona fide legitimate, high quality continuing education courses and programs to the students we are recruiting in areas removed from our main campuses, should be to offer them the very same quality, and in our view the same high level of quality library service as on campus, or face the fact that the potential clientele will soon lose interest in taking courses from our institutions and will turn to other sources of instruction. We must discredit the fallacy described earlier.

The Accrediting Association

Academic librarians who are watching their main campus enrollments decline and who are witnessing the development of extension programs in areas away from the main campus, who are watching the number of full-time permanent positions on their library staffs being reduced, are not alone in their concern for the quality of library service. The accrediting associations, which review the quality and caliber of academic programs, the level of competence of academic faculty, and the availability and quality of services and resources on the main campus, are not becoming very concerned about those very same items in off-campus efforts. Accompanying this paper in an appendix in alphabetical order are statements about off-campus library service taken from the regional accrediting associations throughout the United States (Appendix B). These statements are uniform in their insistence on adequate support for off-campus instruction. Five of the statements specifically mention library resources and services, the sixth refers only to adequate resources. The assumption that this includes library services appears safe. Our institutions cannot assume that their accredited programs when carried off-campus remain accredited by their regional association. The Middle States Association makes this quite clear. Without the association's approval, off-campus programs offered by its members cannot be described as accredited.

In another area, that of administration, the New England Association suggests that the off-campus library services should be administered by the library or learning resource center of the main campus, and that ongoing evaluation of such library service occur. This may seem obvious, but it is not always the case.
The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, concerned about its standards, is considering a proposed revision including the standard for library service off-campus. As reported by Edward G. Holley in the March, 1983 issue of College and Research Libraries News under the title "New Accreditation Criteria Proposed," the intent of this revision is to strengthen the standard for library service off-campus (Holley, 1983).

Cooperation with other libraries is a common theme in several of these statements, a few indicating a preference for written agreements. Obviously, library service to off-campus programs is a serious concern and has a high priority among the accrediting associations. It is important to librarians to follow the lead of their institution's accrediting association and to know and understand these criteria.

There is concern among members of the National University Continuing Education Association for library service for the off-campus students who are their responsibility (Langston, 1983). A need exists in our institutions in many cases for a change of attitude toward off-campus students who often are treated in an entirely different way from on-campus students. Very often they are not given the same privileges or benefits, yet will pay the same tuition. Care must be taken not to charge them for activities which really are not available off-campus, as for example in remote locations. Questions such as "does payment of tuition and enrollment in a degree program off campus entitle an extension student to the same career counseling service received by an on-campus student?" are not for this paper but there is no question about library service. No logic supports any other view but the fact that full and sufficient library service must be available. The potential and indeed the near imminence perhaps in some situations for and of lawsuits cannot be overlooked. Again and again all continuing education personnel must reiterate that the offering of a responsible degree program which carries with it the implication of career preparation must have full library support. They are inseparable. Librarians, as well, must insist on this and others must insist on their involvement. Without good library service, programs decline in quality and students will seek other solutions to their need. One of the points of Johnson's paper cited earlier is working with other offices of the institution and their personnel.

Entrepreneurial Organizations

Competition for potential students comes from a source that really didn't exist years ago, the entrepreneurial organization with a professional orientation. It is not fair to say these are
an off-shoot of the old mail order houses where one could send for what amounted to self-instructional material in pursuit of some occupation. No, rather these are well prepared, well organized firms with very capable instructors, some indeed drawn from the academic world. They offer intensive training in very short time periods. The quality is usually high. They are legitimate, responsible, and very competitive.

Every year the firm Online Inc. sponsors Online, an annual conference and exposition. The Online '83 Conference was advertised as the "What's New" conference for information professionals (Program Information, 1983). This popular conference rotates around the country and offers continuing education credits. These credits are offered through the Continuing Library Education Network and Exchange (CLENE). The programs are presented by experts in the field and are thorough and informative. There it is, nevertheless, it is inescapable that this is a commercial presentation. It is entrepreneurial.

Another very strong competitor in the information field is Datapro Research Corporation which sponsors a series of on site seminars and publishes a catalog entitled Datapro Catalog of Seminars and Information Services (Datapro Catalog, 1983). Faculty for each seminar are obtained from the field and some of the seminars are developed by other corporations in the same field. Again the seminars are rotated around the country from city to city. Datapro also offers the opportunity to have the seminars available inhouse for a fixed fee. The Datapro Catalog makes no mention of continuing education credit, but it does make an appeal to business and industry on the grounds of economy, practicality, and flexibility. The inference is that the loss of time for educational purposes can be held to a minimum. This is a competition offered by entrepreneurial enterprises. There are many other samples. My point in presenting this information is to make it clear that unless we offer a competitive product, we will eventually lose out and that means losing jobs.

The institutes, workshops, and seminars offered by these entrepreneurial competitors are not really a substitute for good academic preparation in our view, but they do meet a need because they are so specific and undisputedly are used as an alternative, and why not? After a short period of intensive work and review, students are prepared to cope with the application of the subject that was studied, for example, a particular recurring type of personnel or budgetary arrangement, perhaps a new financial system or something similar. This author and a colleague once attended an intensive seminar on the program planning budgeting system, immediately thereafter catapulting to a leadership role in our
institution, at least until interest wore out. We were called on by professionals in other units for assistance while the institution converted to a program planning budgeting system. Later the institution moved on to still another system, and the experience remained useful as a foundation for further development.

Such enterprises require no long-term commitment, perhaps a week's time, not even a semester, and they even offer a certificate of completion. Employers may accept such attendance as improving eligibility for promotion, and they often pay the expense involved. Employers may view this as an economy over the cost of paying for academic education over a prolonged period of time while an employee earns a degree, though it is true many do pay long-term educational expenses. There are ample examples of such enterprises and to reiterate they are legitimate, they offer a very viable product; they are a threat in the sense that they draw potential students away from our off-campus continuing education programs.

The Outlook for Library Service to Continuing Education

Academic librarians must be very alert to potential requirements for library service for off-campus instruction. They must be so alert that they are willing to accept the professional challenge of library outreach; so alert that they are willing to get involved in the planning process for off-campus instruction. Librarians must be fully prepared to use the technology now available to us in such ways that they can provide effective library service to off-campus library students no matter how far away they are. Some of our colleagues in the literature cited in the bibliography write about using satellite communication, not only for instructional purposes but also for the transmittal of bibliographic information and other supporting library material. Others discuss free long distance telephone reference service, on-line database searching, television, and other related services (Association of College, 1982; Lessin, 1983). This involvement and willingness to be so active extends to getting to the site to "see the lay of the land," to visit if there are available local public and or other academic libraries and make provision for some sort of host service for students enrolled in our institution's programs. All this may sound self-serving but these are essential efforts by librarians and other continuing education personnel so that good service is made available and people continue to support off-campus programs.
Conclusion

Articles in professional library literature indicate that library school graduates are decreasing, but that job opportunities are increasing (Learmont & Houten, 1984). There is no indication that this applies to continuing education employment opportunities for librarians. The cause of this increase is not clear, so it cannot be said that truly new job opportunities are being created, nor can it be assumed that those that exist now in support of continuing education will be preserved. If colleges and universities fail to offer quality programs off-campus, job opportunities for others will decrease as well. Are librarians and other personnel supporting continuing education doing all they can to protect the jobs that remain and to check this potential erosion of professional service capability? By working together to build quality programs for off-campus instruction and its library support we can do so. All must join in a response that assures quality, that will result in better library service for their off-campus programs and the students they serve.

Sources of some useful solutions have been identified. The fallacy has been described and the truth illustrated. It is up to librarians and their colleagues to take the initiative, to insist on quality service, and to provide it.
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Appendix A

A Checklist of Some Common Practices

Librarians who are responsible for establishing and operating off-campus library services at remote locations frequently do many of the listed here.

Obtain a toll-free telephone line to the reference department of their library for use by off-campus students.

Deposit books and other supporting material in a local academic or public library where the courses or programs are being taught.

Arrange for reciprocal borrowing provisions for off-campus students with local academic and public libraries.

Review the supporting bibliography of materials with the teaching faculty.

Provide an orientation to their library's resources for adjunct faculty.

Visit potential instructional sites and neighboring libraries.

Recommend creation of a branch library where the off-campus population of students and programs justifies this.

Work closely in planning and coordinating for off-campus library service with other continuing education personnel.
Appendix B

The Regional Accrediting Associations

Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Higher Education. Accreditation, Special Programs, Off-campus Educational Activities, and New Degree Levels.

Special programs, off-campus educational activities, and new degree levels may extend learning opportunities to a variety of populations, some otherwise not served. The Commission on Higher Education seeks neither to inhibit such activities nor to diminish creative approaches to them. However, additional programs offered at new degree levels, new locations or in new instructional formats may alter the purposes and procedures of an institution and the nature of the constituencies it seeks to serve. Changes in institutional purposes, in the nature of the potential student body to be served, and/or in the activities undertaken to accomplish these purposes affect the basis of an institution's accreditation and thus may necessitate its review.

Accrediting Procedures Related to New Degree Levels, Special, and Off-Campus Academic Credit Programs

A. Advance Notice to the Commission on Higher Education

It is the responsibility of an institution to notify the Commission about plans for new degree levels, off-campus, and special degree-granting programs at least ninety days before the activities become operational. The following data should be submitted.

1. Statement of the nature and purposes of the activities.

2. Basic planning documents indicating:
   a. Evidence of need for the activities
   b. Legal authorization to conduct the program(s)
   c. Budget and other information showing adequate financing for the projected activities
   d. Governance and administrative organization
   e. Provisions for faculty, library and facilities
   f. Records of institutional procedure followed in approving the activities
   g. Copies of contractual arrangements if any
3. Publications announcing and/or describing the activities.


Providing library, laboratory and other learning resources adequate to support off-campus programs is a difficult problem because off-campus students, who often differ from their on-campus counterparts, may have special needs and it is seldom feasible for an institution to purchase and establish an adequate library at each off-campus location. Thus, students and faculty in off-campus programs generally must make use of public and other libraries in the community or of libraries of adjacent educational institutions.

The Commission recognizes that this problem exists. However, these resources lie at the heart of the educational and learning process so that the Commission must place heavy emphasis, in evaluating off-campus programs and the institution as a whole, in the manner and extent to which the institution has found a reasonable solution to this problem.

The type, size and scope of library and other learning resources needed at each off-campus location will depend on the curricula offered, the methods of instruction, the number and characteristics of the students and faculty, and the use of the resources by students and faculty. Where graduate work is offered, library and learning resource requirements multiply many times. Laboratory facilities are seldom available in off-campus areas.

Before an off-campus program is initiated, there should be a careful, written evaluation by the appropriate on-campus administrative and academic personnel of the library, laboratory and other resources needed for the program. If possible, those who are to teach in the program should also be involved. A determination should then be made concerning the availability of the needed resources in the area.

Written agreements with adjacent libraries or laboratories should then be executed, specifying the conditions under which off-campus students will have access to these facilities, collections, and services. In addition to relying on other libraries, the institution should establish a collection of basic learning materials to which students will have easy access at times convenient to them.
Provision for borrowing books from the institutional main library should be made.

Adequate and inviting study space and facilities should be provided, preferably in the same building which houses the basic collection.

The institution should make certain that competent personnel are available to answer students' questions, advise them on library use, and direct and supervise the institutional collection if there is one.

Suitable orientation programs on the use of the library and other learning resources should be conducted at least once each semester for new students.

The library and learning resources should be constantly evaluated by appropriate institutional on- and off-campus personnel. Faculty members teaching in the off-campus programs should be continuously involved in the selection of materials related to their subjects. The off-campus libraries should be under the overall supervision and direction of the person in charge of the institution's main library and learning resources center.


The Commission no longer has a specific policy on approval of off-campus programs. Instead, approval of such programs is governed by the enclosed Policy on Changes Affecting the Affiliation Status of an Institution. To request approval of off-campus programs, institutions are to provide the information indicated under point 2 of the procedures for implementing this policy.

The institution must provide a written request for approval of an institutional change affecting its affiliated status and the corresponding alteration in its affiliation statement. The request must be made early enough so that approval can be provided before the change is effected and the statement thereby made incorrect.

The request must specify the alteration desired in the affiliation statement and provide the following information:
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1. A description of the proposed change and its effect on the other parts of the institution.

2. Evidence that the institution has the necessary internal and external approvals.

3. Evidence that the purposes of the change are clear and appropriate to the institution's purposes.

4. Evidence that the institution has organized adequate resources.

5. Evidence that the proposed change will have no significant detrimental effect on the rest of the institution's activities.

Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges. Commission on Colleges. **Accreditation Standards.**

Whenever an institution provides programs, it must demonstrate that library and learning resources services, fully adequate to the programs, are conveniently available and used by students and faculty. Occasionally an institution will make library and learning resources services available to students and faculty through specific arrangements with another institution or other agencies where the holdings and services are at an adequate level of support. In such cases, it is incumbent upon the institution to demonstrate that these arrangements are fully effective, will continue to be so in the foreseeable future, and are capable of meeting the needs of prospective program changes and additions.

Provision must be made for laboratory and other required facilities. Special arrangements for adequate library and learning resources support are necessary because of the unique requirements of the continuing education student.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Commission on Colleges. **Standards of the College Delegate Assembly.**

The library is important in the achievement of educational goals of students and faculty. To serve the user well, each library must have basic resources to support the institution's purposes and programs. Such resources should be available in a well-equipped facility which will encourage maximum utilization by the campus community. Moreover, to facilitate use of such resources, both on
and off campus, a competent professional staff should be available to assist the users.

In order to enhance the ability of the library to provide all the resources and services needed by its users, cooperative relationships with other libraries and agencies should be explored. Cooperative arrangements involving federal or state agencies, the libraries of other institutions, business and industry, and community agencies are examples of relationships which are useful in supplementing an institution's own library resources and services. In all cases where cooperative arrangements are a necessity, the institution must establish formal agreements providing safeguards to preserve the integrity and continuity of library resources and services. Cooperative relationships should not be used by institutions to avoid their responsibility to provide appropriate and accessible library resources and services.

Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities. Handbook of Accreditation.

All off-campus and other special programs providing academic credit, whether leading to a degree or for non-degree purposes, are integral parts of the institution. Their functions, goals, and objectives must be consonant with those of the institution. The institution maintains direct quality and fiscal control of all aspects of all programs and provides adequate resources to maintain this quality. The institution follows the Commission's requirements for institutional reporting.

Learning resources, such as library facilities, computer terminals, laboratories, classrooms, study areas, offices, and other equipment and facilities are provided as needed and used appropriately by the programs and courses offered at each learning site.

Books and other forms of learning materials are readily available and used by the institution's academic community, both on and off campus.

If off-campus programs exist, specific written provision is made for students to have ready access to resource collections or their equivalents.
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Extension of an Integrated On-line System (VTLS) to a Regional Campus

Hannah V. McCauley
Ohio University

It has been my contention for about ten years that the automation of library functions is as important for off-campus library services as for our "Big Brother's/Sister's"—if not more so. We tend to have fewer students and faculty, but rather like religion, each individual deserves the same quality library service as any other, no matter where they are getting their education.

Another reason off-campus library services are well served by automation is that staff time can be better spent in helping the students and faculty than in filing catalog cards or doing overdue notices. We have smaller staffs, who by nature must be generalists. We need to free them of the clerical tasks so that they can spend more time on bibliographic instruction, developing the collection, fighting for the budget, and working one on one with students.

Because of the cost of the early on-line catalogs and automated circulation systems, I felt projects such as these would never be within the reach of our two-year campus. This did not stop me from dreaming dreams and being prepared in case lightning should strike. I spent seven years on the Ohionet Board representing small academic libraries and one of my functions was to remind the board of how the prices it set for OCLC and other services would affect us. Another function was to work with small academic libraries to show how OCLC was cost effective and how it increased our ability to serve our patrons.

One of the ways I was preparing for automation was by cataloging through OCLC and building a database. I went on-line with OCLC in 1979 and in 1980 started a retrospective conversion project. Retrospective conversion was free at that time and rumor had it that OCLC was going to start charging for that service. Never one to pass up a bargain, and knowing this was a first step to future dreams, we completed the retrospective project in two years.
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The following information presents some data on Ohio University-Lancaster for comparative purposes. We are one of five regional campuses of Ohio University and our campus is located fifty miles from the main campus. We have 1500 students, 906.6 F.T.E., 36 full-time faculty with approximately 90 part-time faculty over the year. We offer the first two years of the university curriculum; six technical programs, and in conjunction with the Athens campus most of the courses for the bachelor's and master's degree in general areas of business and education.

The library has a full time staff of five: director, reference librarian, audio-visual librarian, library technical assistant II, and secretary, plus 5,700 hours of student help. We have a collection of 57,000 titles, 60,000 volumes, 30,000 audio visuals, 152,000 microforms, and subscribe to 390 journals and newspapers. Our budget is 8% of the total campus budget. Approximately $40,000 is spent for books and $19,000 for periodicals. We add around 2,500 volumes a year. Circulation is approximately 35,000, daily attendance averages 400 a day, and we are open 77.5 hours a week.

Now what are the benefits of an integrated on-line system to a regional campus and how did we get there?

Basically our dreams came true because of the potential of networking.

Ohio University went on-line with the Virginia Tech Library System July, 1983. Prior to the actual start-up date a committee of regional campus librarians and Ohio University Athens library staff explored the possibility of extending the system to the five regional campuses. Complementing planning for these extensions, Ohio University had been planning for a microwave system to serve the regional campuses.

The Lancaster campus was chosen as a prototype for the regional campus installation because

1. records for its collection had been converted to machine-readable form,
2. grant funds were available to substantially offset equipment costs,
3. the Lancaster campus was already a prototype for the microwave link with a TV classroom located in the library, and,
4. the library staff was eager to participate in the project.
A county grant funding source provided $23,000 for equipment and a university 1804 Endowment Fund grant provided $58,900 for the project. Overall start-up costs will be about $100,000.

Objectives

While this proposal specifically addresses the extension of the VTLS on-line library system to the Lancaster regional campus, its import arises from serving as a prototype for the similar extension of the comprehensive library system to all regional campuses and, possibly, other types of libraries. The objectives are thus twofold in nature.

1. To provide the full range of library services available through the VTLS system to the Lancaster regional campus and to permit the identification of resources held at each campus. The VTLS Library System (produced by Virginia Polytechnic as the Virginia Tech Library System) is designed to provide on-line library services for public access catalogs, circulation, and, within the next year, serials control and acquisitions. Additionally, it carries the capacity for networking a number of libraries. This proposal seeks to enhance library services and support for educational programs by providing greater access at the Lancaster regional campus to its own collection and to the resources of the Athens Campus.

2. To document the problems and needs in the extension of the VTLS system to regional campuses. By beginning with a prototype system, extension of the library system to the other regional campuses can be projected.

Benefits Expected

Extending the VTLS system to the Lancaster campus will make the resources of the Athens campus readily available for academic programs and research to the Lancaster faculty and students. The result will greatly expand the resources available to Lancaster programs without requiring purchase of rarely used materials. This will permit strengthening the collection locally without reducing the Lancaster library's ability to respond to specialized needs. Moreover, as an integrated library system, VTLS will enable the Lancaster campus library to automate its circulation, to provide an on-line public catalog, and to enhance other services which contribute to staff productivity and cost effectiveness at a fraction of the cost attempting the same task.
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independently or of the costs previously born by Alden Library (as a result of purchases of capital equipment and of experience). This pilot project will provide the basis for subsequent extension of the VTLS system to all regional campuses.

It will also provide a demonstration of the feasibility of extending services to the other regional campuses and to other types of libraries in the region. With the information generated in this proposal, it will be possible to develop a meaningful request for outside funding.

Most importantly, this proposal is a major first step to realizing the potential inherent in Ohio University with its Athens campus and regional campuses. Not only will the library of each campus be able to identify what materials are available at the other regional campuses, as automated circulation is added within a year, it will be possible to eliminate unwarranted duplication of resources. As a means for not only cooperative planning, but for actually implementing effective resource sharing, the system is a major addition to the management of university resources.

Those were our objectives as we set forth to extend the VTLS system to the Lancaster Campus on July 15, 1984.

Because of the expertise and experience of the staff at the Athens campus and the assistance they were willing to give, the total project was targeted to be completed in less than one year. In the first phase of the project (Fall 1984) the Lancaster campus was able to search the Ohio University Athens library collection; the second phase (Winter 1985) the Lancaster database was loaded, and this spring the students can search the local collection; in the third phase (Fall 1985) the automated circulation system and statistical package will be available.

In preparation for this third phase, circulation, we bar coded all the books and catalogued audio/visuals last summer immediately after inventory.

58,094 Books
3,480 Audio/visuals
67,574 Total items bar coded

Eight students worked in teams of two to bar code the books and attach the matching bar code to the shelf list, which is how we plan to link the records. It took only three weeks to accomplish this as each team did approximately one thousand books a day (four
thousand total) or one hundred twenty-five books an hour. Cost of labor came to five cents a book.

Has the extension of VTLS met the objective of enhancing library services and support for educational programs? Yes, beyond our expectations. The Athens campus has over one million volumes and being able to "browse" their shelves, so to speak, has opened up a whole new world for our students and faculty. Being able to search by subject and by work makes both collections much more accessible. We expect both the interlibrary loan between campuses and our circulation to increase because materials will be more readily found to meet the needs of the patrons.

Students and most faculty have no problems using the system. We have five public service terminals, four on the main floor (two standing and two seated for the handicapped), and one on the lower floor. The potential for the faculty to search the collection from its offices and the public from its homes expands the system's usefulness.

When the circulation component is operational, the patrons will be particularly pleased not to have to sign their name and address on each book charge card. In circulation we are going straight from the dark ages into the twenty-first century. The staff is looking forward to better control of check-out records and to the system doing the overdue notices and some statistics. And the faculty has yet to be introduced to the bibliographies we can now provide for them.

The networking component of VTLS has made it possible to extend the integrated on-line system to our regional campus and in the future to the other four campuses. We could not have done this alone, we would not have had the expertise nor the funds.

The students on a two-year campus deserve the same quality library service as students anywhere else. We believe that extending the VTLS system to our campus has greatly enriched the quality of service we provide.
Computer Searching and the Extended Campus Patron

Theresa McDevitt

West Virginia College of Graduate Studies

Journals provide an essential part of the research material needed by graduate students in nearly all disciplines. Finding journal articles relevant to one's interest can be a time consuming process, involving hours spent searching through periodical indexes. West Virginia College of Graduate Studies is an institution which provides graduate study to residents of a sixteen county area of southern West Virginia. Many students live in isolated rural areas, attending classes at many off-campus locations. Students are widely dispersed, separated from main campus by vast distances and poor roadways. How can an isolated, part-time student find articles relevant to his research needs? After they drive forty to fifty miles to attend class at an off-campus location one night a week, and work at a full-time job, can they still be expected to drive to the main campus to use the indexes in the library? If so, when will they ever have time to read what they find?

The database search is traditionally seen as a method of freeing the researcher from many hours of index searching by providing bibliographies of relevant periodical literature on-line. Database searches are also extremely helpful to those of us trying to service the patrons "up a hollow." They enable us to quickly and easily provide a listing of relevant periodical articles to patrons who live too far away to come to the library and use the indexes.

At COGS, we do database searches free of charge for extended campus patrons. We send them the search, with the citations to journal material which we own checked off, along with the request forms for reprints of articles. Articles which we own can then be supplied within a matter of days, and those we do not own ordered via interlibrary loan.

Typically the search request is received in the mail in the morning, the search is done during the day, the material which we own is checked off, and the search is in the mail the next day. The patrons receive the search as soon as first class US mail can deliver it. They can request materials on the enclosed article reprint request forms and receive the articles themselves in
little more than a week of initially requesting the search. The
process is even faster if the patron calls requesting the search
using our toll free number.

Though for the most part this process works quickly and
smoothly, there are problems associated with doing database
searches for patrons librarians have not had the opportunity to
interview. Many patrons have never had a database search done
before. Their expectations about them are unrealistic, viewing
them as panaceas to cure their research woes. They expect them to
do their thinking for them. When they receive a list of citations
in the mail, they are surprised and disappointed. Unless they
have a question that is appropriate for a database search, a
search can be of no use at all to them. Requests are received for
searches on topics which are too broad or otherwise inappropriate.
Sometimes their questions are not clearly communicated via the
request form, and they receive excellent searches, on topics that
are not what they had in mind. Many times requests are received
for searches of terms or descriptors which are multitudinous or
unrelated, and it is impossible to tell what the patrons' subjects
really are. Even after they receive a relevant bibliography, some
patrons cannot tell from titles of articles and names of journals,
or even abstracts of articles, if the article will help them.
They order everything on the list when only one or two would be
useful to them. By the time they receive material ordered via
interlibrary loan, and discover it will not help them, it is too
late for them to investigate other sources, and large amounts of
money have been wasted on ordering irrelevant journal articles.

Some ways we try to overcome these problems follow:

1. Librarians go to class meetings on and off campus to
   explain the results and utility of database searches.

2. We encourage patrons to use the toll free number to
   order their searches. Speaking directly with the patron
   often results in a better search and provides us with
   the opportunity to discuss the topics.

3. We continue to alter the search request form in an
   effort to elicit the type of information we need to
   base a search on, in a clear and unambiguous way as
   possible.

4. When a search request is totally inappropriate, we
   send the patrons what we feel will better fulfill their
   needs, such as pages from a periodical index or a
   bibliography of books owned. We encourage the patron
to call and discuss topics with us if they still feel they need a search.

5. We limit the number of articles sent to a patron per term to twenty-five. We feel this is sufficient and encourages them to use judgment and restraint in ordering articles.

A recent survey of user satisfaction showed that the great majority of our patrons found our database search service to be very helpful to them. It is undoubtedly true that database searches are very helpful to the librarian who is trying to provide hundreds of unique bibliographies of periodical literature to off-campus patrons every term.
With a Little Help From Our Friends

Librarian and Administrator as Partners in Off-campus Success

Connie Mulligan
University of Kentucky Off-campus Programs

The University of Kentucky's Off-campus Programs was begun in 1919, its primary mission being to serve the graduate educational needs of teachers and administrators throughout the state of Kentucky. While continuing to serve this clientele, the program has grown over the years to encompass over 150 different undergraduate and graduate course offerings during an academic year, all aimed at the adult learner. Courses and programs include a full Master's degree in social work, partial graduate programs in nursing, rehabilitation counseling, library and information science and engineering management as well as undergraduate course work in communications, human sexuality, accounting, word processing, computer science and mining. Course sites are just as varied as the programs and range from the rural regions of Harlan County, Kentucky to the urban area of greater Cincinnati and from a bank board room in downtown Lexington to an Indian reservation in Kayenta, Arizona.

This development paved the way for what is now one of the most innovative and diverse units on the Lexington campus--the College of University Extension. In addition to Off-campus Programs, University Extension serves the non-traditional student through a variety of ways, including media education, independent study, experiential learning, evening and weekend college conferences and institutes, and non-credit community education activities.

Unfortunately, library and information services for non-traditional students did not grow quite as rapidly as the educational opportunities themselves. For it was not until July of 1979, sixty years after the first off-campus class was held, that an official extension librarian was appointed. This appointment was possible due to the collaborative efforts of two administrations--these being the University of Kentucky Library System and the College of University Extension. The original proposal for the position was written by the Associate Director of the Library System, Ruth Brown, at the request of the Dean of University Extension. That request called for a half-time librarian "to plan, design, develop and administer programs and
services applying the library resources of the University to the informational needs of the extension community."

Currently, the extension librarian enjoys excellent support from both the Library System and University Extension. Space is provided for the extension librarian in the reference department of the main M.I. King Library. By using the extensive collection of the Library System which includes fourteen branch and departmental libraries, the research needs of off-campus students are more easily met. Circulation is extended to a full semester for these students and a personalized interlibrary loan service provides photocopies of journal articles at no charge. To assist the extension librarian in filling the ever-increasing number of requests for materials, the library provides funds for a work-study assistant whose primary assignment is to locate, retrieve and mail materials for information. Funds are also provided for a small collection development budget used to purchase support materials for well-established, on-going off-campus programs such as the Master's in Social Work and the B.S. in Nursing at Ft. Knox. As these resources are generally housed at off-campus sites, they are not catalogued as part of the U.K. Library System holdings. Instead, a special computerized records management system was developed for keeping track of Extension materials. A less tangible but nonetheless important library contribution is the professional exchange and camaraderie. Interaction with peers enables the extension librarian to not only keep abreast of trends and important developments, but provides a valuable support network.

University Extension, located across campus from King Library, provides a private office for the librarian, located strategically and conveniently next door to the Off-campus Programs office suite. Here the librarian has direct access to the KATS line, a reduced-rate long-distance calling system which aids communication with off-campus students. In return, off-campus students are able to call into Extension's state-wide toll-free line to make resource and reference requests. This line will be extended into surrounding states in the new fiscal year to reach students in Ohio, West Virginia, and Tennessee. All telecommunication costs are part of the financial support provided by University Extension. Traditionally, the extension librarian relied upon the Off-Campus Program's budget for the librarian which includes adequate monies for travel costs, supplies and printing needs. Now, there is a separate budget for state-wide travel plus trips to professional conferences, a printing line for public relations brochures and instructional materials and a supply line for mailing bags, labels, and other needed material. Perhaps the most exciting line in the budget, however, is one
designated specifically for computer literature searching for off-campus students. These monies came from a proposal written by the extension librarian in 1983 and approved by Extension's Dean which called for financial support of this off-campus service. University Extension increased its support even further in 1984 by providing funds for a Radio Shack TRS 80 Model IV, a modem and a printer. This has enabled the extension librarian to not only perform computer literature searching outside of the main library environment, but also to develop the on-line records management system for keeping track of circulating materials. Funds for a graduate assistant, who works directly with the system, are also provided by University Extension. Salary for the professional position originally came from the University Extension budget and was transferred into the Library System. This transfer now occurs on an annual basis, with both units actively involved in performance evaluation and merit determination.

With the support of this "dual-administration," the extension librarian is able to provide a wide variety of both traditional and innovative services. Approximately seventy-five percent of the Extension Librarian's time is spent working directly with the off-campus patron and faculty. Services include provision and organization of reserve materials at off-campus sites, filling reference/resource/audio-visual requests, providing interlibrary loan materials unavailable in the U.K. Library System, library instruction and orientation off campus and on the main Lexington campus and computer literature searching. Time is also spent working with University Extension administrators, including the Off-campus Programs Director, to research and disseminate current information on their program areas. The extension librarian also serves the adult population enrolled in University Extension courses on campus, providing term-paper workshops, library tours and evening/weekend library instruction. In addition to these activities, the librarian serves on Library System and Extension committees and attends faculty and administrative staff meetings of both.

To assist in the provision of these services, the Off-campus Programs office works closely with the librarian in an almost daily exchange of information on off-campus faculty, students, locations and developing programs and projects. This exchange is a crucial component for both areas and enhances not only library services but the entire Off-campus spectrum. The director and staff of Off-campus Programs are able to include information about library services in all public relations endeavors including descriptive brochures, media spots, Back-to-School Workshops, onsite registrations, professional presentations and, perhaps the most effective of all, personal contacts. The extension
librarian, in return, is able to provide information about Off-campus Programs to current and potential patrons "in the field" and is always alert to new development opportunities.

This cooperative relationship has significantly expanded in recent months to include joint demonstration/presentations at state-wide professional meetings, grant writing for off-campus expansion monies and mutually beneficial budgeting. The most recent collaboration has resulted in a pilot project to teach end-user computer literature searching to off-campus graduate students in eastern Kentucky. Working with administrators and faculty from the College of Social Work and University Extension, a Radio Shack PT-210 dumb terminal was purchased and placed in a local community college library in Ashland, Kentucky, one of the most active off-campus sites. Using the BRS/After Dark computer service, orientation and demonstration workshop plus "hands-on" sessions have been held by the extension librarian throughout the semester to encourage and activate interest in this valuable resource. Although some technical hurdles still exist, this experience has replaced initial fear and apprehension of "do-it-yourself" computer searching with enthusiasm for the possibilities of utilizing Information Age tools. Successful ventures such as this have unquestionably made University of Kentucky's Library and Information Services for Off-campus Programs the statewide model for excellence. In fact, consulting work on developing such services has been done for several regional universities in Kentucky and in our border state, Tennessee. With U.K.'s Off-campus offerings expanding to encompass videotape and satellite transmission programming on a national scale, the extension librarian will certainly face great challenges in the future. These challenges will be met successfully, as we have learned, "with a little help from our friends."
Library Development as a Catalyst for
Continuing Education Innovation
in a Major Research University:
A Case Study

Mary Joyce Pickett
Illinois Institute of Technology

Brian Nielsen
Northwestern University

The role of continuing education programming at a branch campus of a major private research university differs significantly from such programming in a state-supported or private service-oriented institution. Without a clearly articulated institutional focus on service to the surrounding community, a branch campus program may suffer from scant management attention, despite the clear demographic trend toward a growing adult learner, and shrinking the adult resident student population. This paper will describe the efforts of library staff working in conjunction with continuing education managers to enhance continuing education programming through library development. Using the managerial perspective provided by Rosabeth Kanter (1982), the strategy for change may best be understood as the exercise of middle-management entrepreneurship "from below," rather than a top-down push for innovation in continuing education.

Northwestern University's Division of Continuing Education operates primarily on the institution's downtown Chicago campus, ten miles from its main campus in suburban Evanston. The Schaffner Library, a branch of the University Library, has had a mission to serve the SEE Division, as well as the extension Master's in Management program of the Graduate School of Management, though services and collection at that branch were essentially static from 1972 to 1981. The case of recent developments in Schaffner Library is here described as a case to illustrate the strategy for institutional change that moves from the library to the larger SEE program.
Kanter's study of 165 middle managers in five companies describes characteristics of successful middle management which she argues to be critical for the United States' return to a position of economic leadership in the world. Kanter, a professor of sociology and management at Yale University, shows middle managers, not always top executives, leading the way to corporate innovation and increased productivity through "working smart." In like fashion, we hope to show that academic library middle managers can effect major changes in service delivery to extended campus students and faculty. Borrowing from Kanter's conclusions about what makes for high effectiveness in corporate middle management, we offer through a description of service development in a library serving adult learners some suggestions about what may lead to success in library innovation. In a nutshell, Kanter enumerates five qualities in middle managers which may lead to high innovativeness. These are: 1) comfort with change; 2) clarity of direction; 3) thoroughness; 4) participative management style; and 5) persuasiveness, persistence, and discretion.

The library we will describe today is the Joseph Schaffner Library, a branch library of Northwestern University Library, serving students in Northwestern's University College and in the Graduate School of Management's night school MBA program, called the "Manager's Program." The University College is Northwestern's administrative unit for adult continuing education certificate and degree programs, and both the University College and the Manager's Program are located on Northwestern's downtown Chicago campus, two blocks from the Second City's fashionable Million Dollar Mile, but ten miles from the main campus in Evanston, Illinois. Schaffner Library, the University College, and the Manager's Program all occupy the same building.

The recent history of Schaffner Library is a story of exodus, decline, and recent renaissance. The critical event for the Schaffner Library in the last decade was the university's decision to move the management school from Chicago to the Evanston campus, an important step for the university in developing that school into one of the prominent graduate management programs in the United States. When the school moved, so did most of the book collection and staff in the Schaffner Library, leaving behind in the facility a small paraprofessional staff, about 70,000 volumes, perhaps 150 active journal subscriptions, all for the use of students in night classes which remained on the Chicago campus. No librarians were left to do book selection or provide reference services; the only material funds remaining there were for the purchase of books for reserve. The situation remained essentially stagnant for nearly a decade, until aid to the facility was identified in 1979 as a possible
addendum to a major University Library National Endowment for the Humanities Challenge Grant fundraising program. Surprising to the University Library, the Schaffner component of the campaign was immediately successful, and the Library was faced with spending several thousand dollars without much notion of what materials were needed by the patrons of Schaffner Library. Though bibliographers on the Evanston campus did purchase several hundred monographs, they were selecting "in the dark," so to speak, and recommended that a special assessment be undertaken of the need for service delivery in Schaffner. With NEH funding, it was decided to create a one-year professional position to explore service development in the downtown facility, the position to be called the Schaffner Project Librarian.

This paper's first author was hired as the Schaffner Project Librarian in September of 1983; the second author was at the time a member of the search committee for the position, as well as being head of the main library reference department. Working together, and with many other staff both within and outside the library system at Northwestern, the project librarian and the head of reference began to redefine the service priorities of Schaffner, accomplishing considerable innovation within the space of a year.

One of the project librarian's first activities was to gather information about Schaffner Library, other University Libraries, and University College. Information about Northwestern University Libraries was obtained through interviews with personnel representing over twenty areas of responsibility. As the project developed, we found that working with people from reference, circulation, cataloging, reserves, collection management, interlibrary loan, and other Chicago campus libraries was important.

Observation at the Schaffner Library, including some evening and Saturday hours, provided a preliminary understanding of clientele and usage there. A meeting with continuing education English faculty, instructional sessions in classes, and follow-up reference appointments by approximately ten students provided first hand information about University College faculty and students. This preliminary gathering of information resulted in the following observations:

1. Although some students had developed basic library skills, other had literally no knowledge of library tools and research processes (e.g. two students who scheduled reference interviews had never heard of the Readers' Guide until the presentation to their class).
2. Even though most of the students are juggling their coursework around full-time jobs, their commitment is considerable. The students who signed up for reference appointments were there at the appointed time and very appreciative.

3. Northwestern continuing education students need to be made more fully aware of resources available through Northwestern University Libraries. However, because of their diverse backgrounds and situations, bibliographic instruction should be centered around the research process and not restricted to use of a specific library. Karen Brown discussed the importance of teaching transferable research strategies to adult part-time learners in a paper at the 1982 Off-campus Library Services Conference (Brown, 1982).

4. Although the Schaffner Library was tied into the University Library's on-line public access catalog, there was no educational program explaining the system.

5. Once a University College student using the on-line catalog identified a title needed in the main University Library, he or she had to make a trip to Evanston for it; there was no document delivery system between Evanston and Chicago campus libraries. Even worse, University College students had to follow special procedures to obtain a borrowing card for the Evanston campus libraries. Students going there evenings or weekends who had not gotten a card in advance could not check out books. Needless to say this created considerable ill will.

6. The reference collection was inadequate and difficult to use, having numerous shelving sequences. Two classification systems were in use, with the older materials, ironically, in LC, and the newer in Dewey.

7. During the peak one or two hours immediately preceding classes the library was very crowded. Other times it was almost empty.

These observations revealed glaring deficiencies in the library services provided to Northwestern's part-time adult learners. In November 1983 University College administrators were invited to join University Library administrators and the project librarian in a meeting to begin redefinition of library services for University College students. This redefinition included these recommendations:

1. Improved access (for University College students) to the main University Library. University College students were the only group of Northwestern University students not automatically issued ID cards which could be used to charge out library materials. The automatic issuance of ID cards to University College students was strongly recommended. In addition, programs
to acquaint these students with the facilities of the main
University Library needed to be developed.

2. Improved document delivery service between campuses.
Monographic items should be received in one day and photocopies in
two.

3. Reorganization and expansion of the reference collection
at Schaffner. This would involve identifying older LC classed
reference titles to remain in the collection and be reclassed into
Dewey, selection of additional titles, and rearrangement of the
collection into one shelving sequence.

4. The institution of on-line searching as an additional
reference tool at Schaffner. In cases where it was to be used in
lieu of purchasing the print index, the searches should be
subsidized.

5. Provision of qualified reference and bibliographic
instruction personnel. The project librarian's experience
demonstrated a need for instruction in the research process and
the use of reference tools. A reference librarian should be
available during late afternoon and early evening hours when most
students are on campus.

6. Additional study space.

In addition to these proposals for immediate service
improvement, a more general proposal was made which was to have
important implications for Schaffner's future. The head of
reference proposed Schaffner be designated a special "library
laboratory" for information delivery experiments. The "library
laboratory" idea suggested the possibility that Schaffner could
take advantage of Northwestern's advanced ground for smaller
experiments, such as with endorser on-line searching, electronic
delivery of full texts, and use of the university's fiber optic
link between the Evanston and Chicago campuses for message
transmission between the libraries. This suggestion, in line with
Kanter's notion of providing overall clarity of direction for
innovation, was immediately attractive to the University College
administrators, and proved helpful in garnering additional support
for the larger innovation proposed.

The project librarian prepared a proposed 1984-85 Schaffner
Library budget which would enable beginning development of the
above services. A document outlining the rationale and potential
of the library laboratory concept at Schaffner was prepared by the
head of reference. This accompanied the budget document which
included a request for personnel to investigate research
possibilities. The budget was completed and approved by the
University College and University Library administrations in
February 1984. The support of University College administrators
was crucial for obtaining University approval, which was received in early August 1984.

By the spring of 1984 there was movement for actual program implementation, combining resources from both the library and the parent university. Reference titles most appropriate for the collection were identified and ordering begun. Arrangements were made with the cataloging department of the University Library to have those reference titles still in LC reclassed to Dewey and entered into the on-line catalog.

An early political move to alert the faculty to the project was a letter sent to all Spring Semester 1984 University College faculty explaining the project, outlining recommendations made to date, and requesting that they inform the project librarian of their library related concerns. Seventeen faculty responded with a range of concerns including titles recommendations, problems with the reserve system, problems with locating materials in the Schaffner Library, and requests for instructional sessions in their classes. Six sessions (three on the Chicago campus and three in Evanston) were arranged as a result of the letter. Several faculty made general comments supportive of steps to improve services. Feedback from the instructional sessions was positive and notes about the sessions describing strengths and weaknesses were kept on file to refer to if future programs were to develop.

Considerable ill will resulted from the special procedures required of University College students to obtain a library card. The first step of a public relations campaign directed to students was a letter explaining the process, recognizing the inconvenience caused, and indicating that procedures for automatic issuance of cards were being developed. Approximately fifty percent more students requested cards in the Spring 1984 semester than in Spring 1983.

A brief guide to the Schaffner Library was completed and available for patrons. It was distributed in Chicago campus instructional sessions along with guides to the main University Library and a brochure describing the use of the on-line catalog (LUIS).

Delivery between the two campuses was unsatisfactory utilizing the regular campus mail system. In February the University Library instituted an arrangement with the University Purchasing and Stores delivery truck to deliver library materials between the two campuses. This proved to be more dependable but still did not provide direct library to library delivery.
Additional study space was created by moving excess shelving (left by the withdrawal of dead periodical runs), painting, and adding study tables.

Throughout the project questions arose regarding current use of the Schaffner Library. Patron counts were available for some time periods. Additional counts were instituted. To ascertain who used the library and for what purposes, a patron survey was conducted the weeks of March 5 and May 7, 1985. A stratified sample of two hour time blocks was drawn for weekday surveying. Surveying was done the entire day on Saturdays. Over 80% of entering library users took survey forms. Valid forms were returned by 89% or 351 users. Of the patrons surveyed 45% were affiliated with the Manager's Program, 33% with University College, 19% with other Northwestern schools (9% with Medical 6% Law, and 4% other), and 3% were non-Northwestern people.

Saturday users were predominately Manager's Program students (67% of users on March 10 and 56% on May 14 with University College students accounting for only 12% of users each Saturday). More extensive use of reserve materials and computer rooms adjacent to the library partially accounts for the heavier use by Manager's Program students. In addition to being the largest user group, the Manager's students were the most vocal in the comments' section of the questionnaire.

Patrons were asked to indicate library services they used during their visit. Study space was as expected the most frequently checked response. Most responses were consistent with casual observation and with what limited statistics were already available. For instance, the use of reserves reported was consistent with reserve circulation statistics. While 16% of University College respondents used the card catalog and 11% the online catalog, only 7% of Manager's Program respondents used the card catalog and 6% used the on-line catalog. In contrast, the percentages of each group actually using reference books (Manager's Program--13%; University College--11%) and circulating books (Manager's Program--12%; University College--13%) was very similar. What this means is that management students often use familiar reference tools (Value Line, Moody's, etc.) and do not need to refer to the catalog. In looking for circulating books they also may be more apt to go directly to the shelves since the scope of subjects they use is more limited. It may also mean that when they do use the catalog, management students are more apt to find the books they need at Schaffner than are University College students. As was expected, very few respondents (4%) reported asking for reference assistance. Follow-up surveys can help
determine if use of this and other services increases when regularly scheduled reference service and bibliographic instruction programs are instituted.

Because the project librarian had been hired with NEH funds raised primarily by the Division of Continuing Education, she had been directed to examine the library needs of students in that division. Throughout the project it had become increasingly clear that planning for the Schaffner Library should also consider the needs of Manager's Program students. The survey confirmed this assumption, and the project librarian strongly recommended formal involvement of Manager's Program faculty and administration in future planning. The formation of an Extended Campus Services Library Advisory committee was recommended. This committee would include representatives of both programs.

With budget adoption, the Schaffner Library was placed administratively under the reference department of the University Library. The search for an extended campus services librarian to implement and coordinate improved library services to nontraditional students on both the main and the satellite campus was begun. University College and Manager's Program administrators participated in the search process. A librarian was appointed to begin in February 1985 as a member of the Northwestern University Library Reference Department and Head of the Schaffner Library.

The creation of a research office in the University Library occurred shortly before approval of the Schaffner budget. Once the Schaffner budget was funded to provide improved traditional library services for nontraditional students, the library laboratory concept at Schaffner became a logical choice for early projects of this office. The Schaffner budget included funding for an eighteen month half-time person to investigate possible projects and prepare proposals for funding. Alternatives being investigated particularly applicable to a remote site serving busy nontraditional students (mostly employed full-time and taking evening courses) include:

1. Creating model curriculum modules for teaching adult learners aspects of information management. We have been in contact with University College faculty teaching writing and public policy studies to consider offering endorser training, database creation and management, and the use of computer communications programs as components of regular coursework in the college. A proposal for a federal grant to implement this aspect of the Schaffner plan has been developed.
2. Developing enhancements to the Northwestern online integrated system to provide more useful services to adult continuing education students. We would like to see Schaffner patrons be able to search the on-line catalog strictly for materials in that branch library, rather than only in the union catalog mode; similarly, we would like to see Schaffner users be able to request well-formatted printouts of bibliographic citations found in the catalog, rather than using a simple screen printer.

3. Providing documents for use in the Schaffner Library through electronic means. Because we can experimentally isolate Schaffner use from the larger campus library system to at least some extent, we may try providing students with access to such services as Information Access Corporation's "ASAP," or documents available experimentally on videodisk.

Several conclusions which can be drawn from Northwestern's experience are relevant for other institutions planning library services for nontraditional students. First, an effective program requires library-wide cooperation. Kanter's call for a participative management style and for thoroughness dovetail nicely with this conclusion. Planning involved consultation with personnel in many departments including reference, collection management, interlibrary loan, circulation, cataloging, acquisition, and other Chicago campus libraries. This same cooperation is crucial as implementation is taking place. Needless to say, support of the library administration is critical at all stages of planning and implementation.

Second, the support of appropriate academic administrators is crucial. Here, Kanter's notions of persuasiveness and discretion come into play. The academic administrators served as valuable political allies for library middle managers in their efforts to convince upper management within the library of the need to move forward to implement needed change. They can provide valuable information about curriculum, faculty, and students for library planners. At Northwestern we found that academic administrators respond positively to approaches which combine traditional services and new technology in serving busy nontraditional students. A major factor in approval of the 1984-85 Schaffner budget was the support of University College administration in approaching the University for funding.

Third, patience and flexibility are required. As Kanter notes that change is often difficult to effect in large organizations, we had to know when to move slowly, when to contact other staff, when to bring in additional minds for decision
making. Some things did not go as planned. Although we had verbal approval on the creation of a new Extended Campus Services Librarian position in the Spring of 1984, formal approval of the budget for it did not come until late in the summer, forcing an interruption in service provision by a graduate librarian for several months in Schaffner between the time of the departure of the Schaffner Project Librarian and the arrival of the incumbent in the new position. Our planning had to allow for that kind of flexibility.

Finally, effective promotion is essential in creating a successful program. It was very apparent throughout the project that outreach and communication would need to be given top priority in the implementation of services. Many nontraditional students and the faculty who teach them were unaware of the library services which were already available to them. There is little purpose in creating new and expanded services if they are not publicized. Plans for the Schaffner project stressed outreach to students and faculty.
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Thirteen Key Ingredients in Off-Campus Library Services: A Canadian Perspective
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What are some of the key ingredients in an off-campus library service? Can these ingredients be used as standards of comparison? This paper will discuss how these questions were addressed by a group of distance education librarians in British Columbia.

Background

The literature on off-campus library services in Canada is relatively sparse. Three papers have been published in the last ten years: Wiseman (1976), Orton and Wiseman (1977), and Mount and Turple (1980). The papers by Wiseman and Orton and Wiseman discuss a survey shared by Queen's University and Trent University in 1975. While both papers focus on the issues of local library support and on-site collections, recommendations are made regarding professional support from the university library, bibliographic instruction, and a "hot line" telephone service. The article by Mount and Turple describes a model off-campus library service established at Laurentian University. In addition to supplying on-site collections, the library offers service to individual students, including telephone access, bibliographic assistance and provision of material by mail.

In British Columbia (B.C.), the four major post-secondary institutions, the University of British Columbia, the University of Victoria, Simon Fraser University and the Open Learning Institute, offer comprehensive library services to their off-campus students. The model of service present in British Columbia is, in many ways, similar to the model at Laurentian University (Mount and Turple, 1980). The librarians responsible for off-campus library services in B.C. meet periodically to discuss matters of mutual concern. At one of those meetings in 1983, I suggested that, since the Canadian literature on this area of library service is so limited, an effort should be made to discover what other university libraries across the country are doing for their students at a distance. To this end, my colleagues and I composed a letter (Appendix A) to inquire about
off-campus library services and sent it to the chief librarians at Canadian universities which have extension programs. In total forty-two letters were sent and thirty-one replies were received (a 74% response rate).

The question facing us at that point was what to do with the information received. No definite plan had been formulated ahead of time because we were unsure of the type of replies we would receive. As it turned out, some respondents gave detailed descriptions of their off-campus library services. Other libraries admitted they were not currently active in this area. A few institutions indicated there was a need for their libraries to become more involved in offering these services. Several respondents expressed interest in receiving information about the off-campus library services in British Columbia.

The replies to the letter of inquiry motivated my B.C. colleagues and me to undertake three other projects to promote awareness of off-campus library services in Canada. The first was to propose to the Canadian Library Association that a workshop on this topic be held at the annual conference in Calgary, Alberta, in June of 1985. That proposal was accepted. The second was to write a paper describing off-campus library services in British Columbia (Slade). The third project was to classify and compare the information received from the other Canadian libraries.

Classification of Services

At present, Canada does not have any licensing boards or accrediting bodies, nor any statutes, regulations, or standards for off-campus programs as described by Lessin (1982). Canada also lacks any guidelines for off-campus library service endorsed by a provincial or national library association. The ACRL "Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Service" (Assoc. for, 1982) are not formally recognized in Canada and only one of the respondents to the B.C. librarians' letter acknowledged the existence of these guidelines.

It became apparent that each institution in the country had independently developed its own response to the issue of library support for its off-campus and distance education students. In the replies from those universities which do offer some form of library support, we noticed a number of common elements of service. We decided to classify these "ingredients" of service as they emerged from the letters. Using our services as models and analyzing the information contained in the letters, my colleagues
and I established a list of thirteen categories to reflect the types of services offered (Appendix B).

We realized that the list of thirteen categories or the survey form as we called it, was not a sophisticated or scientific instrument to measure the quality of the different library services. It did not probe into areas such as university-approved policy statements, finances and facilities as contained in the unapproved Review Guide prepared by the ACRL Standards and Accreditation Committee (Hodowanec, 1983). In addition, it did not attempt to deal with four major variables which influence the nature of an off-campus library service: the number of courses or programs offered and their enrollments; the mode of course delivery (face-to-face instruction in specified locations versus instruction by distance education methods such as correspondence and educational television); the proximity of the students to the main library and to other major research collections; and the technology available to the main library for use at off-campus locations (e.g. on-line catalogs). However, these topics were not emphasized by the respondents in any consistent way.

The B.C. letter asked about services offered to off-campus students and the list of categories reflected what the different libraries chose to tell us about their operations. We felt that to devise and send out a more elaborate and probing questionnaire would alienate more respondents than it would produce useful results. This suspicion was confirmed when a completed survey form was sent to each respondent involved in off-campus services. Twenty libraries out of the thirty-one (65%) which replied to the initial letter reported that they are involved in one or more areas of service to their students at a distance. Completed survey forms were sent to these nineteen of the respondents asking them to confirm the affirmative and negative responses to each category and to provide more information if appropriate. Seventeen libraries (89%) returned their annotated survey forms.

Following is a discussion of each of the thirteen categories used to classify the information on Canadian off-campus library services. In addition to reporting on the affirmative response rate from Canadian libraries, the commentary attempts to indicate the significance of each category or "ingredient" as a component in an off-campus library service. In cases where an area has been well discussed or documented in the literature, the remarks on significance have been minimized.
1. Core Collections

A core collection refers to a collection of library material placed on-site for an off-campus course or program. The first category was used to identify those libraries which respond to requests from faculty or administration to send books, articles and other material to course sites.

The issues of core collections and arrangements with local libraries appear frequently in the literature on off-campus library services (e.g. Orton and Wiseman, 1977; Mount and Turple, 1980). The provision of core collections is possibly the most traditional way in which library support is offered to off-campus face-to-face courses. This, of course, ceases to be relevant when courses are delivered by distance education methods such as correspondence and educational television and students are scattered over a wide geographical area. Essentially, the core collection service is an extension of the on-campus reserve function. If a library is prepared to provide this service, it is demonstrating a basic level of responsibility for making reserve material accessible to off-campus as well as to on-campus classes.

We found that, among the responding libraries, most were willing to supply core collections on request for off-campus face-to-face courses, provided that the course was held far enough away from the campus to make commuting to the main library impractical. In some cases, special funding had to be found to purchase materials for a core collection, but in most cases the willingness of the library to cooperate in this area was confirmed. Sixteen (52%) of the respondents indicated they are presently active in providing this service. Some respondents provided more information in this area than others, but, on examination, we found that there were not enough consistent details to warrant subdividing the category into more specific topics such as contractual arrangements with other libraries and the existence of separate extension libraries within the main library.

2. Specific Requests

This category represents one of the cornerstones in an off-campus library service. Is the library willing to send specifically identified material to an individual off-campus student in response to a request received by mail, telephone or some form of electronic data transmission? An affirmative response implies that the library has assumed a degree of
responsibility for supporting off-campus education and for meeting the information needs of individual students. With the resources of the main library available by mail (or by some other means of delivery), instructors no longer have to limit readings and assignments to material which is available locally. In addition, off-campus students can have more flexibility in choosing resources for assignments with the option of pursuing a topic in greater depth than would normally be possible were they entirely dependent on core collections and local library holdings.

Seventeen (55%) of the libraries which responded to the letter of inquiry indicated that they do attempt to supply specific material to individual off-campus students.

3. Reference Queries

This category represents another cornerstone in an off-campus library service. Is the library willing to answer reference questions and conduct subject searches for off-campus students? Many off-campus students do not have access to appropriate bibliographies and indexes in their local libraries and core collections are limited in the amount of information they can provide for individual essay topics and assignments. By providing a means for off-campus faculty to set appropriate assignments and for off-campus students to obtain information to complete those assignments, the library is confirming its responsibility in supporting the concept of quality in off-campus academic programs as discussed by authors such as McCabe (1983).

Fifteen (48%) of the Canadian respondents acknowledged that they do provide some form of reference service on request for their students at a distance. Curiously, one library replied that it would answer reference questions from off-campus students, but would not conduct subject searches for them.

4. Special Telephone Line

The category for a special telephone line was based on the model of service present in British Columbia rather than on information extracted from the respondents' letters. The focal point of all four library services in B.C. is a special telephone line to the library for off-campus students to use to request material and information for their courses. The four telephone services in B.C. have the following features in common: students are advised through publicity to call collect; the lines operate
twenty-four hours a day; telephone answering machines are used to accept collect calls and record information and requests.

As emphasized by authors such as McCabe (1983), Rumery (1983) and Johnson (1984), the telephone is the off-campus student's link to the library and serves as a substitute for the student being able to walk into the building in person and select his/her own material. It is traditional for on-campus students to have free, convenient access to the resources of the academic library. A toll-free telephone line is a means to provide the off-campus student with an equitable form of library access. The availability of such a line implies that the institution has recognized the value of library access to off-campus education.

In our survey, my colleagues and I looked for other libraries which utilized a similar concept of phone service. Five libraries (16% of the respondents) indicated that they had toll-free telephone lines available for their off-campus students.

5. Advertisement of Services

This category is very significant for off-campus library services because it is a reflection of whether a service has become institutionalized. For a library to advertise its off-campus service implies that the service has gained acceptance from the administration. The implications extend further to the areas of funding, staff, and resources. By publicizing the availability of a service, the library is indicating that it is prepared to respond to a demand for that service within established parameters.

In the replies to the B.C. letter, several libraries reported that they did provide some services to their off-campus students on an ad hoc basis but, for various reasons, did not formally advertise or publicize these services. Twelve libraries (39% of the respondents) indicated that they did advertise their services.

6. Librarian

Another significant indicator of the institutionalization of an off-campus library service is whether at least one librarian has either full-time or part-time responsibility for the service as part of his/her job description. For a library to devote the time of a member of the professional staff to this service implies a high level of commitment to off-campus programs. Most
university libraries in Canada do not have a person designated as an extension librarian (or, with some similar title). In general, off-campus activities are fitted into the schedules of librarians whose primary responsibilities lie in other areas. Only six libraries (19%) responded that they had a librarian on staff with off-campus services as a primary component of his/her job description.

7. **Support Staff**

Many of the functions associated with an off-campus library service can be performed at a clerical or library assistant level. These functions include retrieving material from the library collections, charging out books, photocopying, typing labels and reply forms, and record keeping. Established off-campus services should have at least one person to perform these tasks as part of their job description. The person may be full-time, part-time, or seasonal. Eleven Canadian libraries (35%) replied that they had such a position on staff. It was of interest to note that two of those ten libraries had a member of the support staff coordinating the off-campus service in place of a librarian.

8. **Bibliographic Instruction**

The relevance of bibliographic instruction in an off-campus library service has been adequately discussed by other authors (e.g. Brown, 1983; Peyton, 1983). In this context, instruction can take place in several forms, including personal visits by librarians to course sites, audio-visual presentations, teleconferencing, computer-assisted instruction, and written instruction. Materials include on-site reference collections, microfiche and on-line catalogs, facilities for on-line literature searches, the resources of local libraries, and pre-prepared instructional packages.

Eight libraries in Canada (26%) replied that they are currently involved in some form of bibliographic instruction for off-campus courses. The most common form mentioned by the respondents was personal visits to course sites.

9. **On-line Bibliographic Services**

The use of computerized literature searching in off-campus library services has been well-documented in the literature (Weinstein and Strasser, 1983; Cookingham, 1983; Rumery, 1983;
Ream and Weston, 1983). There are several advantages to using on-line searching in this context. One major benefit is that it saves time for the library staff, reducing the need to conduct manual literature searches for off-campus students. Another major advantage is that it usually gives the student more involvement in defining and limiting a topic and in selecting his/her own references. Depending on the organization of the service, on-line searching can also save time for the student and give faculty more flexibility in setting assignments.

In Canada, at present, most computerized searching for off-campus students is done by librarians at the campus library. The student writes or phones the library to make a request, the search is conducted at the librarian's convenience, and the results are mailed to the student. Usually there is a charge for this service. In some cases, a librarian will initiate an on-line search on behalf of a student as an alternative to conducting a manual literature search for this user. In these instances, the student is usually not charged for the search. Twelve respondents in Canada (39%) indicated that their library would conduct, on request, a computerized literature search for an off-campus student.

10. Interlibrary Loans

This category was used to establish which libraries would initiate interlibrary loan requests on behalf of their off-campus students. As in category 4 (special telephone line), this section was modeled on the British Columbia services. In B.C., the campus library assumes primary responsibility for providing material to its off-campus users. Students are not expected to request interlibrary loans through a local library. Instead, the students are encouraged to make their requests through the telephone service to the campus library which in turn will initiate, if appropriate, an interlibrary loan request on behalf of the student. The librarians initially screen these requests to determine if another item could be substituted and, if not, if there is sufficient time to obtain the material from another library.

Since interlibrary loans are a traditional on-campus service, we feel that some means should be available to off-campus students to obtain specific items not held by the home library. This is based on the assumption that a comprehensive off-campus service assumes full responsibility for meeting the library needs of its users and attempts to provide services comparable to those available on-campus. Nine Canadian libraries (29%) replied that
they do initiate interlibrary loan requests for their off-campus users.

11. Charges for Service

The objective of this category was to learn how many libraries provide off-campus library services free-of-charge to the user and, inversely, how many hold the user responsible for some of the costs of service. There are two significant rationales for an institution to offer off-campus library services at no charge. First, the services are essentially a form of compensation to the student for being unable to use the resources of the main library in person. If the objective of an off-campus library service is to enhance the quality of academic programs (McCabe, 1983), a system of charges would be to the detriment of this concept of quality since it would likely discourage library use amongst students who are already at a disadvantage in this regard. A second rationale for free services is to minimize the complications and staff time in record-keeping and fee-collecting.

Among the respondents, thirteen libraries (42%) indicated that, with the exception of computerized literature search fees, they provide their off-campus service at no cost to the student. Seven libraries (23%) reported that their students are responsible for the cost of photocopying or postage or both. None of the libraries reported charging any basic service fees nor any fees for loans or manual literature searches.

12. Needs Assessments

The category for needs assessments attempts to discover which libraries take an active role in planning services geared to the needs of the institution's off-campus courses and programs. This implies that library staff meet with the relevant campus educators and administrators to determine how the library can assist in developing and providing resources for a course and how the students can effectively obtain information for their assignments and projects. In some cases, the library may need to promote its off-campus services in order to achieve the desired result and to enhance the quality of the course or program in question. A library's active involvement in this area tends to reflect a high level of institutional commitment to off-campus service.

Eleven libraries (35%) which responded to the B.C. letter and returned the completed survey form acknowledged that they
undertake formal or informal needs assessments for off-campus courses and programs and use this information to plan library services.

13. Evaluation

The premise of this category is that the library staff periodically reviews the services and resources available to off-campus students and faculty and evaluate their effectiveness. As in the previous category (needs assessment), a library's involvement in this area tends to indicate a high level of institutional commitment to off-campus service. Several examples and discussions of evaluation in off-campus programs can be found in the literature (e.g. Kim and Rogers, 1983; Hodowanec, 1983; Johnson, 1984).

After this category was established, I realized that it was inappropriate to assume that the library staff had to conduct the evaluations. At the University of Victoria and at two other institutions which responded to the letter of inquiry, off-campus library services are evaluated as part of larger evaluation projects conducted by the campus agencies responsible for the courses or programs. In these cases, the library has input into the content of the library section of the questionnaire or project. This approach to evaluation is significant because it indicates cooperation between the library and other campus departments. By including adequate library representation in an off-campus evaluation project, the evaluator is acknowledging the importance of the library's role in the academic programs which are under review.

Including the two libraries mentioned above, thirteen Canadian libraries (42% of the respondents) reported that they are involved to some extent in the evaluation of their off-campus services.

Comparison of Services

In order to display and compare the information in the thirteen categories, a software package called Multiplan™ was used on a personal computer. Originally, all respondents to the B.C. letter were listed on the spread-sheet, including those libraries which are not involved in providing any off-campus services. For the purpose of this paper, two revised versions of the spread-sheet were produced. The first version (Appendix C) lists only those libraries which have an affirmative answer for at least
one of the thirteen categories. For the purposes of comparison, the four B.C. institutions were added to the spread-sheet. With the inclusion of the B.C. services, the totals on the spread-sheet will be slightly higher than those cited under the different categories in the previous section of this paper.

In Appendix C, a "1" is assigned for each "yes" answer and a "0" is assigned for each "no." This provides a maximum total of 13 for each library. These totals are displayed in the far right column of the spread-sheet. At a glance, it is possible to see by these totals which libraries are most involved in off-campus services. Since a few institutions offer courses entirely by distance education delivery methods (e.g. the Open Learning Institute, Athabasca University), a "0" under the core collection category does not imply that these institutions are any less active than universities which have a "1" in this category. Therefore the totals in the right-hand column should be viewed within a range (e.g. 12-13) rather than assuming that an institution with a 13 is more active than an institution with a 12. At the bottom of the spread-sheet are the totals by category, which enables the reader to see how many institutions are involved in any of the thirteen categories.

Since Appendix C is a very basic comparison of categories, another spread-sheet (Appendix D) was produced with values attached to affirmative responses in the various categories. The rationale behind this approach was that the categories reflect different levels of library involvement in off-campus services and higher values can serve as a way to give credit to libraries which go beyond offering the basic services (categories 1-3).

In Appendix D, the following values were assigned to the affirmative responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The maximum total for any institution on this spread-sheet would be 25 (right-hand column). Once again, due to variations in the number and types of courses offered, technology available, geographic area involved, and other local conditions, it would not be fair to regard each rating as hierarchically better than another. As with the spread-sheet in Appendix C, the right-hand totals should be regarded within ranges as indications of a library's involvement in off-campus services (e.g. 25-22: high
level of involvement; 21-15: very active; 14-6: active; 5-0: low level of involvement.

Categories 1-3 were considered to represent basic services and had a high affirmative response rate from Canadian libraries. Categories 4-11 could have been subdivided depending on one's view of the importance of a particular category, but for the sake of simplicity, were grouped together as a second level of support indicative of a considerable degree of institutional commitment to off-campus library services. As a note of clarification, category 11 (charges for service) excludes charges for computerized literature searches since very few libraries are willing to subsidize this service to either their on-campus or off-campus students. The highest values were reserved for categories 12 and 13 (needs assessment and evaluation) since these areas are considered to be reflective of an active approach to off-campus library services. In this context, "active" implies the opposite of "reactive" and indicates the library takes initiative in planning and providing services and resources which can contribute to the quality of an off-campus academic program.

Appendix E presents a comparison of the institutional totals from the previous two appendices arranged in hierarchical order. This summary enables the reader to see the two sets of totals side by side as an indication of how the ratings are affected by the assignment of different values to different categories. It is interesting to note that the ranked order of the institutions does not change dramatically with the second set of values. These values tend to "fine-tune" the rating scheme more than they significantly alter any position on the spread-sheet.

The values assigned to the categories in Appendix D and summarized in Appendix E are arbitrary and are primarily meant to serve as an example of one approach to comparing off-campus library services. For the B.C. librarians, this approach provides a rough picture of the state of these services in Canada. We hope that other librarians will be motivated to devise their own categories to describe and compare key ingredients in this type of service and to develop an appropriate rating scheme which will reflect an institution's level of involvement in and commitment to off-campus library services.
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Appendix A

B.C. Letter of Inquiry

Dear

We represent an informal group of distance education librarians in British Columbia who are interested in learning what our counterparts are doing in other Canadian universities. At our respective institutions we offer comprehensive library services for our students who take credit courses or do independent studies off-campus. These services include the availability of toll-free telephone lines to the university libraries, the provision of monographs and photocopied periodical articles by mail to individual students, and bibliographic assistance for reference questions. Two members of our group also supply core collections to the sites where extension courses are taught.

We are interested in knowing which other university libraries offer services similar to ours. If there is an individual in your library who acts as an extension librarian, we would appreciate this person contacting us and sending a description of the services offered to your off-campus students. In return, we will be pleased to provide information about the off-campus library services offered by the following four institutions in British Columbia: Simon Fraser University, the University of British Columbia, the Open Learning Institute and the University of Victoria.

Our purpose for initiating this contact is to collect and share information about off-campus library services on a national basis. Any assistance you can offer in putting us in touch with people operating in this area would be appreciated.

For mailing purposes, please address all correspondence to Sandy Slade at the University of Victoria Library. Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Alexander (Sandy) Slade
Extension Librarian
University of Victoria

Barbara Webb
Student Services Librarian
Open Learning Institute
Appendix B

CANADIAN OFF-CAMPUS LIBRARY SERVICES SURVEY

INSTITUTION: ________________________________________________________________

1. CORE COLLECTIONS:
   A collection of books and articles is sent on request to the site of an off-campus course.
   ____________________________________________________________

2. SPECIFIC REQUESTS:
   The library staff sends specific material to off-campus students in response to requests received by mail or telephone.
   ____________________________________________________________

3. REFERENCE QUERIES:
   The library staff answers reference questions and conducts subject searches for off-campus students in response to requests received by mail or telephone.
   ____________________________________________________________

4. SPECIAL TELEPHONE LINE:
   The library has a special "toll-free" telephone line for off-campus students to request library material. (Note: "toll-free" can be interpreted to mean that the library accepts collect calls.)
   ____________________________________________________________
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5. ADVERTISEMENT OF SERVICES:

Library services for off-campus students are publicized in brochures, handbooks, and other literature which is available to all off-campus faculty and students.

6. LIBRARIAN:

At least one librarian has either full-time or part-time responsibilities for off-campus library services as part of the job description.

7. SUPPORT STAFF:

At least one member of the support staff has either full-time or part-time responsibilities for off-campus library services as part of the job description.

8. BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION:

A librarian provides direct bibliographic instruction to off-campus students by visits to course sites, through teleconferencing, or by use of audio-visual media such as video-tape.
9. ON-LINE BIBLIOGRAPHIC SERVICES:
   On-line literature searches are conducted for ___________
   off-campus students on request.

10. INTERLIBRARY LOANS:
    I.L.L. requests for material not available
    from the "home" library are initiated by
    library staff on behalf of off-campus students.

11. CHARGES FOR SERVICE:
    All library services for off-campus students
    are provided free-of-charge.

12. NEEDS ASSESSMENTS:
    The library staff undertakes formal or informal
    needs assessments for off-campus courses and
    programs and uses this information to plan
    library services.

13. EVALUATION:
    The library staff periodically reviews the
    services and resources available to off-campus
    students and evaluates their effectiveness.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
# Appendix C

## Report of Survey Results by Library: Single Value Description of Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acadia Univ.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athabasca Univ.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Univ.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock Univ.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakehead Univ.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurentian Univ.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Univ.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount St. Vincent U.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Learning Inst.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen's Univ.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Fraser U.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trent Univ.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Alberta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Brit. Columbia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Calgary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Lethbridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Manitoba</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Ottawa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of P.E.I.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Saskatchewan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Victoria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Western Ont.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Windsor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Univ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>184</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix D

### Report of Survey Results by Library: Multiple Value Description of Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Name</th>
<th>Core Col</th>
<th>Sp.Req</th>
<th>Ref.Q</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Advert</th>
<th>Libr'n</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Bib.Inst</th>
<th>Online</th>
<th>I.L.</th>
<th>Charge</th>
<th>Assess</th>
<th>Eval</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acadia Univ.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athabasca Univ.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Univ.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock Univ.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakehead Univ.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurentian Univ.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Univ.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount St. Vincent U.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Learning Inst.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen's Univ.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Fraser U.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trent Univ.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Alberta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Brit. Columbia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Calgary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Lethbridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Manitoba</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Ottawa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of P.E.I.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Saskatchewan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Victoria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Western Ont.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Windsor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Univ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix E

#### Report of Survey Results By Library

Hierarchical Comparison of Appendices C & D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIBRARY NAME</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Append. C</td>
<td>Append. D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon University</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Victoria</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trent University</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Fraser University</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakehead University</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Ottawa</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Learning Institute</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock University</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount St. Vincent University</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurentian University</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Calgary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athabasca University</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alberta</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Manitoba</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Lethbridge</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Windsor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acadia University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Saskatchewan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Western Ontario</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen's University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distant Library Collection Quality:
Comparing with Local Communities

John W. Weatherford
Central Michigan University

In some states, agencies designated to coordinate higher education have set up rules or guidelines setting minimum requirements for library service. Although these requirements are not numerous in the threescore jurisdictions of this nation, they are important both because they address a problem previously ignored and because they furnish a plausible model for other jurisdictions to follow. After decades of total discount, librarians who have worked near off-campus, extension, or external degree programs probably welcome these attempts to relate external higher education to the printed word. Without such connection our innovative enterprises will never gain the legitimacy to which they aspire. External degree programs are a rapidly evolving activity, however, and some of us are outgrowing these guidelines where they do not reflect the present realities of information delivery.

To me it seems that the words "library" and "accessible" frequently found in these rules, require definition and perspective now more than ever. We at Central Michigan University believe that we are giving library service to our students in several states. What is this library service? It is guidance, instruction, and the provision of appropriate literature in a timely way to those engaged in external degree studies. In our case, the external studies are largely in areas of management; the engagement of the students is not only reading, but research papers; timeliness is less than one week's delivery; and appropriate literature is the best and latest suitable anywhere for such papers. To determine whether officially "accessible libraries" do what we do, and what the rule-makers probably vaguely hoped, I have concentrated on two communities representative of those in which we have been active. To compare holdings I sought some simple, minimal, objective, and reputable standard by which to gauge holdings. For monographs I selected the latest Harvard Core Collection in business. Plainly a large survey would be impractical for our present purpose, and so I limited the investigation to two regions in which we have operated: Cleveland and Dayton, Ohio. These are rather typical of our regions of operation. A few are richer in library resources (Washington, DC, for instance), but these riches are so hemmed in by restrictions on use that assessing them would be a more
elaborate project than this. Moreover, the great majority of the fifty-six areas that CMU serves are much less urban than these two and have no libraries that call for this kind of scrutiny. To simplify the searching in this study, I eliminated libraries with budgets and collections so small that they were prima facie not in the running. The sample begins at 1975 so as to reflect holdings rather than OCLC retroconversions.

Table 1 shows the libraries studied, and the portion of the Harvard guide samples in "management" and organizational behavior" that they were found to hold in the OCLC database. Table 2 takes a geographical view of library holdings. Suppose that the Cleveland or Dayton students of these subjects can draw fully on the holdings of any of these libraries in the community: the best case. What is the comparative adequacy of the community holdings as a whole? Matrices represent for Dayton and Cleveland the proportions of the bibliographical samples held by each and not by CMU, by CMU and not by them, and so on. The tables make it plain that within its modest sphere of enterprise the book collection of CMU is not less adequate than those of the combined major libraries of either community, even supposing perfect coordination and freedom of movement among them.

Efforts to require minimal library service for external degree programs and off-campus education generally are to be welcomed as substantial quality control. If CMU were to venture into an area of knowledge for which it has inadequate library collections, it is the library program that would expose and moderate these plans. Library requirements for such programs will be a positive force in controlling quality if they are applied objectively; otherwise they are meaningless. What I have attempted to show is what might be accomplished by a systematic comparison of holdings for specific purposes. I hope to continue from this small start and will welcome any criticism or suggestions offered.
Table 1

**Individual Holdings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Harvard Core Collection Sample</th>
<th>Organization Behavior</th>
<th>Imprints 1975 or Later</th>
<th>N=64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Western Reserve University</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Public Library</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland State University</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga County Library</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton Montgomery County Library</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Dayton</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State University</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Harvard Core Collection Sample</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Imprints 1975 or Later</th>
<th>N=55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Western Reserve University</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Public Library</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland State University</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga County Library</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton Montgomery County Library</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Dayton</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State University</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 2

**Community Holdings**

Library Holdings of a Sample of Books in the Harvard Core Collection List, 1984-1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Heading</th>
<th>Imprints 1975 and Later:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CMU has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton has</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton does not have</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland has</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland does not have</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Behavior Heading</th>
<th>Imprints 1975 and Later:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CMU has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton has</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton does not have</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland has</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland does not have</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reference

University of Alaska's Outreach Program Develops Approach to Delivery of Off-Campus Library Services in Rural Alaska

Margaret K. Wood

University of Alaska-Rural Education

Rural Education is the University of Alaska's statewide academic out-reach unit. It is composed of fourteen rural education centers (see Appendix A) and eight statewide programs. Each center is responsible for four to thirty-two villages in its area, a total of ninety-four rural communities and roughly half of the area of Alaska. In most cases, the centers are located in larger communities, many with military installations nearby (See Table 1). The statewide programs include the A.A. Degree Program, Vocational/Technical Education Program, Correspondence Study Program, the Learning Resources/Library Services Program, the Health Aide Education Program, the Alaska Native Health Careers Program, the Alaska Native Language Center, and the Alaska Materials Development Center. The eight statewide programs serve the fourteen centers and their constituencies as well as students working from a distance in other locations.

Rural Education is informally described as serving the areas where no four-year or two-year university units serve. In addition, through an agreement with the chancellors of the four-year and two-year institutions, Rural Education provides upper division and graduate courses in the community college areas and correspondence study courses in any community in the state.

During a year's time, Rural Education will enroll nearly five thousand students in postsecondary courses. The courses may be in any of the numerous discipline areas offered throughout the university system.

The Need for Off-campus Library Services

Since 1983, Rural Education has bent its efforts to establish a recurring two-year cycle of core courses leading to a general Associate of Arts degree. Once established, the access to curricula meant that the rural residents of Alaska could earn an A.A. degree without incurring the expenses of leaving their homes, families and jobs. The cycle began in the fall of 1983 and was well received.
It soon became apparent that the growth of academic programs in rural Alaska was out-pacing the support services, especially library services. The depth of study required for a degree required college level library and learning resource support, not only for the students but also for the instructors. Questionnaires were administered to instructors and to students during an institutional self-study completed by Rural Education in January, 1983. As reported by the Rural Education Status Report the results of that study included such student comments as: "...library books are the toughest thing in rural areas;" ...that receiving library services "was difficult because of the mail;" and that they "didn't know services were available" (1983:21). The study concluded that "more efforts are needed to publicize the services that are available; and, although the mail system will remain subject to delays, increased use of the university computer network will shorten turn-around time on interlibrary loan requests" (University of, 1983).

Rural Education's experience in finding locally available library resources had been a negative one. During the fall of 1983, inventories conducted in the Rural Education "catchment" area indicated that the small local community libraries' and school libraries' collections were not suitable for university reading and research. Even the basic general reference collections were not satisfactory.

The potential was excellent for rural postsecondary library needs to be met through the Alaska Library Network, an integrated catalog of the major holdings in the state. Lesh and Morse (1984:ii) note, "All libraries in Alaska work together to serve all Alaskans. All libraries are interdependent on each other as our users are interdependent on all libraries for the critical piece of information." However, use of the Alaska Library Network (ALN) Interlibrary Loan proved to be a difficult process. When instructors or students attempted to use it, they were met with long delays before the materials were delivered. They placed their order through the Learning Resources/Library Services Program by mail (one week from center to Learning Resources) or by telephone. When Learning Resources received it, the request was filled. If the request was for a book, it could take from one to two weeks in the mail before being received by the center. Thus a total of three to four weeks could elapse between the original request and receipt of materials. This lapse in time frustrated the instructor and students. Consequently, the ILL was used only occasionally.

Films ordered by the coordinators were usually ordered by mail from one of four film libraries: University of
Alaska-Fairbanks' Media Services, Anchorage Community Colleges Media Services, or the Alaska State Film and Video Libraries in Anchorage and Guano. Once the film was requested, two weeks lapsed before the films were booked. Because of extreme remoteness, acknowledgment by the film libraries of the booking by mail added another two weeks to the total lapsed time before the rural coordinators learned of the outcome of their requests. If film was unavailable, the same length of time would lapse before that information was received in the field. The State Film/Video Libraries had a current catalog available on microfiche. The centers had portable microfiche readers, but, because they were difficult to assemble, they were seldom used. The University of Alaska-Fairbanks was converting their film library to microfiche. That microfiche catalog became available in September 1984. The Anchorage Community College film catalog had not been available for several years, but was redistributed in the Spring of 1984. (It is now in the process of being converted to microfiche.) Since the rural education centers were not using their portable readers, few films were ordered. Since the film libraries were there to be used, center coordinators and staff naturally expected the libraries would fill their film needs. In practice, that was not the case.

In sum, off-campus library services in rural Alaska were severely diminished by lack of materials at the rural sites in the face of rapidly expanding academic programs and extended delays in interlibrary loan procedures and film library requests.

Formation of Library Acquisition & Maintenance Committee

In the fall of 1983, responding to the above needs and others, the Dean of Rural Education, the unit's executive officer, appointed a standing committee for the Learning Resources/Library Services Program. The committee was to act in an advisory capacity to the Director of Learning Resources/Library Services (myself), who was also the chairperson for the committee. The committee was called the Library Acquisition and Maintenance Committee. It was made up of five coordinators from rural education centers, and the liaison for the Health Aide Education Program. Occasionally other program and center coordinators attended and contributed to the meetings.

The Dean charged the committee with developing a plan that would establish library services in the remote areas. These services (1) would incorporate an operations and maintenance program for the library/learning resource services and (2) would insure continuance of library services through training programs for local university facilitators acting as library assistants.
Through discussions held in group meetings, often via audioconferences, the committee developed a strategy for access to distant library services. Nine objectives were identified for the Library Services Program to accomplish within the next two years. Prioritization of those objectives follows: (1) training covering the management and operation of small libraries for local library/community facilitators employed by Rural Education; (2) exploration and selection of long-distance delivery systems and techniques; (3) inventory of existing library resources, especially general references; (4) acquisition of needed general references; (5) inventory of local library holdings to support a two-year cycle of core courses leading to an A.A. degree; (6) acquisition of library holdings for those rural sites where core course support is unavailable; (7) provision of materials received via distance by interlibrary loan; (8) provision of materials acquired following computerized literature searches; (9) investigation of transmittal systems for materials acquired through interlibrary loan (ILL) and through computerized databases.

In order for the plan to be implemented in every one of the ninety-four rural communities served by Rural Education, phase-in of services was planned. This would ease the strain on the two-person office of Library Services/Learning Resources, and would also allow for inclusion in the eighteen-month budget planning cycle that is in effect for the University of Alaska. However, as "seed" money, a capital account for library acquisitions was used.

We are now nearing the end of our first year implementing this plan and looking forward to the next year. In the remainder of this paper, I present past and future developments with respect to each of the nine objectives named above.

Objective 1 - Training Programs

Development of training programs

The Library Acquisition and Maintenance Committee identified the need for two types of training programs relating to the emerging rural library services. One program needed to be developed for those persons acting as local library aides and yet another program was needed for students using the local rural libraries.

The training for the local person, who would ultimately be in charge of the community's postsecondary library, was recognized as being crucial to the success of the developing library services. Information services for rural students would not be
optimal unless the local person was trained to operate and maintain the library in the rural community.

In the fall of 1984, the northern state library coordinator approached Rural Education with the idea of revising and offering the library training courses statewide for the many library aides employed in community libraries. The courses were considered to be especially important for the aides in the rural areas. This request coincided with Rural Education's decision to provide training for the rural library aides who work with postsecondary collections. Rural Education agreed to assist with the revision and further development of the course materials by the three state library coordinators. The first course will be offered to rural library aides and Rural Education facilitators via audioconferencing in the fall semester 1985.

Training of rural education facilitators

The position of the Rural Education Facilitator is a unique one for the University of Alaska.

The facilitator is responsible to the Rural Education Center Coordinator and may facilitate one or more courses by holding class meetings, setting up audioconference classrooms, assisting the instructors in preparing materials, or reviewing instructions, assignments, and holding discussions with the students much as a teaching assistant might do. In some communities the facilitator may operate the local learning center. In addition to those responsibilities, the local facilitator is in charge of the Rural Education collection.

Many villages have no local library and no accessible or appropriate school library. In those villages, the university collection will be kept in the Rural Education facility if there is one. For that reason it is necessary that the local facilitators be able to maintain the collection for circulation and to be able to assist local students and faculty with references, ILL requests and computerized literature searches. Therefore, the need to provide training for rural education community facilitators was of paramount importance and ranked as the first priority for the first phase of the Library Services development plan.

Training of library aides

In some of the communities served by Rural Education, a local library or a school library exists. In those communities, Rural Education was concerned with being able to offer training
for the local library aides who would be serving the Rural Education postsecondary student—a group with far different needs than those of the local resident reading for pleasure.

Local library committees throughout the state support the training of the local library aide. Tenant and Kolb (1984) found that the libraries are much better managed and received by the community when they have a trained paraprofessional operating the library. Also, library aides are found to have more pride in their jobs after they have completed the training.

Schools have also shown an interest in the staff development aspects of this course for their library assistants and for those teachers who are assigned to the library duty.

Training of rural students

The second type of training program was developed especially for Rural Education students desiring to improve their knowledge of the use of a library for postsecondary study. That training program consists of a course designated as "LS 101-Library Skills." A large resource kit accompanies the course and is left in the center's or village's library for the students' continuing reference. Library Skills 101 is being considered as a possible added communication requirement for Rural Education students. Rural Education facilitators, who are in charge of small collections, will also be encouraged to take this course as well as the technical management series. It is available on an individual basis throughout the year via correspondence study, via independent study, or for group classes at any of the rural education centers.

Objective 2 - Long Distance Delivery Systems

Access/cost factors

Of the fourteen rural education centers, three are connected to the major cities of Anchorage and Fairbanks by road. Airplanes are the common carriers for delivery of materials and services. Air service increases the cost of the materials' transmittal and affects the amount of time necessary to make successful deliveries in the bush communities. With these cost factors in mind, the term "access" takes on additional importance when speaking of the accessibility to library and learning resources. A variety of long distance delivery systems were examined which were available for the delivery of materials to enhance postsecondary education in rural Alaska: these systems included the telephone, computer, mail and small package delivery service by airlines.
Telephone

The most frequently used system is the telephone. More than eight telephone companies provide the service to the fourteen centers and their surrounding villages. It is difficult to know who is responsible for the telephone service of a given village. The quality of service is variable. It is not unusual for a village to be inaccessible due to a malfunction of the telephone system. It may take days to repair telephone line problems. In spite of this, the telephone remains the major link to the rest of the world. Courses conveyed by telephone lines are increasingly popular. The students and instructors of such courses offered by Rural Education have learned to remain flexible when the annoying occurrence of "dropping off" the audioconference line happens. Their resilience in the face of such inconvenience is demonstrated when, for example, they dial back in to announce to the rest of the statewide class that they had been disconnected for the last ten minutes. Nevertheless, telephones are reliable enough to order books, films and other learning materials. Requests for literature searches are made by telephone. Of course, all such communications from the village facilitators, Rural Education coordinators, instructors and students are toll calls. Budgetary implications have shaped the profile of use. Items that cannot wait for the one to two week mail time, or items of an involved nature or that require immediate information exchange, are usually handled by telephone.

Computer

Budgetary considerations have also shaped the use of computers for information sharing and other communications for purposes of administration, instructional support or instruction. Each of the centers has been provided with at least one Apple IIe computer for communication purposes. For those requiring distant contact, the computer connection via a telephone modem is once again a toll call. Conservative coordinators have resisted using the computer for communication, although it is debatable whether a toll telephone call provides more information than a toll computer mail message. Perhaps the staff members feel that more informal information is gained via a telephone call rather than the more rigidly structured computer message. However, when a center requests books, films, or literature search information, the cost of the computer message is frequently a source of concern even though the time saved by using the computers rather than the mail is roughly equal to one week. (Average cost for bush telephone toll service is thirty-two dollars per hour or fifty-three cents per minute.) It is expected that, with increasing encouragement
by the central administration, the use of computers will become more frequent and the cost of toll charges off-set by the expedient delivery of information.

Rural Education is researching the use of 1200-baud modems. Currently 300-baud modems are used to transmit computer messages from the rural education centers to the central office in Anchorage and to each other. This slow baud rate quadruples the cost of toll charges for the message transmittal. If 1200-baud modems are exchanged for the 300-band modems, this quicker and therefore less expensive computer communication may encourage the use of the computer. The estimated cost for changing the sixteen computers to the 1200-baud modems will be $1,200 each, or $19,200, a cost at least partially offset by the savings in telephone tolls.

Another adaptation under consideration is the installation of a responding unit in the center's computer, which will give an auditory signal when computer operators dial, and when they enter the university mainframe computer. At this time, the operators do not know if they are on line or not. They may complete the dialing process only to discover they are not connected with the mainframe. Such actions taken to improve the computer may make using the computers for telecommunications more palatable to the field coordinators.

Mail

The mail system, as mentioned earlier, is the most time consuming method of transmitting information. It is relatively inexpensive, and the Learning Resources program makes frequent use of the "library rate" offered by the post office. Interestingly, the materials sent to the villages from Anchorage by "library rate" reach the villages as early as the materials sent first class. Adak mail takes at least one week to reach that center from Anchorage. It can take longer. Mail going by small airline contractors to the bush communities may take nine to fourteen days. It is frequently lost. To send important mail or expensive materials, many use registered or insured mail with return receipt requested. This special handling has proven to be worth the additional cost.

Express mail is not used for mail going to the rural sites. Its twenty-four-hour-service guarantee is impossible for the bush. In many locations, the scheduled mail plane does not visit a community more than once or twice a week.

Small package delivery service
Small package delivery service of the major airlines and some bush commuters is used frequently for the rapid transmittal of small packages to bush communities. It is sent and received the same day at the airline terminals of the larger communities. There the airline personnel or a university contact may escort the materials to a bush airline and the materials may arrive on the same day in some of the larger villages with daily air service.

Objective 3 - Inventory of Local Library Holdings

Selection of libraries for inventory

Since it is presently impossible to build ninety-four libraries, one in each of the villages for which Rural Education is responsible, it was necessary to establish the following criteria for selecting which libraries would receive special attention this first year: (1) distance of surrounding villages from the area's center and the number of airlines serving the communities, (2) reliability of telephone services, (3) number of established libraries, (4) interest and willingness of the rural education center coordinators to carry out the related library services objectives in their villages. Those communities with few aircarriers or poor schedules in the remote villages, difficult mail schedules, few library holdings, or no existing library were considered the most in need. The rural education centers selected for inventory and development were Galena, McGrath, Nenana, and Fort Yukon. These Centers have a combined total of thirty-three communities. Of those thirty-three communities, the following were selected for assistance: Galena, Kaltag, Ruby, Nulato, Tanana, Allakaket, Bettles, Huslia, Hughes and Koyukuk in the Galena area; Anvik, Grayling, Holy Cross, Lime Village, McGrath, Nikolai, Shageluk, Tokotna and Telida in the McGrath area; Nenana, Cantwell, Clear AFB, and Healy in the Nenana area, and those villages which time and funds would allow in the Fort Yukon area. It was expected that the libraries in the villages in the latter center's area would not be completely developed by the end of this fiscal year, and that some of the communities would have their libraries developed during fiscal year 1985-86. What was of critical importance was the support of the coordinators in the selected centers and their interest in providing better access to the State's Library resources to improve their students' education.

Inventory list and results

The list provided (see Appendix B) by the northern region's library coordinator provided a guide and the criteria by which
local libraries were measured. The starred items on this list were considered most crucial. On the average, the libraries inventoried held only about half of these starred items.

Objective 4 - Acquisition of General Reference

If the libraries did not have the needed resources, the items were purchased by Rural Education. This applied to local community and/or school libraries and to rural education center libraries. Once the purchases were catalogued on the Library of Congress system, carded, and made ready for circulation, they were distributed to the libraries.

The collections established by January 1985 were in the villages of Tanana, Kaltag, Ruby, Galena, Allakaket, Bettles, Cantwell, Healy, Nenana, Anderson and Clear. The budget required to provide those general references for those villages has amounted to $367.44 per library.

In villages where small libraries are available to the students and faculty, arrangements have been made to combine the Rural Education holdings with that of the local library. The only problem to date is that Rural Education, as the rest of the University of Alaska, has catalogued its holdings using the Library of Congress system and the schools and local libraries use the Dewey Decimal system. Separate card catalogues and separate shelves solved this problem in the small libraries that have been willing to give space to the installation of the Rural Education holdings. The material, unless it is on reserve for a class, is available for community school use. In exchange, Rural Education has offered the school libraries assistance with subject searches for their faculty requests.

Objective 5 - Inventory of Support Materials for A.A. Degree Core Courses

The Rural Education core faculty in charge of approving course offerings submitted to the Learning Resources Director a listing of library holdings felt to be central to the study of the major areas of "Humanities," "Communications," "Social Science," "Natural Science/Mathematics," and "Applied Studies." These identified items are books, audio/video media, and periodicals relating to the A.A. Degree core courses. It is expected that those learning resources will add to and enhance the courses, providing to the rural study program the kind of depth usually experienced only on a campus with a large postsecondary library. The additional items and most current journal issues may be obtained through the Interlibrary Loan services of Rural
Education/Alaska Library Network and the Washington Library Network

Objective 6 - Acquisition of Support Materials for A.A. Degree Core Courses

These materials have not been purchased at the time of this writing. They are anticipated for purchase by late spring 1985, and will be available in the above communities for fall semester 1985. The A.A. Core Course collection is expected to cost approximately three to five hundred dollars per site.

Objective 7 - Interlibrary Loan

This is an example of needed off-campus services now provided in cooperation with other agencies and university units. The ILL for the State of Alaska is supported by all of the major libraries in the state, including the university libraries. However, the traffic is heavy, and the few librarians responsible for filling the requests are fortunate if they are in a position to respond within the week. When that week delay is compounded with the time taken to mail in a request, or to mail back the requested item, as much as a month could go by before the student or faculty member might receive a reply. In the past, this has resulted in the loss of interest in using the ILL system by Rural Education staff.

Rural Education's expectation of the level of services to be provided for students and faculty through the ILL and the Alaska Library Network has thus been unrealized. Since many of the centers did not have local libraries for their students' resources, they readily approached the ILL as a first-line library resource. The ILL was and is used primarily by people who have many local resources available and who are therefore less demanding of it; however, the Rural Education staff, faculty and students, for whom ILL is a first-line resource, have found it unresponsive.

Following consultation with the state library coordinator for south central Alaska and productive meetings with the two major libraries in the state, the University of Alaska-Fairbanks' E.E. Rasmussen Library and the University of Alaska-Anchorage's Consortium Library, an informal agreement was made for the use of the ILL by Rural Education. The need for quicker turn-around time was addressed. The state library coordinator for the south central region suggested that Rural Education short-cut the current request procedure by training a clerical staff member to directly order materials via computer to the library involved,
rather than going through a university ILL desk in Anchorage or Fairbanks. This would allow Rural Education to use ILL as a primary library resource for its clientele.

Staff training of the Rural Education personnel involved with ILL was provided through the University of Alaska--Anchorage Consortium Library. They have offered computer time on their dedicated computer line to the Washington Library Network during off-hours. This particular library has also provided much in the way of assisting staff members with their first experimental ventures into reference searches for citations requested by faculty.

One factor that has increased the use of ILL is the acquisition of standard microfiche readers. In 1982, Rural Education had purchased portable microfiche readers for its centers. However, the fiche readers were difficult to assemble and were generally unused. In order to make use of the Alaska Library Network microfiche catalog, Rural Education reinvested in fiche readers, this time of the standard model suggested by the northern regional library coordinator.

The rural education centers and the Library Services Program were outfitted with microfiche of the holdings of the Alaska Library Network. The Library Services Program also obtained the Washington Library Network Resource Directory on Microfiche for further ILL requests if the items were not available in-state. These additional access tools, plus on-line access to Washington Library Network, would allow Rural Education-Learning Resources to identify the location of desired materials in most cases.

The new tools made procedural changes possible. The rural education center Coordinators and their faculty could search their Alaska Library Network microfiche for resources first and then request the specific ILL's via computer or telephone rather than by mail to the Rural Education Library Services staff. At least one week was dropped from the turn-around time by this change. By having the Rural Education Library Service staff request, via computer, the in-state loan items directly from the holding library, another week was dropped from the turn-around time. By arranging for urgent items to be treated with priority status at the host library when so indicated, the item could be on the way to the requesting party one to two days after the initial request. The improved turn-around time for ILL requests began to make the rural education centers feel as if they did have a library on their doorstep.
The Elmer E. Rasmussen Library of the University of Alaska Fairbanks has also offered assistance with the ordering of equipment (an HP 150) which will place Rural Education on a dedicated line. That computer line will connect with all major libraries into a university on-line circulation system. Public access catalog capability is also planned. It is planned to load the Alaska State Library holdings onto the university system for reference purposes. Rural Education will be placing their holdings in the system which include unique materials in the area of bilingual/bicultural studies.

Objective 8 - Computerized Literature Searches

Dialog information services

In 1984, Rural Education purchased access to the more than two hundred computerized data banks of Dialog Information Services, Palo Alto, California.

The telephone modem on the Apple Ile computer allowed Rural Education to directly dial Dialog's data banks in Palo Alto. Receipt of the requested citation or abstract occurred via computer printer in Anchorage within a few moments. However, transmitting the abstracts to the field coordinators and instructors required a method of transfer that would circumvent the mail and airline schedules and thereby conserve the time gained by using the computer to access the materials. All coordinators have "mailboxes" in the University of Alaska Computer Network mainframe. The citations and abstracts from Dialog Information Services could be sent to their mailboxes once they were received in Anchorage.

To transmit the materials from Anchorage to the field required a special procedure that would permit the materials from the data bank company to be accepted by the University of Alaska's Honeywell mainframe computer in Fairbanks. The procedure allowing the materials to be received by the mainframe was a special editing which eliminated spaces between paragraphs. When the citations and abstracts were received in Anchorage from Palo Alto, they were saved on disc. After editing the disc file, the information was sent to the Honeywell mainframe computer in Fairbanks, once again using the telephone and modem. The field coordinators and instructors were then able to connect with the Honeywell via their own computers, and access this file at their leisure. The total amount of lapsed time for this procedure could take as little as a few minutes. Such prompt receipt of citations and abstracts has elicited enthusiasm for proper postsecondary research in the rural areas.
Objective 9 - Investigation of Transmittal Systems

Digital facsimile transverse

We are currently studying the feasibility and cost of several transmittal systems that have not been used before in rural Alaska. One of these systems is the digital facsimile transceiver. This system transmits text via telephone from distant locations. The cost of the toll charges while the text is being copied ranges from twenty cents to forty-five cents per page. However, a request for many copies of the transmitted text would quickly exhaust available funds if the students were located in different locations of the state. At the same time, for a page or two for a few students, it is a possible way of shortening the time required for delivery of learning materials. However, transmitting complete transcripts of library materials of a lengthy nature would be quite costly and is not being considered due to the cost.

The facsimile transceivers available in Alaska cost from $3,500 to $5,000 each. The more expensive models have a potential for a computer connection. It is this connection that provides hope for a transmittal system that has the greatest potential of all. This will be discussed at a later point in this paper.

Teletext

Rural Education and other units of the University of Alaska examined the possibilities offered by teletext systems. The teletext systems are cost-free information transmission systems which use the free "vertical blanking interval" of existing television signals. It is estimated that the cost for the encoding and decoding units will average two thousand dollars and seven hundred dollars, respectively. The exploration of using the teletext transmittal systems has uncovered two problems. The first problem was that the text must be retyped from the original in order to be entered into the teletext encoder. This is an impractical (and expensive) distribution system for materials of more than a few pages. Therefore, it is more practical for teletext to be used in distributing classroom materials of no more than a few pages to multiple sites rather than to distribute lengthy materials. The second problem encountered was that no interface existed for the facsimile system and the teletext system.

There is no doubt that the greatest potential is offered by a wedding of these state-of-the-art transmission systems. An
interface between the two systems that would allow the teletext encoder and the facsimile system to talk to each other needs to be developed. If such a coupling were available, retyping the materials before being distributed via teletext would be avoided. The pervasive availability of television, even throughout rural Alaska, would bring the materials quickly to the distant students at no cost. At this time, only the interface needs to be developed and we will have a transmittal system with the best characteristics— inexpensive and quick.

As has occurred in Alaska past and most certainly will occur again in the future, a dream is realized. That which was thought impossible becomes a reality. We are certain that today's idea to fuse new methods and technologies will become a reality tomorrow. Rural Education has been on the cutting edge of many educational innovations. Our interest and desire to explore new technologies and their applications will continue. Even though the communities we are serving are in many instances remote frontier outposts, we are dedicated to the implementation of state-of-the-art education technology throughout Alaska.
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Table 1

1982 Population Census of Rural Education Center Communities\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adak</td>
<td>3,405(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Bay</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Junction</td>
<td>1,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillingham</td>
<td>1,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Yukon</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galena</td>
<td>847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Cove</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGrath</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nenana</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Paul Is.</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Point</td>
<td>797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unalaska</td>
<td>1,922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 - Census by -- Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Alaska

2 - Adak and Galena -- Department of Community and Regional Affairs, Division of Local and Government Assistance
Appendix A

Sites of Rural Education Centers -
University of Alaska 1985

Key
- Rural Education Center
- Served upon request by Rural Education
Appendix B

Reference Books for Small Alaska Libraries

Revised March 1984 by Barbara Pavitt
Alaska State Library

Alaska Reference Books


Alaska Statutes. Michie Bobbs Merrill (11).


* Alaska Library Network Catalog (ALNCAT). Annual.


Reference Collection


Literary Market Place: With Names and Numbers. Bowker, 1940- Annual.


Market Guide. Editor and Publisher, 1924- Annual.


Contemporary Authors. 1st Revision. Detroit, Gale, 1967-.

Current Biography. Wilson, 1940- Monthly.


Poor's Register of Corporations, Directors and Executives, United States and Canada. Standard and Poor's Corp., 1928- Annual.


Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature. Wilson, 1905-
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