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The Off-campus Library Services Conference held in Albuquerque, N.M. was the fifth such conference sponsored by Central Michigan University Libraries and the Extended Degree Programs and Credit Courses.

The primary object of the conference was to provide a forum where practitioners involved with library services for off-campus constituents could gather to exchange relevant ideas, concerns, and perspectives; and to share research. Topics included internal and external relationships, present and future practices, program start-up, needs assessments, service in urban settings, promoting services, program measurement and evaluation, technology, and research conducted in off campus library services.

All papers submitted for inclusion in the Conference Proceedings were accepted as received. No editing was done for content or writing style. The papers were, however, reformatted using a modified version of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association to achieve a consistency of presentation.

It was decided that only one edition of the Fifth Off-campus Library Services Conference Proceedings would be produced rather than a conference edition and a final edition as had been done for previous conferences.

It is the belief of all those involved with the Fifth Off-campus Library Services Conference that this edition of the Conference Proceedings will become a significant part of the growing body of literature in the field of off-campus library services.

Carol J. Jacob
October 30, 1991
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Bibliographic Instruction Using Interactive Television

Thomas Abbott and Susan Lowe
University of Maine at Augusta

Introduction

In November, 1985, the University of Maine System Board of Trustees charged Dr. George Connick, President of the University of Maine at Augusta with the responsibility for preparing a proposal for the "development of a community college concept throughout the University System with particular attention towards policies and procedures governing access to the University for older, part-time and commuter students" (Report of the Community College, 1981). As part of that process, nine committees were formed composed of faculty and staff from each of the campuses, State governmental agencies and public schools. After six months of Systemwide planning, the Community College of Maine Plan emerged (1986). In 1987, as a component of the Community College planning process, the Task Force for Off-Campus Library Services was established. It was made up of eight librarians from the University of Maine campuses and a representative from the Vocational Technical Institutes. After an extensive review of all of the issues involved in delivering off-campus library services, the task force prepared a planning document which defined the basic elements of the model program being implemented today.

The model is based on four major points:

1. That students at centers have a library services contact point. This could include a reading resource room set up at a Center or a local contracting public or special library in a community.

2. That students have ready access to library source documents and resources-- including a basic collection of reference materials, electronic access to URSUS, and local document delivery.

3. That students have direct access to reference services and support from qualified library personnel.

4. That library instruction for all students is built into their education process (Community College Task Force, 1987).

In the fall of 1989, the Community College of Maine began transmitting thirty-six (36) courses to over 2500 students in forty-seven (47) locations throughout the state. This number has risen to forty-six (46) classes being offered in the Fall of 1991 to seventy-seven (77) remote locations. (See Figures 1, 2, and 3) The number of students is expected to climb dramatically when the full complement of 200 sites are connected over the next five years.

In 1986, concurrent with the planning for the Community College of Maine, the University of Maine System trustees, the legislature and the general public passed a bond referendum to finance the automation and ultimate sharing of library resources among the nine University of Maine System libraries. That project is now in its final stages of completion for the University System. The State Library and the Law and Legislative Reference Library have just received grants to convert their entire collections into the University's on-line catalog system (URSUS). Additionally, URSUS acts
as a gateway to collections at Maine's private colleges—Colby, Bates and Bowdoin and several of the larger public libraries are considering including their database on the system. Access to CARL's UnCover journal indexing system is also available through URSUS for all users.

**Off-Campus Library Services**

As part of the transition to a more active and educationally oriented philosophy, the library staff established its own mission and direction based on the recommendation of the Community College Task Force for Off-Campus Library Services. One central aspect of that mission is that the library assumes responsibility for educating students in library and information use and information processing by integrating these skills into the curriculum. One of the major goals of the program is to deliver the same library use instruction that students have access to on campus. This is accomplished in a variety of ways including taking advantage of the technology offered by the Community College of Maine's interactive television network as a means for the delivery of bibliographic instruction along with a variety of technologies including our statewide on-line catalog.

**Bibliographic Instruction Over ITV**

As stated earlier, one of the core elements of the off-campus library services program at the University of Maine at Augusta is library use instruction for all students. This is provided for the off-campus students through a course called the Freshman Seminar available on the Interactive Television System. The course offers students information, insight, and skills that are essential in ensuring a smooth, successful, and rewarding transition into higher education and the library offers nine classroom hours of library use instruction within the structure of this course. Lecturers include the Director of the Learning Resource Center and three professional librarians from the University of Maine at Augusta campus library. The course is coordinated by the Coordinator of Off-Campus Library Services. The Freshman Seminar is a required course for students in the associate degree General Studies program and can be used as an elective credit in any program.

In the Freshman Seminar students are provided an overview of the philosophy and missions of libraries, services provided, and introduced to research strategies using general and reference collections, indexes, and on-line catalogs. Topics covered in detail include:

- Why use a library?
- Layout/functions/missions of libraries
- Elements of a traditional card catalog card and the on-line catalog
- Evaluating what you find
- Basic reference sources
- How to use reference sources
- How to use periodical indexes
- Accessing off-campus library services
- Researching a topic
- Style manuals
- Plagiarism

The content areas covered do not distinguish this course from any other bibliographic instruction course, but the delivery system (using the interactive television network), the physical distances covered, and the variety of local library resources available present a challenge to the delivery of the course. Unlike the delivery of an on-campus bibliographic instruction course where the physical setting for research is determined and the available resources within that setting are predefined, any lectures or hands on assignments given to the distant learner must take into consideration available
local resources and the use of the technology itself as a means of delivering the content. For example, searching both the traditional and on-line catalog must be covered as students may encounter both types or only one depending where they live in the state. Specific reference materials or indexes mentioned in that segment of the course may not be available locally to the viewing students. Style manuals needed for the written assignment may not be readily available. Immediate hands-on use of demonstrated materials may not be in the off-campus classroom during the actual demonstration. All of these concerns and others have to be taken into consideration when designing a course for this type of medium.

When the Community College of Maine was in its infancy, the University System Libraries wrote and received a grant from the Federal Department of Education, College Library Technology and Cooperation Grants Program to expand the library network of the University of Maine System's on-line catalog--URSUS--to the off-campus Centers and Sites. This grant is in its final stages and access to URSUS has been provided to 19 high school Sites, all 11 Centers, 4 cooperating public libraries and the State Library. Ten additional Sites will be on-line by the Fall of 1991 bringing the total of off-campus access points to 45. This access provides the off-campus students taking the Freshman Seminar class an opportunity to research for their written assignment in a research collection within their local setting. In addition, MaineCat, a union catalog on compact disc produced by the Maine State Library contains the collections of public and private postsecondary institutions, public schools, public libraries, and special libraries equalizes access to resources for the distant learner. Currently over 200 Maine libraries of all types have access to MaineCat.

For the written assignment in the course, students are asked to compile a bibliography on a topic of their choice using local resources. The bibliography must have as its elements reference materials, books or documents, and journal/newspaper articles. As an option, vertical file material, reports, audiovisual materials, or an interview may also be included. The bibliography must be typed or word processed and follow a recognized style manual. Before the assignment is due, but after the information on library research has been covered, the students must call in during class time and give a progress report. During this session, four librarians are available to answer any questions the students may have about their research, help them over the rough spots, answer questions about using the style manuals, and refer the students to other subjects areas or resources that might be helpful. This call-in session during class time is by far the most enjoyable segment of the course. The students through their reports share some of their frustrations and successes in the research process. Through the sharing session, students become aware of the variety of resources available statewide, learn of special libraries and government agencies that can be tapped for research assistance, and report on the great equalizer that URSUS and MaineCat have provided to their community. Both databases open rather dramatic doors for the student. For example, for a student who one day is only aware of the local public library open only 12 hours a week with limited research materials to the next day having access to over two million potential volumes of research material is an eye opener. This is a startling revelation for some individuals.

The response to both of the written and oral assignments has been very positive. Student comments at the end of the course indicate that the library segment of the Freshman Seminar Course was one of the most helpful to them—especially the bibliography that allows the student to apply the classroom content immediately using a hands-on approach and opening up new vistas to research material.

Closing/Summary

Library support services for distance education at the University of Maine at Augusta and the CCM has quickly moved to level of high quality and educational integration. This is attributed to a
strong model outlined by the ALA guidelines, a comprehensive planning process and a level of cooperation among the librarians of the state which rivals the United Nations.

The major criticism of the project arises out of skepticism that resources available to the off-campus student will equal resources available to the on-campus student—a sense that the off-campus students' experience will be diminished if he or she can't work in a campus library. Response to this criticism has been answered through the use of technology. No longer can libraries be thought of as people and resources within walls. Libraries to the off-campus student have no walls, but the resources and people are still there to support their research. Technology provides the access and people make the program work.
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What's Involved in the Evolving?: The Process Used in Developing a Proposal for Library Needs of Distant Learners in a Sparsely Populated State

Kate E. Adams, Rebecca A. Bernthal, Tracy Bicknell, and Debra Pearson
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Introduction

Distance education. Distant learners. Extended campus library service. Nontraditional students. Satellite delivery. Access to information. Equal access to information and service. Limited resources. Over the past few years, these topics have appeared frequently in the literatures of higher education and librarianship. As the burgeoning interest in distance education continues to grow, more and more librarians are involved with meeting the needs of distance education students.

Although meeting the library needs of any nontraditional student has always been a challenge for academic libraries, developing a program and process to serve distant learners is particularly challenging. In Nebraska, geographic and demographic factors further add to the challenge. Nebraska, a state spanning 400 miles, is sparsely populated (1.6 million), with the majority of the population concentrated in the eastern quarter of the state. Total enrollment at all public higher education institutions in the state numbers only 104,617 (U.S. Department of Education, 1990). The University of Nebraska system, comprised of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, University of Nebraska at Omaha, University of Nebraska Medical Center, and the recently-added University of Nebraska-Kearney, accounts for 48 percent of this enrollment. Additionally, there are three state colleges, located in Chadron, Peru, and Wayne, and a dozen private schools.

Map 1. Public Institutions of Higher Education of Nebraska.
Given the geographical distances and the relatively small number of academic libraries, the challenge of serving distant learners becomes greater. This paper describes the planning process used at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln to develop library service for distant learners.

Background

In the spring of 1990, the library at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) was focused on automation. The University Libraries had just signed a contract with Innovative Interfaces Inc. for the purchase of Innopac, an integrated online system. The system was scheduled to go online over a span of five months, starting with the public access catalog and circulation modules, and followed closely by the cataloging, acquisitions, and serials modules. At the same time a grant proposal was in the works to fund a CD ROM Local Area Network for the University Libraries consisting of ten different sites and with as much as three miles between them.

Externally, the University environment also was changing. A presidential search was in progress, there were several vacancies among key administrative posts, and the addition of Kearney State College to the state university system was underway. During this same time, in May of 1990, the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Division of Continuing Studies released a draft report of its three-year curriculum plan for expanding the delivery of courses via satellite. The curriculum would primarily be at the graduate level, although there would also be delivery of professional-level workshops and seminars. Seven locations, called education centers, were identified as being core delivery sites. The seven education centers were in various stages of development. For instance, graduate-level engineering courses had been delivered to the Scottsbluff education center for three years, while the education center at Grand Island was in the fund-raising stage.

Map 2. Division of Continuing Studies Education Centers.
The University Libraries' Involvement

In May, administrators and staff from the University Libraries and the Division of Continuing Studies (DCS) held an initial meeting to discuss the role of the University Libraries and how the library needs of distant learners at the education centers could be satisfied. As an outgrowth of this meeting, the University Libraries administration formed a working group charged with developing a process to address how the University Libraries could indeed provide library services to distant learners.

By July 31, 1990, a mere three months later, the working group had submitted its report, "Library Services to Division of Continuing Studies," outlining the proposed process to the library administration. The report was accepted by the library administration with few changes and forwarded to the Division of Continuing Studies. How the working group developed a workable proposal within two and a half months is the theme of this paper.

The Process

Four librarians—the Chair of General Services Department, the circulation librarian, the business librarian, and an agriculture/social sciences librarian—were appointed to what became known as the Division of Continuing Studies Working Group. The concept of "working group" had already been developed and used extensively by the University Libraries during the preparation for and implementation of Innopec, the automated system. A working group is defined by the University Libraries as an ad hoc committee, created with a specific charge and life span. Members are selected from a list of individuals who express a willingness to serve and who meet key criteria such as job assignment and experience. Working groups are encouraged to be creative and forward-looking in developing final products. Functioning in an atmosphere of creativity, plus operating with specific deadlines and short life span, working groups have tended to develop a sense of trust and reliance upon full participation by all members.

The Division of Continuing Studies Working Group's initial meeting in May was a brainstorming session in which issues and concerns were enumerated. Issues considered included telephone reference, the role of subject specialist librarians, staffing and hours, costs, bibliographic control, impact on interlibrary loan, and possible services available through local public and community libraries. Also, we began to identify colleagues within the University Libraries who could provide information about the issues raised and to assess the projected impact of an extended campus library service program on current services.

During this initial meeting we also identified specific constraints and assumptions that would necessarily shape the University Libraries' extended campus library service program in Nebraska. We decided any proposal would likely have to work within an environment of limited library resources (staffing, space, budget) and with an extended campus program still in the developmental stages with a limited but growing curriculum and uncertain enrollments. Additionally, other constraints included the administrative requirement from the University Libraries that support for on-site collections at the education centers would not be acceptable, nor would the promotion of duplication in services be favored. These limitations, although not unworkable, did inject a sense of reality into the kind of proposal we could expect to prepare within the two month time period.

With these issues and constraints in mind, the working group proceeded by dividing responsibilities for gathering information. Those of us who planned to attend ALA Annual Conference were asked to make contacts and attend meetings of the Extended Campus Library Services Discussion Group. Another member was asked to consult colleagues within the University
Libraries about possible programmatic impacts on current service levels. Also, one member contacted the Nebraska Library Commission (Nebraska's state library) to gather more information about the collections and services of public libraries throughout the state.

Between meetings, a formal literature review, using Library Literature and ERIC, was conducted. The working group was in the fortunate position of having two recently-published seminal resources available. One was the "ACRL Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Service" (1990). The second was Virginia Witucke's article, "Off-Campus Library Services: Leading the Way" (1990), which proved invaluable. Also, not to be overlooked was the availability of several Off-Campus Library Services Conference proceedings, which proved equally helpful.

As the working group probed the literature and continued to discuss the concept of extended campus library service, we ascertained areas needing further data gathering and discussion. We felt areas such as bibliographic instruction, contacts with teaching faculty, document delivery, telefax, the roles of interlibrary loan and cataloging, the impact on mediated computer searching, reserve materials, accreditation issues, and publicity all merited consideration. In addition, we developed a list of academic institutions throughout the country that already had extended campus library service programs in place.

By mid-June, the working group had met formally only four times. Meetings emphasized "blue-skying" and discussion, rather than details. We examined overarching concepts and debated alternatives, roadblocks, and realities. However, outside the meetings, each member spent several hours gathering information, as well as reflecting on what had been discussed at our meetings, in preparation for future meetings.

With a sense of urgency, the library administration had requested a preliminary report by mid-June. In order to meet this deadline, one working group member prepared a draft of the preliminary report. We then devoted one meeting to critiquing this draft. We found working with drafts an effective operating style. Prior to meetings each member could make revisions and generate ideas for group discussion. Then, when we met as a group, we discussed the revisions while we continued to entertain new ideas. Discussions ranged from philosophical approaches to identifying areas needing further data gathering, and finally how to bring focus and direction to our preliminary report.

The chair of the working group then prepared the final copy of the preliminary report and delivered it to the library administration by the deadline. Administrative response to the preliminary report was completed by late June, and a critique returned to the working group.

Administrative support was positive. A few specific changes to the preliminary report were made and some additional information was requested. The working group was asked to include an indication of those services for which there should be charges. We were asked also to provide cost estimates and specific target dates for implementation. In addition, the library administration asked that we include scenarios for different levels of funding as part of the final report. The scenarios would describe the information needs of the distant learner and illustrate how those needs would be met at each level of service.

The working group convened in early July to discuss the critique and to decide what else needed to be done. Faced with an August 1 deadline for the final report, and with vacations on the calendar, the working group was motivated to work quickly.
The working group focused on shaping the extended campus library program proposal into a three-tiered levels of service plan. The first tier included those services that could be immediately available to distant learners, with few additional resources required from the University Libraries. The second tier expanded the services and anticipated the need for some additional resources, while the third tier projected complete services with sustainable funding when a fully operational Division of Continuing Studies distance education program was in place. Since the seven education centers were still in varying stages of development, it was vital that the levels of service be flexible and provide for different needs.

At this juncture, the working group again assigned tasks to each member. One member was asked to prepare scenarios outlining what services a distant learner could expect from the library, and how each level of service was to be implemented. Another member was charged with preparing a draft of services, with target dates and costs. Other members continued reading and synthesizing the literature.

As we continued to comb the literature for ideas, and as we debated service issues, our programmatic recommendations began to jell. We came to the conclusion that the geographic distances in Nebraska, coupled with the relatively small number of post-secondary public institutions, were constants and also major obstacles. We realized that comparing our proposed program of extended campus services to that of Central Michigan University or an urban, populous state seemed less and less feasible than initially considered. Accordingly, telephone interviews were conducted with University of Wyoming and Utah State University, states with similar geographic and population dynamics. By placing these calls late in the process, we were able to ask specific questions to fill in the gaps in our proposal, and to draw upon the experience and perceptions of other libraries in accommodating the factors of geographic distance and scattered population.

As we began to write the final report, we worked and reworked drafts. Our meetings again functioned as review sessions where we fine-tuned concepts. As the chair of the working group prepared drafts, members offered substantive criticism and guidance as well as editorial comments.

Since the report was being written for administrators in the Division of Continuing Studies, we wanted to avoid library jargon. Library services needed to be explained concisely and portrayed as one component of the overall picture of the University Libraries' service, and yet as an integral part of the Division of Continuing Studies program. We also needed to make the report understandable to administrators who in all likelihood would not be conversant with the daily operations and organizational structures of libraries. Furthermore, we wanted to emphasize communication and cooperative development between the University Libraries and the Division of Continuing Studies.

The final report was completed by the August 1990 deadline. The document included an introduction to possible library services for distant learners, described a three-tiered approach to providing services, and provided cost projections for each level of service. Recommendations were sequenced by academic semester and month. Substeps were provided, but were not necessarily listed in priority order. Target dates and projected costs were identified through January 1991. Beyond that date, the plan was more open-ended and less specific, to ensure flexibility in responding to curriculum developments, budgetary constraints, and the future direction of the Division of Continuing Studies program at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

The final document was approved by the library administration and was sent to the Dean of the Division of Continuing Studies. The recommendations contained in the final report have been incorporated into the planning process of the Division of Continuing Studies.
Key Elements of the Plan

Underpinning the proposal for service to distant learners at the education centers are several assumptions. These assumptions closely parallel statements in the ACRL Guidelines and also reflect the University of Nebraska-Lincoln's role and mission statement.

1. The University of Nebraska-Lincoln is ultimately responsible for providing support services to meet the library needs of distant learners at the education centers.

2. The University Libraries have the primary responsibility for identifying, developing, coordinating, and providing library resources and services.

3. Effective and appropriate services for distant learners may differ from services offered to on-campus clientele. Services to distant learners as well as on-campus students are based on academic course requirements.

4. Resources and services of "unaffiliated local libraries" may be used to support information needs of distant learners. Unaffiliated local libraries are libraries located near the education centers, and may include public, community college, and state college libraries.

The first tier of services includes services currently in place at the University Libraries, and requires few additional resources. The emphasis is on utilizing circulation, interlibrary loan, designated subject specialist librarians, and reference services as currently operational for on-campus users. Few additional costs are projected.

The second tier of service assumes the presence of a distance education library services coordinator. The position is envisioned as a dual appointment between the University Libraries and the Division of Continuing Studies. The coordinator's initial tasks include conducting site visits to each education center and developing a list of recommendations to enhance and expand library services for distant learners. Other recommendations are the examination of the issue of bibliographic control and the development of policies for purchasing limited resources to meet distant learners' collection needs.

The third tier of service assumes a complete program in place with sustainable funding. The report recommends the development of a survey instrument to assess needs of distant learners and teaching faculty, as well as the development of a bibliographic instruction program designed specifically to meet needs of the extended campus community. A third recommendation is the development of a full-scale marketing program for library services to distant learners.

Summary

The process of utilizing the working group concept in developing an extended campus library services program was effective. The four librarians on the working group appreciated the challenging opportunity to combine both professional knowledge and creativity in the development of a program. Also, the planning approach provided numerous opportunities for input by librarians and library staff. Units that would ultimately be affected by the provision of services to distant learners were involved in the development of recommendations.

In addition, the interaction with the Division of Continuing Studies was positive. The fact that the University Libraries' participation was sought out at the beginning was a welcome indicator of
campus recognition of the role of the library. The process effectively helped to build stronger ties on campus.

At present, this is a time of transition for both the University Libraries and the Division of Continuing Studies. It is crucial for all parties involved—the University Libraries, the Division of Continuing Studies, distant learners, teaching faculty, and the education centers—to emphasize communication and cooperative development. All have a vested interest in the dynamic growth of extended campus educational programs that are a component of both higher education and economic development within Nebraska.

Postscript. Since the programmatic plan was developed and approved, the state of Nebraska has elected a new governor, and the state has experienced a major economic downturn in revenues. The new budget climate is significantly different. Also, the University of Nebraska system is under the direction of a new president, while key administrative posts at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln are still in the process of being filled. The University of Nebraska-Lincoln faces budget cuts in the 3-5% range. Thus, program enhancements are on hold. But the plan is in place and should be usable whenever funding allows for implementation.
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Staffing Off-Campus Libraries: An Examination
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DePaul University's Suburban Campus Libraries have gone through a significant change over the past few years in the area of staffing. Staffing was acknowledged as the top personnel issue in libraries by an informal canvass of selected library administrators (Staffing-The Number, 1990). Staffing is also considered a key issue in the providing of satisfactory library services (Haworth, 1982). In her examination of the concerns administrators face in developing branch libraries, Kemp (1988) states gaining control of staffing means greater uniformity in the provision of services and greater control in policy/procedure establishment and application.

This paper will investigate staffing patterns at off-campus libraries and will be divided into three sections: (a) a review of the literature with a focus on staffing extended campus libraries, (b) a presentation of the results of a survey dealing with staffing-related questions, and (c) a discussion of the history and development of the DePaul University Suburban Campus Libraries and their unique staffing situation.

Literature Review

A review of the literature on off-campus services has revealed that during discussions of these services, staffing procedures are infrequently mentioned. When staffing is discussed, there are topics which appear in the literature. One such topic are the skills needed by off-campus librarians in order to provide adequate service. Crocker (1984) strongly suggests that off-campus librarians must accept the challenge and develop a mission that would change their traditional, passive role in education. In her study of West Virginia extended campus libraries, Forrest (1984) discovered that librarians at these facilities became more flexible, mobile, creative, and energetic in serving this type of patronage. Ream and Weston (1982) point out that their library hires those who are creative, flexible, and able to cope with the frustrations, uncertainties, and occasional impossibilities. Ream and Weston further explain that flexibility is the key for successful extended library service. Finally, the Personnel section of the "ACRL Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Services" (1990) says these libraries should be staffed with persons who have the skills to identify informational needs and can respond to them flexibly and creatively.

Another topic appearing in the literature is an examination of what goals off-campus librarians and their institutions should attempt to achieve. One such goal is for library services at extended campuses to be equal in quality to the services of the home campus (McCabe, 1982). Cookingham (1982) believes his Triple A program of awareness, access, and availability is one method librarians can use to reach the goal of providing quality service to off-campus library users. Emmer (1987) draws the conclusion that if off-campus librarians are resourceful they could make a difference in their academic program. In her analysis of providing service to graduate students at off-campus libraries, Hageman (1988) states that an extension librarian is an effective, visible sign of that institution's goal of a strong commitment to service. Hageman goes on to say that having an extension librarian equals effective, continuous service. Slade (1985) echoes the idea that professional librarians at extended campus libraries imply a high level of commitment.
At Central Michigan University, regional librarians are responsible for service only at their off-campus libraries. This ensures that all patrons at those sites are aware of the services provided and how the librarians can assist (Johanningmeier, 1982). In describing their model of library support to off-campus programs, Kascus and Aguilar (1988) suggest that the off-campus librarian needs to be a liaison between all components of the library such as bibliographic instruction, faculty orientation, and public relations. Kascus and Aguilar also proclaim that these librarians must help off-campus students achieve the goal of becoming independent, self-directed learners. Landau and Hunt (1982) also discovered that extension librarians sometime have a number of functions which could include being the reference, periodical, acquisitions, or circulation department, and these librarians must have expertise in certain areas such as audiovisual maintenance.

A final topic common in the literature is one which encompasses a variety of criteria or standards on how off-campus libraries should be staffed. "The ACRL Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Services" (1990) state that the library should provide professional and support personnel sufficient in number and of the quality necessary to attain the goals and objectives of the extended campus program. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' Criteria for Accreditation claims that competent library personnel must be assigned duties in planning and providing library resources and services and in ascertaining their continued adequacy (Drake, 1989). Frank (1989) proposed a normative theory of staff allocation based on the need to find the right level of staffing so organizational effectiveness will be enhanced.

In her model of the librarian's role in open learning, Wilkinson (1985) says librarians, not faculty, should be utilized by students since they are more aware than academic staff of (a) the availability of learning materials, (b) the facilities and resources the library can offer, and (c) the different study modes and media. This places a strong importance on the qualifications of off-campus librarians. It has also been noted that the staffing of off-campus libraries need not disturb the duties or responsibilities of on-campus library staffs (Mount and Turple, 1980). Jenkins (1985) believes that an institution should not use its on-campus librarians to staff its off-campus sites due to the risk of inconsistent service. But, Jenkins further suggests that the institution's entire library staff would benefit by knowing what is happening at the off-campus library facilities. Steffen and Ward (1987) sum up the idea of what an off-campus library staff's primary goal should be and that is to provide a variety of services aimed at reducing barriers to library usage and upgrading academic program quality.

**Staffing Survey**

This survey was taken in order to gain an idea of how different institutions staff their off-campus libraries. The survey results do not indicate one overall way of staffing these libraries, but a mixture of several different ways. Because of the complexity of the survey, there were difficulties in gaining a clear picture of the staffing patterns of off-campus libraries. One of the main difficulties was that many institutions use a variety of staffing patterns because they have many different sites and this information was hard to keep clear on one survey form. Another difficulty arose from the fact that many parts of the survey were not filled out or were filled out in such a way as to cause confusion with what had been checked previously on their survey.

**Survey Methods**

The survey on staffing off-campus libraries was sent as a part of a larger survey on off-campus library development. One reason this was done was to save libraries with off-campus sites from being inundated with surveys. It was also done to save postage and mailing costs since the two groups working with the surveys were from the same institution.
Two hundred and eighty-five surveys were sent out to names and addresses obtained from two lists. One list was the membership list of the ACRL Extended Campus Library Services Section which had its first meeting at the 1990 ALA Annual Conference. The second source was the lists that came from the discussion groups on Extended Campus Library Services that have occurred at ALA meetings. This list was last updated in January of 1991.

There was some overlap between the two lists and some effort was made to eliminate this. However, it was not possible to eliminate all of the overlap since the ACRL-ECLSS list had mostly personal names and addresses on it and the Discussion group list had a mixture of personal and institutional names and addresses. This was reflected in the return rate. The responses for the survey were: 285 sent; 76 returned; and 56 filled out.

The survey instrument was seven pages long with the section on personnel covering one page. The survey had seven sections which were: general, facilities, finances, personnel, services, resources: collection and access, and future trends. For each of the first six sections the questions were asked for the first year the site opened and for the current year.

The section on personnel includes these questions:

13. Who is directly responsible for the management of the extended campus site(s) library? (please indicate title; name optional.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. Who does this person report to? (please indicate title; name optional.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. How many professional librarians are employed by the library as a whole?

- 0-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16-20
- 21-25
- over 25

16. How many of the following staff the extended campus site(s) library?

- Full-time professional librarians
- Part-time professional librarians
- Full-time support staff
- Part-time support staff
- Full-time student workers
- No library staff
- Other
17. How many hours per week are library staff scheduled at the extended campus site(s) library?

0 ______
1-10 ______
11-20 ______
21-30 ______
31-40 ______
41-50 ______
over 50 ______

18. If professional librarians staff the extended campus site(s) library, do they also work at the main campus library?

First Year
Yes ______
Current Year
No ______

19. Is electronic mail available for library staff use?

First Year
Yes ______
Current Year
No ______

The survey results were analyzed using descriptive analysis. The results for Questions 16, 17, and 18 were tabulated and percentages were calculated by using the number of surveys returned and filled out divided by each possible response chosen. (see Table 1 on following page). Other results were obtained by tabulating the responses to questions and examining remarks made on the survey that were not directly asked for by the survey.

Looking at the results of Question 16, we see that for both the current year and the first year the highest percentage of staff was the "full time professional librarian." For the first year it was 21% and for the current year it was 50%. The next highest percentages are for "full time" and "part-time support staff" in the current year and "no library staff" in the first year. "Full time support staff" was 34% and "part-time support staff" was 29% for the current year. "No library staff" was 18% for the first year. "Part-time professional staff" was calculated as being 13% for the first year and 9% for the current year.

Question number 16 allowed respondents to mark all that apply, so almost every survey which did not list "no library staff" listed some combination of staff. The combination most in evidence from looking at the percentage results of the survey is "full-time professional librarians" with either "full-time or part-time support staff." It was surprising to see that the use of "part-time professional librarians" was less than that of "full-time and part-time support staff" in the current year. A general assumption in the greater Chicago area is that there would be a higher percentage of "part-time librarians" used to staff libraries than either "full-time or part-time support staff." This could indicate that "part-time professionals" are not as available outside of urban areas.

Only 4 surveys out of the 57 returned indicated that they do not use professional librarians in staffing their off-campus sites. These were surveys that had indicated that some type of staff was at the site, but did not check either part-time professional or full-time professional librarians being at the site. This is a reassuring sign that if there is library staff at the off-campus site, most sites have a professional librarian there either full time or part time.
Table 1

Results for Questions 16, 17, and 18

Question 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Type</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FT Pro Lib</td>
<td>12 (21%)</td>
<td>28 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT Pro Lib</td>
<td>7 (13%)</td>
<td>5 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT Support</td>
<td>6 (11%)</td>
<td>19 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT Support</td>
<td>7 (13%)</td>
<td>16 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT Student</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT Student</td>
<td>7 (13%)</td>
<td>13 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Lib Staff</td>
<td>10 (18%)</td>
<td>9 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>5 (9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours of Site</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Hours</td>
<td>15 (27%)</td>
<td>11 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 Hours</td>
<td>4 (7%)</td>
<td>5 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 Hours</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 Hours</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 Hours</td>
<td>5 (9%)</td>
<td>7 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 Hours</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>4 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 50 Hours</td>
<td>4 (7%)</td>
<td>13 (23%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 (11%)</td>
<td>21 (38%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Seventeen surveys indicated they did not provide library staff for the off-campus site. They indicated this by either checking off "no library staff" in Question 13 or by checking "library service not offered" in the general section of the survey. Of those, seven surveys did not give any indications of why in the survey. Ten surveys gave indications by added comments to the survey in the margins of the survey. Five of the surveys listed comments that indicated that the libraries were staffed by host institutions or that students used local libraries not attached to the survey library. Five surveys indicated that the library staff stayed on the main campus to provide library services (see Table 2).

Table 2

Comments on No Off-Campus Library Staff
- Library hours the same as the host institution.
- Most of our library services are thru another Institution....
- Students at our extended campus sites use nearby academic libraries who have agreements w/"college" and our #800-line toll free reference service.
- Librarians employed by host institution.
- We use the local community college libraries
- We teach courses at 14 different sites, but in all but one case, there is not library service beyond access to AV materials.
- Maintained by teaching faculty: books provided shelf-ready to them.
- Served from main campus.
- Extended campus sites do not have libraries....all services and library staff are in the "name" campus library.

Since De Paul's off-campus sites are staffed by librarians who work at both the main campuses and the off-campus sites, Question 18 examined how many institutions had staff who worked at both places. For the first year, 11% said "professional librarians" work at both sites. For the Current year, 14% said that "professional librarians" work at both sites. We were interested to see in what type of area the sites were located. Eight surveys listed "yes" to Question 18 for the current year. One respondent did not check off what areas the sites were in (see Table 3). The table lists the number of actual surveys that indicated "yes" to Question 18 across the top. The numbers listed for each institution are how many sites they have in each type of area.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rural</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urban</td>
<td>1 1 1 3 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suburban</td>
<td>1 1 20 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>town/small city</td>
<td>1 10 4 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results indicate most institutions have sites in more than one type of area. Only two institutions checked only one type and those areas were rural and urban. The institutions with librarians who work at both main campus and the off-campus sites are mostly located in urban and suburban areas. This fits the profile of De Paul University's off-campus staffing which is discussed in the following section.
DePaul University: Off-Campus Libraries' Staffing

DePaul University, founded in 1898, is one of the ten largest Catholic universities in the world. As an urban university, it offers, through its seven colleges and schools, a wide range of academic and professional programs to over 15,000 students. The diverse student body covers a wide range of ages, religions, ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds. Seventy-five percent of these students work to finance their education. The student/faculty ratio is 17:1 at this institution dedicated to teaching versus research. Upon graduation, approximately 85% of the 80,000 alumni live and work in the Chicago area (College Bluebook, 1982).

The two main campuses of DePaul are located within the Chicago city limits. These urban settings result in a "commuter college" label that DePaul is overcoming by an increase on out-of-state freshman enrollment that has tripled since 1984 (College Bluebook, 1989). The Lincoln Park Campus, located just a few miles from the center of Chicago, is considered the main campus of DePaul. This traditional college campus setting houses the social sciences and humanities programs. The Loop Campus is located in the middle of the financial and business section of Chicago, also named the Loop. This campus houses the business and law schools, the computer science program and the non-traditional, adult education program called the School for New Learning. This location has special appeal to the many people who work downtown and offers many evening classes.

There are also two off-campus sites, the Oak Brook Campus and the O'Hare Campus, that are within 20 miles of the two main campuses. Their names denote their proximity to office-complex developed corridors just west and northwest of the city. These campuses are housed in office type facilities and offer courses mainly in the Graduate School of Business Program, the College of Computer Science and the School for New Learning. Other courses, both at the undergraduate and graduate level, are occasionally offered at these campuses. The students attending these campuses are usually adult learners who hold full-time jobs.

When the first off-campus site opened in the early 1970's, classes were held in a northwest suburban high school. After outgrowing this facility, office space in the same area was utilized. Classes at the Northwest Center, as it was eventually called before becoming O'Hare Campus, were offered Monday through Friday during the evening hours. In 1984, a second site opened at Oak Brook with a first quarter enrollment of 419 students. The two sites are now functioning at near capacity with a total enrollment of approximately 1400 at each site each quarter (R. A. Skoczylas, personal communication, June 21, 1991). Both facilities have gone through expansion and are looking again to expand in the near future. Classes are also currently being offered on Saturdays. These facilities are open seven days a week and house classrooms, a study/electronic library area, and a computer lab.

Originally, library service to the first site consisted only of aiding in setting up reserve collections of materials (limited to five items per class) per request of the instructors who were then responsible for overseeing the check-out and return process. It was determined not to offer full services or staffing due to lack of funds (Scharfenorth, 1979). In 1984, when the decision for a second off-campus site was announced, the library responded to an obvious need by deciding to offer expanded library services (M. R. Stitch, personal communication, April 24, 1991). The first step was to appoint a coordinator to analyze and develop these services. This coordinator provided service to the Loop Campus Library as a reference librarian as well as supervising these off-site duties. One evening during the week was spent at one of the extended campus sites evaluating the needs and developing the policies and procedures to meet these needs (J. L. Rycombel, personal communication, February 11, 1991). It was decided from the beginning that these sites would contain electronic libraries that would include online catalogs and facsimile machines. This decision was based on space and budgetary limitations (Brown, 1985). Reference service was offered weekday evenings and on Saturday and Sunday. These hours were staffed by volunteers from the main campus libraries and part-time librarians hired specifically for staffing these.
sites. The next five years saw a steady change of staff that made the quality of service somewhat erratic. It was decided in 1988, after evaluating the needs of the suburban sites, that a more effective way of providing library service had to be explored (S. B. Mader, personal communication, May 7, 1991).

With this in mind, a new Coordinator of Suburban Campus Libraries Services was hired in July of 1989. The important difference was that this position was now considered to be of department head level. The main responsibility was defined as the administration of the suburban libraries. In order for the person in this position to understand and be part of the functioning of the main campus libraries, the position included reference duties at the Loop Campus Library two days per week. A full-time reference librarian was hired in October of 1989 to staff the other suburban library three days per week and to provide reference service at the Lincoln Park Campus Library two days a week. By March 1991, two more full-time librarians were hired, one for each suburban campus, again with the expectation of working an alternating schedule with the main campus libraries (DePaul University Libraries, 1988).

To date, this arrangement has proved to be stimulating and challenging for the four suburban librarians and for the main campus libraries that have the benefit of the extra reference service. Each suburban librarian works two days per week at a specific main campus library. The O'Hare Campus suburban librarians spend their two days per week at the Lincoln Park Library; the Oak Brook suburban librarians spend their two days at the Loop Campus Library. Responsibilities at the main campus include providing reference service for a portion of the day, being a subject bibliographer, and, at the Loop Campus, being in the online searching rotation.

The suburban librarians work a two evening shift at the particular suburban site at which he or she is assigned. Although reference service does not start officially until 4:30 pm, the librarian is available for reference duty the minute he or she arrives at the site at 2:00 pm. The fifth day of the work week, Friday, is set aside as a meeting/special projects day. In the past year, policies and procedures have been honed, and a manual produced during these Friday meetings. Forms and instructional sheets have been developed, services researched, bibliographies compiled, library instruction designed, other schools' off-campus sites visited, problems confronted and solved. Part-time librarians provide reference service on Friday evenings and during the day on Saturday; though some quarters the full-time staff has to provide the Friday night reference service on a rotational basis at one of the campuses. As weekend classes and student enrollment increase, this staffing is constantly being reevaluated. Being able to provide consistency with a permanent full-time and part-time staff has been the key to better and more personal library service.

The full-time librarians provide such services as library instruction for classes, research consultation, instruction using the electronic tools, a photocopy and book request service, maintaining the audiovisual equipment, anything that can aid the students, staff or instructors find and use the information they need. The main qualifications for this job are strong organizational skills plus the ability to be flexible while working between two campuses, one with traditional library setting and the other primarily an electronic library. And, in agreement with what the literature has shown, an ability to be creative and to maintain a high degree of energy are also attributes necessary to accomplish the variety of tasks required.

One of the major benefits to this multi-campus staffing is working with our peers at the main campuses which invites an understanding of each others' situations and an openness for solving difficulties when they arise. Also, our familiarity with the collections, services, and even the physical set-up of the main campus libraries helps us provide better service at our off-campus libraries. We can also often take advantage of the opportunities for meetings, workshops, etc. offered through the main campus libraries. The opportunity to meet as a department on Fridays and to have such a big block of time to accomplish tasks has been a reason we have been able to achieve so much in the past year.
A disadvantage to this staffing approach is that, at the suburban campuses, we work in isolation without a peer to turn to for immediate help. Electronic mail and the telephone are our vital links to the main campus libraries and to each other. Also, we miss the details of the everyday activities and changes that occur in the main campus libraries that are not communicated through official channels. This drawback can be a problem that occurs to any off-campus or part-time librarian. The opportunity to be at one of the main campus libraries can turn into a disadvantage when the schedule becomes hectic. Some weeks we are required to be at all four campuses. A large briefcase and a well-kept calendar are a must!

We feel the overall result of this staffing approach is the improved quality of service that we provide our suburban libraries users. The students, faculty and staff have come to rely on us to help them meet their library needs. In fact, many students and faculty members seek us out when at the main campus libraries to help with particular research needs.

Summary

This paper attempted to investigate staffing patterns at off-campus libraries by: (a) reviewing the literature on extended campus libraries, (b) presenting the results of a survey dealing with staffing-related questions, and (c) discussing the history and development of the DePaul University Suburban Campus Libraries' staffing situation. The literature review of off-campus libraries revealed that staffing is an infrequently mentioned topic. This seems unusual given the importance of staffing to any business or organization providing public service. When staffing was discussed, one interesting aspect that appeared was a list of traits desirable of off-campus librarians such as a high energy level, creativity, flexibility, and strong organizational skills.

The results of the survey indicated a variety of combinations of staffing patterns such as full-time professional librarians with part-time support staff at the off-campus facility. The options seem to be determined by factors such as distance and budgetary considerations. Another result was the discovery that a large number of off-campus libraries are staffed by professional librarians. Perhaps this high proportion reflects the guidelines suggested by the ACRL for extended campus library services or the accreditation requirements of the institutions that were surveyed. Finally, only a few of the institutions replied that their off-campus librarians also had main campus library responsibilities.

An examination of DePaul University Suburban Campus Libraries' staffing situation indicated that a carefully analyzed and organized process will help build a successful off-campus library program. Benefits include implementing service which will be useful to patrons and the formulation of policies and procedures for the off-campus library itself. The advantages of the Suburban Campus Librarians' opportunity to work and maintain responsibilities at one of the main campus libraries is represented in the number of new and successful services implemented at the off-campus sites.

The authors agree that future research in the area of staffing would be beneficial to the study of off-campus librarianship. An example of future research is a study of how off-campus library staff communicate with the personnel of the main campus library.
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Developing an Urban Off-Campus Service: York University Libraries' Experience

E. B. Braaksma
York University

Like the United States, Canada is a large, far-flung and geographically diverse country, linked by excellent transportation and communications networks. Unlike the United States, the bulk of Canada's population is concentrated in a thin line along the 49th parallel. The rest of the country is sparsely populated, consisting of small, single-industry towns with resource-based economies. Physical access to secondary or post-secondary educational facilities is often difficult. For instance, a survey of distance education students in Northern Ontario found that nearly half the respondents lived 200 km or more away from their parent institution (Burge, 1988, pp. 40-1). As a result, Canada has a strong tradition of post-secondary distance education and such programs are offered at most post-secondary institutions throughout the country. Combined with this is the increase in the popularity of adult/continuing education. A huge market for adult education exists and universities are becoming more responsive and innovative in their recruitment of mature students. Off-campus courses are now often targeted to specific groups: shift workers, stay-at-home caregivers, new immigrants, upgrading professionals. Increasingly, these programs are offered in urban settings--in the auto plant, at the police station, in the hospital--thus blurring the definition of what constitutes a "distance" education course.

In spite of the necessity, availability and popularity of distance education programs, they are viewed as being outside the main mission of the university, and do not receive much in the way of political or financial support. The Commission of Inquiry on Canadian Universities noted that "while Canadian efforts in distance education are described as very successful, this field receives surprisingly little attention on campus. Especially in view of Canada's geography, [it is] felt that distance education should receive a higher priority" (Commission of Inquiry, May 1991, p. 7). If distance education programs are widespread, but relegated to the back burners of the post-secondary agenda, where does that leave libraries, always the Cinderellas of the academic world?

Library support for post-secondary off-campus/distance education programs exists, to a greater or lesser degree, at all of the institutions offering outreach programs. Traditionally, the emphasis in distance education has been on providing a self-contained packet of course materials, including selected readings that make students independent of the library. Textbooks on planning and designing off-campus/distance education courses have few or no references to library support services. This may explain why there is practically no journal literature on off-campus library services outside of library journals, and even then the information is limited.

The library literature, and more specifically the Canadian library literature on off-campus services falls into two categories: the case study and the survey. Slade's Canadian off-campus library services surveys (1984/85; 1987) are exhaustive analyses of the then-current state of affairs in Canadian off-campus library services (Slade, 1988). Nettlefold's 1987 cross-Canada snapshot of services (1988) and Conley's 1987 Ontario survey are smaller, but no less ambitious attempts to produce a comprehensive picture. Local studies done by Appavoo, Montgomerie, Howard, Burge and Snow, and Sin Fu help to round out the Canadian picture.
These studies show that Canadian off-campus library services look very much alike from institution to institution. As Conley has pointed out, different levels of service exist at different institutions, depending on the delivery model used for the courses themselves (Conley, pp. 2-6), but a composite picture might look like this:

In each library, the service has five main characteristics.

1. There are core/deposit collections devoted exclusively to off-campus courses.

2. There is a dedicated toll-free/call collecting telephone line.

3. There is a small staff handling requests. Often the staff is part-time, and the off-campus service is part of a larger department.

4. There is a shipping service for materials requested by off-campus students/faculty. The requests are filled from a core/deposit collection, the general library collection, and sometimes ILL.

5. The library provides reference services (subject searches of the catalogue, online/CD-ROM citation searches,) and sometimes bibliographic instruction.

In most locations, the library's off-campus service seems to be mainly reactive, with the staff searching out and shipping materials upon request by students or faculty. Reference searches, either manual or online, do take place but they do not constitute the majority of 'business' (Slade, pp. 15-19). Surprisingly little use is made of the interactive capabilities of new technologies such as fax or electronic messaging, although this may have changed in the years since these surveys were done. Students sometimes access to a microfiche copy of the library catalogue, but usually rely on reading lists contributed to them by their instructors. Librarians generally have very little input into course design or reading lists, since liaison with faculty is limited. Publicity for the service is generally limited to pamphlets, handouts, or word of mouth, although some librarians visit off-campus sites to give bibliographic instruction. Probably because of limited publicity, the off-campus service is not used to its fullest potential.

In some ways, this composite picture is disheartening. Even though effective, and labor-intensive systems have been developed to support their studies, off-campus students remain unaware of the library services that are available to them, or if they are aware, use them in a very limited way. This is not unlike the way that many on-campus students use their libraries as well. However, it could be argued that on-campus students at least have the option of exploring the library on their own, or using other libraries available to them. Off-campus students do not have this option, and so may be getting a second-class education as a result. But is this line of reasoning an accurate one? Is it true that off-campus students are deprived of all library resources?

Burge, Snow and Howard's study of library services for distance education in Northern Ontario, Developing Partnerships, found that while students did live far away from their parent institution, they often lived close to some other kind of library:

A great majority of respondents, however, have a public library facility close by: 88.4% under 10 km and 96.7% under 50 km. Another library facility, that of a local school to which the student has access, might be of use to many students as 57% report this type of facility within 50 km. A college facility is located within 50 km of 44.3% of respondents, and a university within 50 km of 32%. A large percentage of missing data for this question leads us to ask whether students are in fact aware of the existence and location of other
academic institutions in their region other than the one institution in which they are enrolled. (pp. 40-1)

This report raises an interesting question: MUST off-campus students be limited to the resources available to them through their parent institution? If they are using other libraries informally, why not set up a formal, cooperative arrangement between university libraries and their non-academic counterparts so that off-campus students have better access to library resources of all kinds? This is the model proposed by Burge and Snow in their idea of "developing partnerships". It is also similar to an initiative proposed by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, which calls for "universities [to] develop appropriate linkages between their academic and professional communities and those outside the university to ensure the vitality and effectiveness of part-time lifelong learning" (1989).

The Burge and Snow model was designed for areas of Canada where distances are great and library resources are few and scattered. But it should also work in an urban setting, where the concentration of library resources is much higher and the possibility of networking is much greater. In fact, the province of Ontario is actively exploring such library networks in its Strategic Plan, a joint project of the Ministry of Culture and Communications and The Ontario Library Association (Ontario Public Library, 1990). Building library networks between university, college and public libraries opens up new possibilities of providing library support to urban distance education/off-campus courses.

Urban off-campus services would seem to be an oxymoron at first glance. After all, the whole point of distance education is to deliver services to students who live too far away to be able to get to a university campus. But because of changing student profiles and demands, the concept of geographical proximity as a criterion for delivery of off-campus courses is changing. It is now understood that "distance education" can mean that a university will offer courses "off-campus" but within its own, or neighbouring, urban areas. In this scenario, students live close enough to be able to visit the campus occasionally, or perhaps take some courses on-campus to complete their degree. Given this example, it is possible to imagine requests for library materials coming from "off-campus" students who live within the city. And in fact, this already happens. For example, Athabasca University, whose distance education program is the largest and farthest-ranging in Canada, found that 33% of library requests were generated by students living in Edmonton and Calgary, the province's two largest cities (Appavoo and Hansen, 1989, pp. 13, 29).

Urban off-campus library services are not common, or at least not documented in the library literature as a separate species of library service. Such a service would be well-suited to certain types of universities, which have a large population of commuter students or continuing education students. York University is one such institution.

York is located in Southern Ontario, the most densely populated part of Canada. The Metropolitan Toronto area and its neighbouring municipal Regions are home to over 3.5 million people (Canadian Almanac and Directory, 1991, pp. 5-174-5-192). There are several post-secondary institutions in this urban conglomeration, of which York University and the University of Toronto are thought of as the "Toronto" universities, although their service areas are much larger.

York University's latest statistics show an undergraduate enrollment of 34,983 and a graduate enrollment of 3,363 (York University, 1990). The majority of York students are older and have a wide range of family responsibilities and employment experience. They also do not call the campus home. A recent study by the York University Advising Centre found that only 10% of students live in residence (Accinelli, 1991). The rest are local residents who commute. Not surprisingly, York has an active off-campus/distance education program, administered for the most part by Atkinson
College (the academic entity that is responsible for adult education at York). In 1990/91, there were 17 sites offering courses to 2753 students.

In 1989 York University Libraries and Atkinson College began collaboration on a pilot project to bring library services to four of the 17 off-campus teaching sites. Funding for the project was provided through a grant designed to enhance outreach services to York students. Three of the four sites were located within 125 km of York.

For some years before the beginning of the pilot project, a limited version of off-campus services had been offered by York's social sciences and humanities library, the Scott Library. Scott is the largest library, and also serves as the administrative centre for the York University Library (YUL) system. The existing off-campus service served only one site: the library on the Orillia campus of Georgian College, a community college 125 km north of Toronto. In the existing arrangement, library staff in Orillia had a microfiche copy of York's catalogue and access to the college's WATS line to Toronto. Orders were phoned to the Scott Circulation Department where the staff charged the books out to the Georgian library (not the individual patron) in a sort of modified inter-library loan arrangement. Journal articles were rarely asked for. The materials were shipped to Orillia by van and returned the same way.

The new project was to expand this service to three more sites: the library on the main campus of Georgian College in Barrie, the library at Durham College in Oshawa, and the library of Algoma University College in Sault Ste. Marie (Ontario). The project was to combine features of off-campus library services to distant off-campus sites with the advantages of a location inside an urban area with rich library resources.

The four final sites (the Orillia site was included) were chosen because of their long-standing association with York's continuing education program, and because each site had an excellent library collection. The latter point was particularly important, because it was decided early in the project that the traditional core or deposit collection would not be used. Instead, a collaborative relationship of resource-sharing would be established between the college library and York's Scott Library. This relationship would give York students access to and borrowing privileges at the host libraries. The host libraries would also serve as "home base" for York students by handling requests, notifying students of the arrival of materials, storing and distributing packets of YUL material, returning borrowed materials, and acting as liaison.

From YUL's point of view, the libraries at each site would be ideal locations for the provision of off-campus support services. They would act as surrogates for YUL, providing a ready-made post-secondary level library collection that would include basic reference sources. The limitations imposed by a small, predetermined deposit collection would be avoided. Even more importantly, the college libraries would be able to give on-site reference support with librarians or library technicians. From the host libraries' point of view, this collaboration would provide a systematic and controlled way of giving service to visiting students. The inconvenience of finding storage space for a deposit collection, arranging a special set of circulation procedures, maintaining the security of the loaned collection, and catering to visiting students would be minimized.

In the first year of the project, visits were made to all of the sites, and meetings were held with the library directors and their staff to negotiate how this collaborative process would work. It cannot be stressed enough how important it is to build good relationships with colleagues before beginning such a project. It was important to remember that York's students would be guests of the college libraries, and that even though the off-campus operation was to have as little impact as possible upon the host library, it was inevitable that there would be some change to the daily routine. Since relations between universities and community colleges can be strained at times, it was
important to show respect and appreciation for the college libraries' commitment to the project. Reaction to York's proposal was mixed; some directors were openly welcoming, some were more cautious and agreed to a minimal level of support in terms of space and staff. Equally important was the building of relationships with colleagues in the YUL system. The implementation of an expanded off-campus service required the cooperation of several departments within the Scott Library (Circulation, Reference, Shipping, Facilities (photocopying and fax)), as well as cooperation between branches of the YUL system. The process of developing policies and procedures that everyone felt comfortable with took months, and is still evolving.

Off-campus access to the YUL catalogue was given a high priority, since it would establish a York presence at the host sites, and make it easier for students to find and order YUL materials. It would also have the further benefit of familiarizing off-campus students with YUL's collection, and encouraging them to come to the campus to take advantage of all library services. An added benefit for the host sites was easier access to YUL's holdings. Online access to Yorkline was deferred to the second year of the project, since Yorkline, YUL's new NOTIS catalogue went online only a month before the beginning of off-campus expansion. For the first year, copies of York's microfiche catalogue were sent to each of the new sites.

Once the negotiations were complete and the groundwork laid, practical details of getting the materials into students' hands had to be looked at. It is not within the scope of this paper to describe every detail of the implementation process, but an overview of the first two years of the project will give some idea of the complexities involved in setting up a service like this.

The first thing to be dealt with was how requests were to be taken. It was decided that like many other university libraries involved in distance education, YUL should provide the off-campus students with a collect-call, direct dial telephone line, accessible 24 hours a day. This line is equipped with Phonemail, a flexible voicemail system that allows for high-quality sound recording. Even though 3 of the off-campus sites are relatively close to the York campus, they are all located outside of the toll-free dialing area. The telephone link is used by students for requesting specific materials, reference questions, or general library problems. It is also used by library staff at the host libraries as a free method of keeping in touch with the Off-Campus Services Office for questions, troubleshooting and so forth.

Once requested, the materials would be shipped via Priority Post, the federal postal system's courier service, to the host libraries where York students could then pick them up. The idea of using Priority Post came from Lakehead University, where couriered mail proved to be the fastest and cheapest way of delivering materials over Northwestern Ontario's long distances. The same method proved to be very effective in an urban setting; with shorter distances to travel, overnight or next-day delivery of materials to the sites could be reasonably expected. Van delivery, which had been used when YUL and Georgian College/Orillia had an off-campus library service, was eliminated as a cost saving. It was decided that students would not have materials shipped directly to their homes since most of the students would be within driving distance of their host library. In order to facilitate quick return of materials, each site was provided with a pre-addressed supply of Priority Post labels free of charge.

Sign-out procedures were developed in consultation with the Scott Circulation department. Like the original system in Orillia books would not be charged out to individual students but to a corporate "patron," which was the host library. Any overdue notices, recall notices, etc. would be sent directly to the host library where their liaison person takes the appropriate action. Books would be charged out for the regular two-week loan period, but in fact, a slightly longer loan period was set up in York's circulation system, in order to allow for travelling time. This meant that books shipped off-campus would usually be in circulation for about the same period of time as books
signed out to on-campus users. The advantages of the shorter distances of an urban service become apparent here. Unlike university libraries that must compensate for large distances by charging books out (and therefore making them unavailable to on-campus users) for the duration of a course, YUL's books would only be "away" for the usual length of time, and could be quickly recalled if necessary. Some YUL books were returned late, due to the uncertainties of the postal system, but these were simply backdated so that the "patrons" would not be responsible for fines. Special circulation arrangements had to be made for the students in Sault Ste. Marie. Two factors influenced this: first, because of the greater distance to "the Soo" (approx. 750 km), Priority Post shipments took longer, and cut into the time available to the students to use the materials. Second, the students in "the Soo" were graduate students, requiring longer use of research materials. It was decided that they should be granted the same extended borrowing privileges as on-campus grad students. In order to do this, "the Soo" students had their online patron profiles altered to allow for automatic 90-day loan periods. Requested books were then charged directly to their individual accounts rather than to the Algoma University College library. However, the requested materials were still shipped to Algoma for ease of handling. Since all of the students lived within the city of Sault Ste. Marie, it was easy for them to pick up and return borrowed materials from the college library.

Photocopies for all students were produced free of charge, and were not expected to be returned. They were usually shipped to the host library in a packet along with books. No limit was imposed on the number of photocopies one student could request. Statistics on the number of photocopies were kept and the policy reviewed each year.

Staffing in the first year of the project proved to be problematic. Because the volume of requests was unknown, extra staff were not hired to handle the requests. Instead the duties were shared among Scott Circulation staff, under the joint supervision of the Circulation Department and Off-Campus Library Services. An added wrinkle was the presence of a work-study student, hired by Atkinson College's School of Social Work specifically to retrieve library materials for "the Soo" students. Initially there was no liaison between the School and YUL and the student worked without any direction from the library. Unfortunately the student had poor library skills and delivery of library materials to the Soo students quickly bogged down. When complaints began to come into the library, meetings were arranged with the course director, the student, the Off-Campus Librarian and the Circulation Department. In late November the student began reporting to the Off-Campus Librarian, and the backlog of requests began to clear. As unhappy as this experience was, it showed that there were enough requests to keep a library-trained clerical worker occupied for a half-time position. A proposal to hire a permanent part-time library staff member for the second year of the project was put forward.

In the second year there was very little change in policies or procedures but there were new developments in the delivery of services to off-campus students. The most significant change was the placement of Yorkline terminals at the host sites. At the time of Yorkline access installation, none of the host libraries had an automated system of their own.

Lakehead University was used as a model again in determining how best to achieve remote access to York's catalogue. Based upon the results of a feasibility study done for LU Library's Multiples system (Preliminary Report, 1988), it was decided that York would purchase PC workstations rather than dumb terminals for each host library. There were several advantages to using personal computers. The host sites would gain a microcomputer for their own use in off hours; the users would have the flexibility to download results to either paper or disks; and the machinery would be capable of handling any upgrades in service or hardware, such as multiple database access, bulletin boards, or CD-ROM drive attachments or fax boards. Each workstation would also be equipped with a printer.
Prior to the installation of the equipment, dedicated telephone lines had to be installed at each site. The installation and monthly billing charges were absorbed by York through the grant. Also, iNet (a communications gateway) accounts were set up for each of the sites in order to lower the cost of Datapac telecommunications charges. The equipment that was finally chosen for each site was the IBM PS/2 Model 25, with dual floppy drive and internal modem. Hewlett-Packard Desk Jet 500 printers were chosen for their small footprint and low-noise printing. Each site was also given a copy of YTerm communications software and a menu program allowing them to invoke an automated dial-up procedure. Almost immediately, telecommunications difficulties occurred, which have still not been completely resolved. Because most of the sites are close to the Metro Toronto area, they must compete with all telecommunications users in a very active market with a limited number of public Datapac ports. Once connected to York's mainframe, the users again face the problem of competing for a limited number of ports for access to the library. Most sites learned to use the Yorkline terminals either in the morning or at night.

Staff support came after the installation of the equipment. Since each terminal was located in, or close to the Reference or Circulation areas of each library, it was necessary to train all public services staff in the basic Yorkline commands and searching techniques. Staff were to be responsible for helping York students with their searches, and for changing paper and ink cartridges. However, any problems with the equipment or the telecommunications would be the responsibility of York Libraries. Acceptance of the new technology seemed to come quite easily, with the off-campus staff generally being happy to have an appropriate tool for York students to use. Some frustration had been expressed earlier at the inability of the college libraries to serve all of the off-campus students' needs through the college's own collection. Access to Yorkline eased the frustration somewhat, and shifted the responsibility for finding materials to the user and the York Libraries. The easy acceptance of Yorkline was all the more remarkable given that none of the host libraries had their own online catalogue at the time of Yorkline installation. Their first exposure to an OPAC seems to have been a positive one.

Another technology came into play in the second year. The Scott Library acquired its own fax machine and fax access was advertised to the off-campus students. It was used most by the Algoma students, each of whom had a fax at their workplace. Standardized fax request forms were designed and sent to each host library, in order to make receipt and processing of requests easier. Some library correspondence with students and faculty took place this way, but the fax was mainly used as an alternative to phonemail for requesting materials. It was decided that short photocopies could be faxed to students or faculty if the need was urgent.

The second year also saw the hiring of a permanent part-time clerical assistant. The assistant took over the functions of the work-study student (retrieval of materials) circulation clerk (charging/discharging books, renewals, library card validation, etc), and facilities staff (photocopying articles and preparing materials for shipping). The consolidation of all of these scattered functions into one position made the workflow much easier and faster in the second year. As a result of better day-to-day workflow, the role of the Off-Campus Librarian changed as well. There was much less involvement in the daily activities of the unit, and much more involvement in planning, administration and troubleshooting. The librarian was also able to devote more time to faculty contacts and was able to attend meetings of the Atkinson Outreach Committee.

It was at these committee meetings that the York Libraries learned of the Outreach Committee's intention to expand off-campus teaching and support services. Part of the new plan was the idea of "wheels": courses that would rotate sequentially through the different service areas, thus providing students with the ability to take much of their degrees off-campus. A comprehensive support program was visualized which would providing off-campus students with one-stop remote access to the library, Computer-Assisted Writing Centre, and an electronic bulletin board service. Library
access was seen as one of the most important features of the support network, and the Committee was gratified to learn that a York model of off-campus library service existed.

The idea of using public libraries throughout the service area was put forward, but time pressures did not permit the immediate implementation of the plan. As an alternative, Regional Administrative Centres (RACs) were designed. The first two RACs, scheduled to go online in September 1991, will be storefront locations providing office and workspace to off-campus students. Each RAC will have a complement of equipment similar to the existing arrangement at the college libraries. There will be one significant difference to the new setup. Although students will have access to Yorkline, the RACS will not act as locations for students to pick up books. Since the students will be very close to York and other major Metro Toronto libraries, they will be encouraged to visit the libraries themselves. However, reference assistance will continue to be provided via phonemall, fax, or electronic mail. The RACs are a pilot project. If successful, it is possible this model will be used if York expands into other territories, but there is support on the Outreach Committee for using public libraries as host sites, much the same way the community college libraries are now. If this occurs, a true network of libraries will have been born, with links between university, college and public libraries.

The third year of the project is about to start, with optimism and enthusiasm. There will be changes: two new off-campus sites will require library assistance; one site (Orillia) will no longer be active. Awareness of the off-campus library services is much greater among faculty both on and off-campus, and a better collaboration is occurring with faculty and the library in designing services to the off-campus students. York's experience with a new off-campus library service has shown that partnerships can indeed be developed between libraries in different 'worlds,' and that new models of support for off-campus library services can be developed that will work effectively in non-traditional settings. Even though York University's off-campus students all live in large urban areas, they still create a demand for the type of off-campus library service that has usually been given to students living in remote locations. The changing profile of continuing education students demands that universities and libraries keep up with the times and develop innovative ways to serve their clientele. By using ideas from a variety of traditional sources, York University Libraries have been able to create a new hybrid of off-campus library services, one that combines the best of service to remote users with the convenience that proximity to a wealth of urban library resources brings.
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Off-Campus Library Service and the Accreditation Process
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The opportunity to experience the preparation for and visit of an accreditation team representing the regional accreditation association in two widely separated parts of the country might be considered an unique occurrence. One of the authors has, within the past three years, had that chance. As University Librarian, Merrill Library and Learning Resources Program, Utah State University, there was the occasion to prepare for the decennial visit of a team representing the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges; and as Director, Academic Library Services, East Carolina University, there has been involvement in preparing for the decennial visit of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) scheduled for March 1992.

Although regional accrediting groups are assumed to be in the same business, there is diversity in their standards. A similar diversity in the manner in which campuses respond to and prepare for these decennial visitations can also be noted. The accreditation review is designed to provide an objective examination of the institutional strengths and weaknesses that will encourage opportunities for organizational change and improvement. However, because more than two people are involved in the process, the experience is often politicized and emotionally laden to a degree that inhibits meaningful change from occurring.

Complicating the regional accreditation process is the fact that most universities are subject to parallel, if not duplicative, accreditation exercises from a number of other agencies. In the case of East Carolina University, two dozen additional professional groups review some part of the institution to determine if it is in compliance with their standards or expectations. It is reasonable to assume that the expectations regarding what is appropriate performance in order to be "accredited" will vary between the several groups. This assumption is accurate. Additionally, rarely if ever, will these discipline-specific groups evidence any concern regarding the quality, or even presence, of library support to off-campus programs. In fact, few of these groups seem concerned about off-campus instruction at all.

Northwestern Association/Utah State University Accreditation Process

It could be suggested that there might be differences of philosophy and emphasis between the Southern and Northwestern Association of Schools and Colleges, and indeed there is. The section of the Northwest Association's booklet that relates to library and learning resources contains three sections: Standard, Description, and Analysis and Appraisal. There is no statement in the Standard segment that indicates that the Association believes there is a place for library services delivery in support of off-campus instruction. The only reference to off-campus library support in the entire Libraries segment is found in the Analysis and Appraisal section with this statement.

4. If germane, evaluate the adequacy of materials and services provided to support off-campus courses and programs (Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges [NASC], 1984, p. 46).

Within the standards section of the Continuing Education and Special Instructional Activities segment, there is passing reference to library support.
Special arrangements for adequate library and learning resources support are necessary because of the unique requirements of the continuing education student (NASC, p. 51).

This statement is so broad that it is conceivable that insufficient library resources could be defended as adequate because of "unique requirements." If there had been, within this Continuing Education segment, some reference to the library section, however, the relationship between library resources and services to off-campus programs could have been underscored.

The approach taken by Utah State to prepare for the visit by the Northwest Association's team was to focus on identifying the strengths and weaknesses of each unit in the university. No specific framework was established as the model to be used in preparing these statements; each unit was left on its own to prepare its response. Unlike the Southern Association's document which will be examined later, however, the Northwest did specify in broad brush the types and categories of information that would be expected to be on-hand for the visiting team to examine.

The result at Utah State University was a twenty-one page document with two volumes of supporting examples and statistics that described the current condition of the library and its programs. Twenty-three academic units, departments, schools and colleges, provided their assessments, too. These comments ranged from short paragraphs to three pages. None of them made any comment on the availability or quality of library services in support of off-campus instruction. Apparently, the topic was not of sufficient importance for these units to worry about.

Regardless of the Northwest Association's standards or the University's priorities, Utah State University had developed an extensive program of off-campus instruction. A number of undergraduate degree programs as well as three graduate degree programs were delivered to more than twenty-one sites throughout the state and adjoining states. While some programs were still presented in person at the remote sites, more and more often they were being delivered electronically. If success is measured by increased enrollment, the programs were successful and generated revenue for the institution.

Thus, whether or not the academic programs addressed the question of library support to off-campus programs, the library portion of the University's review presented the work that was being done. The reaction of the Northwest Association's team was positive; no negative comments were received. The team did recommend strongly, however, that some centralization of effort involving the delivery of library and related services to off-campus sites be implemented.

**Southern Association/East Carolina University Accreditation Process**

The process used to prepare for the decennial accreditation review at East Carolina University is different than Utah State's, if only because it is based on a different and more extensive set of criteria. *The Criteria for Accreditation, Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Schools and Colleges, Fifth Edition-1988* is being used by the university as the framework to prepare for its 1992 review. Library-related topics are found in Section V: Educational Support Services. In contrast to the Northwest criteria, the entire section is five pages long with library concerns filling two and a half pages. The subsections covering libraries include:

- 5.2 Library
- 5.2.1 Services
- 5.2.2 Collection
- 5.2.3 Staff
- 5.2.4 Institutional Relationships
- 5.2.5 Library Resources at Off-Campus Sites
The fact that off-campus library resources as an aspect of academic library services is given a separate subsection would seem to indicate that SACS is interested in and concerned about what institutions and their libraries are doing in this arena. This impression is reinforced by a reading of the text of this subsection.

At any off-campus location where credit courses are offered, an institution must ensure the provision of and access to adequate learning resources and services required to support the courses, programs and degrees offered. The institution must own the learning resources or provide them through formal agreements. Competent library personnel must be assigned duties in planning and providing library resources and services and in ascertaining their continued adequacy.

When formal agreements are established for the provision of library resources and services, they must ensure access to library resources pertinent to the programs offered by the institution and must include provision for services and resources which support the institution's specific programs, in the field of study and at the degree level offered. (Southern Association of Schools and Colleges [SACS], 1988, p. 32)

The implications of this section for East Carolina's Joyner Library are substantial. The University's SACS staff have taken the contents of this subsection, along with the rest of the material in the Criteria booklet, and refashioned the statements into a series of questions that each unit must answer. In our case the list of questions that are related to off-campus library services is:

4.1.5 LIBRARY RESOURCES AT OFF-CAMPUS SITES:

251. **4.1.5.1 How do we show that we ensure provision of and access to adequate learning resources and services required to support courses, programs, and degrees offered at any off-campus sites?
252. **4.1.5.2 How do we show that we own the learning resources or provide them through formal agreements at these sites?
253. **4.1.5.3 How do we show that we have competent library personnel assigned duties in planning and providing library resources and services and in ascertaining their continued adequacy at these sites?
254. **4.1.5.4 How do we show that, when formal agreements are established for the provision of library resources and services, we ensure access to library resources pertinent to the programs offered by the University and that those resources and services support the specific programs in the field of study and at the degree level offered? (J. L. Smith, personal communication, August 27, 1991, p. 25)

Without discussion as to the findings at this point, suffice it to say that preparation of the responses to these questions has been an involved process within the University. Library faculty and staff contributed information to the library administration who assembled the appropriate text. That document has been submitted to a Library Subcommittee charged with the preparation of this section of the University's self-assessment. That section, in turn, has been prepared by the subcommittee and reviewed by the library administration and faculty. Changes, corrections, modifications, and emendations have been made. The subcommittee has passed the document on "up-the-ladder" to its parent, the Educational Support Services Committee, for its review. This committee has completed its review, and the document is now in the hands of the campus SACS office for their further review and massaging.
The quality of the responses to the four questions developed by the campus SACS office is strongly influenced by the place distance education has held in the past on the East Carolina University campus. When there is no legislative mandate to undertake an activity, there must be an institutional commitment. Institutional commitments all too often are driven by the strength of personalities rather than organizational philosophy. The result is that the emphasis given to a program will ebb and flow over time.

The History of ECU's Off-Campus Library Service

The history of off-campus library service at East Carolina University is an excellent example of this ebb and flow. Created in 1947 to train public school personnel, the Division of Continuing Education has been the focal point for the University's off-campus program and thus its off-campus library service.

While Joyner Library, the University's main library located on campus, has always been involved to some extent in the provision of off-campus resources, it was most active during the 1970s. At this time, Continuing Education employed on its staff a full-time librarian whose primary job responsibility was to work closely with Continuing Education faculty and library personnel to identify specific resources needed to support off-campus courses. In addition to materials available in the library, other resources were purchased and housed within the Continuing Education facility.

Since Continuing Education funds were limited, other components of the librarian's job included helping to locate specific resources within the University library and checking them out to Continuing Education. Faculty, in turn, circulated them to students; Continuing Education assumed complete responsibility for return of all items.

As with so many good ideas in education in general and academia in particular, this program commitment waned. When the librarian resigned in the late 70s, no one was hired to replace her. It was not long before off-campus library services assumed a different character.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, the University developed two major programs through the Division of Continuing Education: the Community College Contract Program and graduate centers at Fayetteville State University and Elizabeth City State University. In both these programs, the commitment to provide library resources to students was designed to be provided by the libraries and learning resource centers on the individual campuses.

While the assumption on the community college level is that the campus LRC will have resources adequate for lower division work and that the student will transfer to ECU at least by his or her junior year, the provision for graduate resources at the two universities is somewhat different. Since the program's inception, the General Administration of the University of North Carolina system, of which all three universities are a part, has committed funds to expand both the FSU and ECSU library collections. Unfortunately, state budget constraints oftentimes have made this allocation small or occasionally non-existent. The graduate program at FSU is now operating independently of East Carolina University with the assumption that library resources are adequate, but the ECSU Graduate Center remains under the wing of East Carolina's Division of Continuing Education.

Extension courses, those Continuing Education courses developed to address a specific need such as in education or nursing, still rely upon faculty to identify needed resources. Once this is done, the Division of Continuing Education will assist the faculty in finding the materials in Joyner Library and checking them out under the Continuing Education circulation agreement.
Influence of Accrediting Bodies on Off-Campus Library Resources

If this is the history of provision of library resources to off-campus programs at ECU, what influence have regional accrediting agencies such as SACS and professional accrediting agencies such as NCATE had upon this aspect of the Continuing Education program? To be honest, not much.

While the 1973 NCATE accrediting document makes an oblique reference to the “logistics of obtaining materials,” (Library Assessment, 1973) no mention in the Education Department's self-study was made to providing resources to off-campus education courses sponsored jointly by the Division of Continuing Education and the Department of Education. In the 1983 report, even though NCATE was particularly concerned about student and faculty access to resources at the University, again no mention was made of off-campus material delivery. And in the most recent NCATE accreditation visit, while the University's report included a description of off-campus course procedures and a discussion of how off-campus students and faculty interact, it did not address the provision of off-campus library resources.

Up until the current SACS self-study, the situation has been no better. In the University's 1972 self-study, no reference is made to off-campus library resources in either the Continuing Education or the Joyner Library portions of the document. In 1982, the self-study was the University's 10-year planning document. Within it, both Continuing Education and Joyner Library address off-campus resources, Joyner obliquely, Continuing Education specifically. Throughout several objectives, the library refers to the funding and provision of resources to all programs, voicing particular concern about appropriate graduate materials. Continuing Education, however, specifically identifies "Improvement of library resources" as one of its goals with further discussion as an objective:

Library facilities and library resources for some off campus continuing education programs need extensive support and upgrading, especially for graduate programs. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall create a committee to investigate and report the type and levels of library support needed by various continuing education programs; of particular concern shall be the serious problem of library resources and facilities for off-campus graduate centers. The committee shall incorporate both off-campus and on-campus representatives and representatives from every graduate program offered through the Division (Long-Range Planning, 1982, p. 243).

Unfortunately, since the objective was to set up a committee, it could be met without substantial change in the system or resources.

As previously mentioned, the 1992 SACS self-study has returned to specific standards which all areas of the University must address. In so doing, each department, school, and division is required to respond to the Standard 5.2.5: Library Resources at Off-Campus Sites delineated above. Response at ECU was uniform; off-campus library resources are inadequate. The University administration, Division of Continuing Education, and Joyner Library all recognize that students in off-campus courses are not receiving resources equal to those provided to on-campus students. And yet, while the library's self-study, based on University-wide response, addresses in no-uncertain terms this important aspect of its mission, the report slated to leave the University as its official response seeks to down-play this perceived deficiency. If these resource needs cannot be addressed within the final document, little change is likely to occur.

Thus, it appears that the commitment to off-campus library resources is much like motherhood, apple pie, and the American flag. While everyone recognizes that all students, both on-campus and off-campus, deserve equal access to resources beyond the textbook and classroom lecture, the reality is that, at least at East Carolina University, they do not receive equal access. And while the
recognition abounds that this is indeed the case, particularly within both the Division of Continuing Education and Academic Library Services, the accrediting agencies which carry so much clout as far as allocation of resources is determined, do not require that this equality of access be maintained. When equality of access has been approached, as in the 1970s when Continuing Education hired its own librarian, it has been provided by individual unit or personal commitment rather than University commitment and regional or professional accrediting standards.

References


Needs Assessment: The Basis For Sound Program Planning

Janice Bradley  
Washington State University Pullman

Gretta Siegel  
Washington State University Vancouver

Carol Terry  
Washington State University Spokane

Introduction

Library administrators make program decisions all the time. Sometimes these decisions are based on intuition, sometimes on reflex, and sometimes on hard data. Increasingly the literature addresses the need for administrators to become more responsible in decision-making; to learn to assess needs and plan programs based on collected data.

Hernon and McClure (1990, pp. 10-11) state that without an evaluation component effective planning cannot take place. Evaluation findings must be an integral part of the planning process. For our purposes here we are using the terms "program evaluation" and "needs assessment" interchangeably to indicate that some sort of management data is collected, tabulated and analyzed, and then used as a basis on which program decisions are made and justified.

Hernon and McClure present a Planning and Evaluation flowchart (see on next page) which indicates as one of the early steps, conducting a needs assessment of the library and its environment. This is what was done by Washington State University's Extended Campus Library Services' (ECLS). The flowchart provides a good map of how to effectively proceed through the planning and evaluation process.

This paper will first describe how each Washington State University branch campus evolved; what kind of library service the original Task Force recommended be available at each campus; and what the state of branch campus affairs was by late 1990. Next, the development and distribution of the survey instrument used to gather data will be described. Finally, the studies' results will be discussed.

Overview of WSU Branch Campus System

Through legislation and state funding, the WSU branch campus system was established on July 1, 1989. Prior to that date, WSU had offered courses in the Tri-Cities for nearly four decades, beginning with the General Electric School of Engineering in the 1940's, then through the Joint Center for Graduate Study at Hanford from 1958 through the 1970's. More recently, WSU was part of a five-university consortium known as the Tri-Cities University Center. In 1988, as part of the state Master Plan for Higher Education, WSU was designated the primary provider of upper-division and graduate education for the region. A library had been developed early on at the Tri-Cities facility, which collected resources in support of the courses offered. A full range of library services was available which was directed by a full time librarian.

As the lead institution in the Southwest Washington Joint Center for Education in Vancouver, WSU began offering graduate programs in engineering and computer science in 1983 to meet the area's growing need for advanced technical education. The University expanded its Southwest Washington offerings in 1985, first with education courses, then with the MBA program in 1986.
Planning and Evaluation Flowchart

Reprinted with permission from Evaluation & Library Decision Making

In 1987, WSU received approval to initiate an undergraduate degree program in Vancouver. Library support for course offerings came through the Clark College Library, which received financial resources from WSU. It was not until December 1990 that a librarian was hired by WSU Vancouver, and planning and implementation of library services had begun.

WSU has offered continuing education courses in Spokane since 1913. In the 1950's, WSU introduced engineering courses and student teaching programs in Spokane. In 1970, pharmacy and nursing internships began in Spokane hospitals. In the mid-1980's, WSU leased a downtown facility where master's degree programs in engineering were offered. In 1988, as part of the Master Plan for Higher Education, WSU was designated the primary provider of graduate education and research in Spokane. Initially a classified person was hired to coordinate library services through the Library Information Network Center (LINC). In August 1990 a librarian was hired by WSU Spokane to take over administration of the WSU Spokane Library.

Original Task Force Recommendations

A Task Force was appointed in September 1987 to create a plan for providing effective library services at the developing campuses in Vancouver, Tri-Cities and Spokane in preparation for the
anticipated establishment of a WSU branch campus system. The Task Force's recommendations can be summarized in ten points:

1. Rely on main campus libraries for major library research resources and services.

2. Rely on WSU Director of Libraries and Center Directors to have final authority and decision-making responsibilities in regard to libraries and library personnel.

3. Provide small reading room library facilities at the WSU Spokane and Vancouver sites and expand the library space in the WSU Tri-Cities Center.

4. Establish cooperative library agreements and contractual library services with appropriate area libraries to assist in provision of reference and clerical support, library monographs and serials resources, and other library services and functions.

5. Equip all library facilities on-site (and some of those with extensive contractual services) with a toll-free telephone access to WSU; search only capabilities to WLN/COUGALOG electronic mail capabilities; a telefacsimile machine; a photocopy machine; a microcomputer terminal to be used for related word processing statistical record keeping capabilities; a microforms reader/printer; and adequate shelving and reader stations for WSU, etc., if these are not already available on-site.

6. Hire adequate permanent, professional and/or clerical support for each on-site reading room library facility to cover hours library would be open and to provide limited public service assistance.

7. Provide adequate funding for necessary staffing, acquisitions, telecommunications, equipment, office supplies and services, etc.

8. Provide adequate funding to establish cooperative agreements and contractual services via selected local/area libraries.

9. Provide adequate funding for periodical travel by appropriate personnel to and from library and Center sites.

10. Provide the WSU Director of Libraries with signature authority for library acquisitions, postage and mailing, goods and services, and other operating expenditures.

These recommendations were ready for implementation in 1989 when the branch campus system was formally approved and funded by the State Legislature.

State of Affairs by Late 1990

By late 1990, the Task Force's recommendations had been implemented to varying degrees in the three branch campus libraries. From the establishment of the WSU branch campus system in July 1989 to August 1990, there was a permanent librarian at Tri-Cities, no librarians at either Vancouver or Spokane. Multiple people rotated in and out as Acting Head of Extended Campus Libraries Services, which is an administrative position located on the main campus in Pullman, until October 1990 when the position was finally filled. The branch campus libraries were in various stages of disrepair.
Library services available at the three campuses were vastly different. They ranged from an established library in Tri-Cities to no library at all in Vancouver.

Courses had been being offered in Tri-Cities for several decades under different auspices and a library had been developed; however the facility had long ago outgrown its space and the staff was having difficulty keeping up with service demands.

The WSU Spokane campus originally implemented what was referred to as LINC (Library Information Network Center) which was staffed by part-time paraprofessional staff. There were virtually no resources housed on site with remote borrowing being the way in which programs were supported, but this was not working well.

WSU Vancouver contracted with Clark Community College to provide library services to WSU students. This arrangement was implemented because the WSU Vancouver campus was (and will be for several years) housed on the Clark Campus. The time had come, however, to provide their own library support for the WSU Vancouver curriculum.

In early 1990, the Washington Library Association President, on behalf of the Association, shared with the Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board the memberships’ concern about the lack of library support being provided by parent institutions to their branch campus faculty and students. The state’s community college libraries, public libraries and private academic institutional libraries were all concerned that they were going to shoulder the burden of providing the library support and they were not interested in serving in that role—their missions didn’t incorporate it nor were they funded to provide that level of service.

Rumors of poor library service to branch campus patrons were rampant. WSU branch campus faculty and students were channelling their complaints about library service through the WSU Extended Academic Programs office in Pullman and everyone was anxious to see some changes take place. Concern was also being aired by parent campus faculty and administrators about the branch campuses draining off scarce resources. By the end of 1990 it was clear something must be done, and soon.

This all indicated a need for some sort of evaluation or assessment of the current situation. We wanted to avoid making knee-jerk decisions on what needed to be changed, added or deleted. However, we did not have a large window of time in which to develop a strategy and then collect and analyze our data. We set out to identify what information was needed and how best to obtain the information.

Survey Instrument

It was determined that we would rely on a survey questionnaire to collect data. Development of the questionnaire involved the Head of Extended Campus Library Services, the branch campus librarians, branch campus deans and WSU Libraries Directors Council.

Also needed was approval by the Institutional Review Board, which is charged with insuring that individual’s rights are protected any time a University-sponsored research project is conducted. It was necessary to pre-test the instrument to see if the types of responses we received were what we expected. The pre-test did produce a few minor problems with the questionnaire. We now had a survey questionnaire that was ready to distribute.

Distribution, it was determined, should be very unstructured yet as comprehensive as possible. It would not represent an attempt at random sampling or allow for tracking returned surveys. This
decision was driven by a very short timeline in which to complete the project. The campus librarians had copies of the survey and cover letter for each faculty person and every student on their respective campuses. They gave packets of surveys to faculty, who distributed them to their students. Completed surveys were either turned in to the library or sent to the Head of Extended Campus Library Services on the main campus.

Discussion of Results

In the three and a half months that it took to develop, distribute, collect and tabulate the survey it was necessary to make some decisions. These had to be made without the benefit of data but relying on our best judgment. We did find that much of what we suspected and based our decisions on was later verified by the data.

The return rate was disappointing at all three branch campuses. We had 15% returned at Spokane, 13% at Vancouver and 39% at Tri-Cities. Interpretation of the low return rate is difficult. Of those returned, virtually none were from the branch campus faculty, but primarily from students. This was puzzling since most complaints came from branch campus faculty.

The low return could mean that frustration with the library services really was not high, or that frustration was so high that the campus faculty and students saw no use in filling out the survey, or everyone was too busy to complete the survey and return it. Because of the unstructured nature of distribution, we had no way to follow-up on the "non-receipts."

Obviously, the low return rate makes it impossible to use the data for anything other than to get a general idea of the "direction and velocity of the wind."

We solicited responses on the survey in the following areas:

•how frequently did they use the campus library to complete assignments or conduct research
•how frequently did they use other area libraries to complete assignments or conduct research
•determine level of satisfaction with service received at the campus and local libraries
•which area libraries were used
•what services were used at the campus and local libraries
•rate document delivery service
•indicate hours they would like the library to be open
•access to and use of the main campus mainframe
(see Appendix for the complete survey questionnaire)

Of the respondents from three campuses on use of the campus and local libraries, most used the campus library at least once to complete assignments and conduct research. Use of local libraries was no less than 99% of those responding. The services used at the campus and local libraries were:

•Reference assistance
•Online searches
•CD-ROM searches
•Interlibrary Loan
•Cougalog
•Document Delivery from the main campus
•Used books, journals and other resources just in the branch campus library
•Made photocopies
• Just to study
• Other (viewing videotapes, reserves, etc.)

When asked to respond to satisfaction with services received at campus and local libraries the responses for the campus library ranged from 58% to 85% falling between "poor" to "average." It is interesting to note, however, that many comments offered indicated high satisfaction with the library staff but not the services provided.

Satisfaction with services received from local libraries was significantly higher than the level of satisfaction with the branch campus library services. Respondents from all three campuses ranged from 82% and 88% with responses falling between "average" and "excellent."

Responses to what hours the respondents would like to have the library open indicated we should be open from early morning to late night. However, there seemed to be groupings: Spokane clustered from 10:00am to 6:00pm, Monday through Friday; Vancouver from noon to 8:00pm, Monday through Friday; and Tri-Cities from 2:00pm to 10:00pm, Monday through Friday. It was very difficult to interpret the responses to this question as it was misunderstood by the majority of the respondents.

The final set of responses clearly indicated that access to and use of the main campus mainframe was minimal. This is an uncomfortable piece of information given the assumption that the branch campuses are linked through the network capabilities that exist between the main and branch campuses. The expectation is a strong reliance on telecommunications and electronic technology by branch campus faculty and students.

Conclusion

Although the return rate was low and the results would not bear the scrutiny of scientific significance, the information we gathered did provide us with data which can be used in the decision-making process. As we prepare budgets for each branch campus library we can use the survey results to:

• indicate that most of the services used in the campus and local libraries are those which require library staff with a high level of expertise; we cannot, therefore, rely on students for our primary staff
• indicate where the most frequently used library hours group, so if we have to trim hours we know where to cut
• indicate low satisfaction with service received from campus library and to be responsive to this lack of satisfaction.

The findings also substantiated assumptions made about the level of satisfaction with library services on the branch campuses and what the library patrons perceived to be the major problems.

We plan to use a revised version of this survey questionnaire next year to measure our progress. Utilization of a more structured methodology will not only be desirable but possible given we are no longer operating in a state of emergency. We will have the luxury of time and our results will have a higher degree of validity.

Reference

Appendix

Extended Campus Library Service

Needs Assessment

1. Campus at which you are completing this questionnaire (check one):
   
   _____ Spokane
   _____ Tri-Cities
   _____ Vancouver

2. Status (check one):
   
   _____ Faculty
   _____ Student

3. Employment Status (check one):
   
   _____ Work full-time outside the home
   _____ Work part-time outside the home
   _____ Don't work outside the home

4. Number of times you use the WSU extended campus library during a semester, to complete class assignments or conduct research (on average):
   
   _____ 0
   _____ 1-5
   _____ 6-10
   _____ 11-15
   _____ 16 or more
   _____ Not Applicable (WSU Vancouver respondents may find this the most reasonable response)

5. Number of times you use area (academic and/or public) libraries, other than your extended campus library, during a semester, to complete class assignments or conduct research (on average):
   
   _____ 0
   _____ 1-5
   _____ 6-10
   _____ 11-15
   _____ 16 or more
6. Please check all appropriate statements below, as they pertain to completing class assignments or conducting research:

- There was no WSU extended campus library to use (WSU Vancouver only campus where this is true)
- I use the WSU extended campus library
- I use other area academic libraries
- I use other area public libraries
- I go to Pullman to use WSU libraries
- I was not aware there was a library on campus
- My understanding or perception was that the library did not have materials I needed
- I completed assignments without using library resources

7. If area libraries (academic and/or public) were used to complete assignments, please list them:

8. If you used the WSU extended campus library which services did you use? (check as many as appropriate):

- Reference assistance
- Online searches
- CD-ROM searches
- Interlibrary Loan
- Cougalog
- Document Delivery from Pullman
- Used books, journals and other resources just in the library
- Made photocopies
- Lasercat
- Just to study, didn't use any library resources
- Other (Please list)

9. What is your overall evaluation of the level of satisfaction from your WSU extended campus library experiences:

```
1  2  3  4  5
Poor Excellent
```

Other Comments:
10. If you used area libraries (academic and/or public) which services did you use, to complete class assignments or conduct research? (check as many as are appropriate):

- Reference assistance
- Online searches
- CD-ROM searches
- Interlibrary Loan
- Used books, journals and other resources just in the library
- Made photocopies
- Lasercat
- Just to study, didn't use any library resources
- Other (Please list)

11. What was your overall evaluation of the level of satisfaction from your library experiences at local libraries?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. I would generally rate document delivery service between WSU Pullman and your extended campus library as:

- Better than the service I could get from an established, full-service library
- Comparable to the service I could get from an established, full-service library
- Turnaround time is longer, but the support services available at the extended campus library make the overall service acceptable
- Unacceptable turnaround time and level of service available at the extended campus library
- Want to reserve judgement until I've had a chance to evaluate the service now that a librarian is available at the extended campus library

13. Indicate which hours you would be most likely to use the extended campus library, by placing a "1" in your top priority, "2" in next priority, etc. Please prioritize only those hours you are likely to use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>8-10</th>
<th>10-12</th>
<th>12-2</th>
<th>2-4</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>6-8</th>
<th>8-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Do you have a microcomputer at home/office which is capable of accessing the WSU Libraries online catalog (Cougalog)?

___ Yes
___ No
___ Don’t know

15. If the answer to #14 was yes, have you searched Cougalog in the last six months?

___ Yes
___ No
___ I tried, but couldn’t get into Cougalog
___ I tried, but didn’t know how to use Cougalog to find what I needed

16. Do you have access to CMS or PROFS on the WSU mainframe?

___ Yes
___ No
___ Don’t know

17. If your answer to #16 was yes, do you regularly use CMS or PROFS?

___ Yes
___ No

18. Please share your comments regarding existing extended campus library programs, hours and staffing as well as suggesting other services you would like to see available at your extended campus library.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Please return this completed questionnaire by February 22, 1991. It may be returned to your extended campus library or sent to Janice Bradley, Washington State University, Holland Library, Room 460A, Pullman, WA 99164-5610.
Providing Off-Campus Library Service Using Academic/Public Library Cooperation and Remote Access to Sophisticated Online Systems

Ruth Britton
University of Southern California

David B. Combe
Ventura County Library Services

The University of Southern California School of Social Work has entered into an agreement with the County of Ventura to offer a Master of Social Work program on the site of the Government Center in Ventura, located some seventy miles from the USC campus in downtown Los Angeles. The program was created to fulfill the needs of both the School and the Ventura County government. With more than two hundred social work positions, Ventura County was maintaining a 13 - 15% vacancy ratio, as well as a 25% turnover. Projections indicated that shortages of social workers will be increasingly acute, and a multi-faceted approach was needed to attract and retain qualified people, especially bilingual multicultural personnel. At the same time, the USC School of Social Work needed to maintain enrollments during a time of declining applications (Work Force 2000 Committee, 1991, p. 38). Current trends have increasing numbers of students enrolled in social work programs at off-campus locations. In May of 1990, an agreement was reached between the University and the County of Ventura to offer a three year part-time program leading to a Master of Social Work degree at the County Government Center beginning with the Fall, 1990 semester (Ventura County Personnel Department, 1991).

The County of Ventura agreed to pay a portion of each employee/student's fees. In exchange, a formula was worked out requiring continuing employment with the County.

Securing a site and transporting faculty to locations some distance from central campus facilities are not difficult to achieve. Equal quality for these programs, with the same goals and objectives, the same course content, and the same expectations of students in the preparation of assignments is a built-in part of off-campus planning.

Usually as an after-thought, consideration is given to the provision of some form of library service. In 1982, the Association of College and Research Libraries published its "Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Services" to mixed reviews from the librarians who were affected, with a final version published in 1990 (Association of College and Research Libraries). In succeeding years, a body of material has been published to help the librarian faced with such a dilemma plan ahead and make considered choices for the services that can be offered.

Faced with the proposition of providing library service to the newly formed off-campus social work program, the two authors met for the first time in April of 1990. The goal of the meeting, in addition to the beginning of a professional relationship, was to identify choices and to set up some "menus" for planning and implementing services to our incoming students. Budgets for both of our institutions were in place for the coming school year. Money was very tight, and there was no possibility of funds from either operation for materials needed by this new program. Earlier off-campus activities offered by the School had given the Social Work Library some experience, but this was the first exercise in Library cooperating with Library to support such an effort.
The USC Social Work Library has a collection of approximately 35,000 volumes in the field of Social Work, and it currently receives approximately 124 journal titles. It operates as a unit of the Central Library system, so it has the resources of a major university available for its students. Access to the collections of the USC Library are available by means of a sophisticated automated system, which includes access to the on-line catalog HOMER and to USCInfo, a collection of 13 periodical databases.

In 1988, the Ventura County Library Services Agency had established in the County Government Center a special library, the Government Center Reference Library, to meet the work-related information and library needs of county departments and employees. The library provides reference assistance, including on-line access to DIALOG, interlibrary loan, and a space for the consolidation of the departmental reference collections that had developed over time.

The missions of the two libraries became clear. They were to meet the library needs of county employees, and to support the USC off-campus program. This united two libraries owing service to a common group: 23 USC graduate students who were also Ventura County employees.

It is possible to implement a program of library service that makes use of a variety of combinations of ideas. Some of the components we considered for our program are as follows:

CORE COLLECTIONS: USC agreed to provide a core collection of required and recommended readings for the courses offered each semester. As the program has continued, books provided for completed courses are left in place, allowing the core collection to grow. Files of six professional journals, starting from 1980, have been supplied to the center. These journals include American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Clinical Social Work Journal, Social Casework (now Families in Society), Social Service Review, and Social Work Research and Abstracts. Social Work Research and Abstracts provides an index to the social work literature. The main campus library produces monthly Current Contents of Selected Journals, which reproduces the title pages of periodicals received by the Social Work Library. This is used in the GCRL to maintain a database which shows which other area libraries receive these journals.

FORMAL AND INFORMAL USE OF OTHER AREA LIBRARIES: It was clear that the described material would prove useful to both the students and the staff at the GCRL, but that this collection could not begin to provide adequate material for a graduate level program. Neighboring university libraries, while offering useful collections, did not support graduate programs in social work. All of our students worked and had family responsibilities. This made the substantial commute to nearby institutions or needed visits to the USC campus a hardship. A way for students in Ventura to access USC's collections, and have material on campus quickly available to them was not only imperative but their right as USC students.

ACCESS TO ELECTRONIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS FROM REMOTE LOCATIONS: Online access to the holdings of the central university library from the Ventura location was a top priority if our operation was to be successful. HOMER, the Libraries online catalog, provides information about the materials the Library owns and where they are located, with records presently complete back to the early 1970's. It also displays status information about these materials. USCInfo provides computerized indexing for magazines, journals and newspapers at no charge to the USC community. Fourteen databases are now available, including Social Science Index, PsycInfo, Medline, Pals, and the National Newspaper Index. The system can be used at various library locations or from a home or office computer using a modem.
With a capacity for remote access searching already available in the Government Center Library, staff from USC's Library Automation Development Department came to Ventura, provided software with required protocols allowing downloading from the systems, and installed and tested the linkups. Ventura County pays the telephone connect charges.

Searches are performed at the Government Center Library, students select the books and articles they want to see.

DOCUMENT DELIVERY SERVICES: As students identify materials necessary to their studies, plans do include an organized way of transporting those materials to them at their off-campus location. Availability and location are confirmed in Homer or the Union List of Serials, and requests are faxed to the Social Work Library. Available staff gather material or photocopy as appropriate, not only from the Social Work Library's collections, but from other USC libraries as well. Responsibility for initiating and receiving requests at the off-campus location, delivery of materials to student requestors, and arranging for return of materials to the main library are the responsibility of the Ventura location. Original plans for document delivery included participation in a document delivery service operated by the central library. Costs generated by this system seemed prohibitive, and delivery time was slow. With teaching faculty assigned to both campuses, they are recruited to be our couriers. Deliveries were thus made once weekly, with occasional use of the fax and next-day mailing. For those items not owned by USC, regular Ventura County interlibrary loan procedures are followed, including using OCLC.

REFERENCE SERVICE: Provision of reference service to a student in an off-site location can be an exercise in professional discretion. How much searching main campus collections for requested information can be done before it becomes the librarian's search and not the student's? How can students at an off-campus location be involved in the strategy of their search, learn from the process, and become better library users? Use of computerized literature searching provides an opportunity for the user to participate in strategizing his search and limiting his topic. The search itself then permits him an opportunity to select those references that are the most relevant and make his own intellectual decisions. Telephone access to the main campus location, while a part of many off-campus operations, was not considered necessary in our case. Access to reference assistance is available by use of the Ventura library.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION: Bibliographic instruction at key points in their learning careers can be an essential component in the learning experience of social work students in off-campus programs. Original plans made by the two of us included an organized visit to the main campus library as part of our library orientation activities. However, this plan did not materialize. Entering social work students at all locations are invited, prior to their enrollment, to an orientation session at the Social Work Library on main campus. Some came from Ventura, others were given briefer introductions to the library on Saturday visits, and the idea was abandoned. Both librarians participated in the opening briefings held in Ventura and library service became faces, names and locations to the students. Visits to the classrooms and written instructions that related to key assignments smoothed the path for more effective use of the services that the libraries offered. Orientation to a special assignment involving extensive research on policy issues included a presentation by the Ventura librarian using transparencies, printed handouts, and an introduction to the collections of the Ventura County Law Library.

What has been the student response to these services? To find out, a brief survey was distributed to the students after two semesters of coursework and partway through a research class during the summer of 1991. (See Appendix).
With a mean age of 39.11 years, many of the students already have work experience. Nine (39%) are employed by the Public Social Services Agency, six (26%) by Mental Health, five (22%) by Corrections Services Agency, and one (4%) by Health Care Agency. Two other students (9%) are employed by private nonprofits in Ventura with county contracts to provide selected services. In addition, six students already have master's degrees in other fields.

Students were asked to rate the adequacy of library facilities available, including the Government Center Reference Library and other facilities near their home on a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 being "Extremely good" and 7 being "Extremely bad".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th># students</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40% of the students rated adequacy of library service near their home as above average. 70% of the students rated it average or above, when "extremely bad" is defined as having to "generally drive to the main campus for library resources." Not one student reported having to do this.

Students were next asked to indicate the libraries they most used to support their research needs. There was some confusion, with some students ranking more than one library as the one they used most frequently, and some merely checking those they had used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th># 1st</th>
<th># 2nd</th>
<th>#3rd</th>
<th>Total 1-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USC Social Wk Lib.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCRCL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Library</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Lutheran</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camarillo State Hosp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura Cty Law Lib</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura Cty Medical O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal State Northridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxnard College</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura College</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six students (26%) indicated that the GCRCL is their library of first choice, we hope for convenience. Four (17%) indicate that they go to USC first. But when the first three choices of students are combined, the main campus collection is the first choice of 61% of the students. 48% choose the GCRCL when the first three choices are combined.

We believe this is as it should be. Our program can provide core collections in Ventura with reference service from a librarian, access to collections from the main campus, and bibliographic
instruction. Ultimately, graduate education requires use of and familiarity with graduate level library research collections.

Each student was asked to write three strengths and three weaknesses of the library services supporting the USC MSW program in Ventura. Similar comments with slight wording differences were combined.

**STRENGTHS**

- GCRL staff willingness to help 19
- Computer hookup with USC/Online searching 6
- Weekly delivery of materials from campus 6
- GCRL convenience, location, hours 6
- Core collection from USC 4
- USC Social Work Library collections, hours 3
- Ventura Library ILL services 2
- Cooperation between USC and GCRL 2

The top four strengths of this program, as evaluated by the students, are four of the five items the authors feel are the strengths of the program. That the core collection is housed in a library with professional staff, located where the students are taking their classes is different than USC's past extended campus library programs. The computer hookup for access to collections is a vital component of our program's success, and the delivery of the student-identified material back to Ventura makes the system work. We were surprised that the quality of the core collection received few high marks. The materials sent from USC are those identified by the instructors as necessary for the class.

**WEAKNESSES**

- Limited number of journals, too few books 9
- Distance to USC 9
- GCRL circulation policies 4
- GCRL hours not convenient for those not working in Ventura, no weekend hours 4
- Turnaround time between USC/GCRL too slow 1

The most frequent concern of the students is the small size of the core collection. While we recognize this as being true, the authors believe that the lack of financial resources (and space in the GCRL), explain the root cause of this problem. The system developed between USC and Ventura County, the online connection and the delivery system, are designed to address this major problem. As noted above, however, graduate education assumes a graduate research collection. The entire resources of the USC library services are available to all Ventura MSW students, granting the need for travel to campus or the time to deliver material to Ventura.

The circulation policies in Ventura have generated more ongoing comment from students than any other part of the program. Because of the small size of the core collection, which has a minimum of duplicate material, it was decided early on to limit circulation of the core collection to 24 hours. Students not living or working in Ventura have been critical of this policy. Experiments allowing student to keep material longer have in turn generated complaints that material is not available in a timely manner for other students to obtain required readings between class meetings.
Given the nature and purpose of the collection and the lack of funds to duplicate material the authors have found no solution to this dilemma.

The concerns about GCRL hours are more a problem with staffing than hours. The library is staffed Monday through Friday from 8 am to 5 pm, but as a matter of policy the doors have not been locked (the library is inside a four story building with 24 hour security guards), allowing access from 6:30 am to 6:30 pm Monday through Friday. Students have been permitted to check out material to themselves when the library is not staffed. Into the third semester, only one book has "disappeared." Outside these hours, access to the building is available to county employees on presentation of ID badges and signing a security form.

We believe that we have in operation a system that works. The student/employees, if they avail themselves of it, have a program that provides access to the graduate level research collections that they need to receive a quality master's education. Service is provided with a minimum of bureaucracy, and in a way students are seen and treated as distinctive individuals receiving individual reference service from professional librarians. It is a model that we think others may consider and follow.
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Appendix

Please complete this brief questionnaire considering your use of library facilities as it pertains to your research needs for your participation in the USC New Program offered in Ventura. Please consider the totality of all classes completed by or in progress as of this date.

Please rate the adequacy of library facilities available to you. Include the Government Center Reference Library and other facilities near your home.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Extremely good, I've had no problems
Extremely bad, I generally drive to Main campus for library resources

23 QUESTIONNAIRES
1:  5  2:  2
3:  2  4:  7
5:  2  6:  5
7:  0

23 TOTAL RESPONSES THIS QUESTION

Please prioritize all library resources that you have used in order of frequency.

(EXAMPLE: Rate Ventura College Library #1 if you use that library most frequently, UCSB Library #2, if you use it second most frequently, etc.)

____ Government Center Reference Library (#1:5; #2:5; #4:2)
____ USC Social Work Library (#1:4; #2:6; #3:4; #4:1; #5:1; #7:1)
____ Other USC Library, please specify _________
    UNNAMED: (#12:1)
    SOCIAL SERVICE: (#3:1)
    NORRIS: (#9:1)
    DOHENY: (#4:1)
____ Ventura County Library, specify branch(s) _________
    CAMARILLO: (#4:1; #5:1)
    FOSTER: (#2:3; #3:3; #4:6; #5:3)
    UNNAMED: (#3:2; #7:1; #11:1)
____ Ventura College (#2:1; #4:1; #5:1; #7:2)
____ Oxnard College (#2:1; #4:1; #6:1; #7:2)
Moorpark College (#7:1; #8:2)
Santa Paula City Library (#7:1; #10:1)
Thousand Oaks City Library (#4:2; #5:2; #9:1)
University of California, Santa Barbara (#1:2; #2:3; #3:3; #4:1; #7:1)
Camarillo State Hospital (#1:1; 3:1; #5:1; #7:1)
Ventura County Medical Center (#3:2; #4:1; #6:1, #7:1)
California State University, Northridge (#1:1; #6:1; #13:1)
Other, please specify

CAL LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY: (#2:1; #3:2)
OXNARD PUBLIC LIBRARY: (#4:1; #7:1)
PERSONAL LIBRARY: (#7:1)
SANTA BARBARA PUBLIC LIBRARY: (#13:1)
VENTURA BOOKSTORE CAN ORDER ALMOST ANYTHING: (#7:1)
VENTURA COUNTY LAW LIBRARY: (#1:1; #2:1)

In the space below, please describe up to three strengths and up to three weaknesses of the library services supporting the USC MSW program in Ventura. COMMENTS HAVE BEEN ABRIDGED AND OR COMBINED.

STRENGTHS:
- GCRL STAFF WILLINGNESS TO HELP, EFFICIENT (19)
- WEEKLY COURIER SERVICE FROM USC (6)
- HOOKUP WITH USC COMPUTER/ONLINE SEARCHING (6)
- GCRL CONVENIENCE, HOURS (6)
- DEPOSIT COLLECTION FROM USC (4)
- USC SOCIAL WORK LIBRARY GREAT, HOURS (3)
- COUNTY LIBRARY ILL SERVICE (2)
- COOPERATION (2)
- UCSB HAS BEST HOURS (2)

WEAKNESSES:
- LIMITED JOURNALS AT GCRL/TOO FEW BOOKS (9)
- DISTANCE TO USE, OTHER COLLECTIONS (9)
- GCRL CIRC POLICIES (4)
- GCRL HOURS INCONVENIENT FOR THOSE NOT WORKING IN VENTURA CANT GET INTO BUILDING NIGHT/WEEKENDS (4)
- VENTURA COLLEGE LIBRARY CLOSED WEEKENDS (1)
- NEARBY LIBRARIES W/BEST HOURS DON'T HAVE APPROPRIATE COLLECTIONS (1)
- CLASSES START OUT BEHIND, CONSEQUENTLY WE ARE ALWAYS BEHIND IN LIBRARY USE (1)
- USC SOCIAL WORK LIB HOURS TOO LIMITED (1)
- NO ACCESS TO USC INFO/HOMER (1)
- TURNAROUND TIME IS TOO SLOW BETWEEN GCRL AND USC (1)
- WE ARE FORCED TO PLAN FOR ASSIGNMENTS VERY FAR IN ADVANCE (1)
- MATERIAL IN GCRL LIBRARY IS INAPPROPRIATE FOR ASSIGNMENTS (1)
OPTIONAL

Male ___ Female ___ Age ___

Ventura County employee? No ___ Yes ___ Dept. ____________________________

BA received from: ________________________________________________________
Degree in: ______________________________________________________________
Other Masters? No ___ Yes ___
MA received from: ________________________________________________________
Degree in: ______________________________________________________________

MALE: 5
FEMALE: 18
U.READ: Alternatives to On-site Bibliographic Instruction

Susan E. Cleyle
University of Regina Library

The University of Regina is a mid-size Canadian university located in the western province of Saskatchewan. This province comprising of approximately one million people is for the most part a rural area. People live in small towns or on their family farms. The major urban areas, Saskatoon and Regina both have universities. A Community college network provides academic education to the rural communities and the universities have for decades played an integral role in this delivery of distance education.

At the University of Regina, approximately 150 distance education classes are given, either on-site, or via video-conferencing. Classes vary in subject and depth, from introductory arts and sciences, professional classes to graduate courses. These courses support approximately 2600 students, faculty and instructors who register with the University of Regina and its six affiliate institutions. These classes are for credit and students are expected to complete the same requirements as their on-campus counterparts. Therefore, access to academic library support is imperative.

Prior to 1988, library support for these classes consisted of answering a few individual inquiries and sending packages of books to remote sites. A modest extension collection was kept in the Main library but by the mid-1980's it had become dated and was virtually useless.

U.READ

In the fall of 1988, the University Library became an active participant in the delivery of distance education classes. It introduced a centralized library service called U.READ (University of Regina Education at A Distance). The primary mandate of this service was and still is: "to supply equal library services for the off-campus population." The provincial library system in the past had been supporting this client base and their interlibrary loan resources were heavily burdened with University requests. The U.READ program enabled the University of Regina Library to finally assume responsibility for these clients.

A toll-free number is the main avenue for students to request materials, information and/or assistance with papers and other class work. The decision was made in 1988 to have U.READ utilize the on-campus collection, instead of building an off-campus collection. This choice has shaped the way U.READ provides bibliographic instruction and it is worth explaining the reasons behind it. Angel and Budnick note that separate collections are expensive and would not supply adequate resources for the off-campus population (1986, p. 17). Cost was a major reason for keeping a centralized collection but space and the wide variety of classes offered, solidified the decision to utilize the on-campus collection.

As a result, U.READ's main obligation was to provide a document delivery service first and bibliographic instruction second. As the program has changed and developed, so has the pledge to bibliographic instruction. U.READ now endeavours to overcome the challenges and frustrations of successfully delivering BI in an off-campus environment.
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It should be noted that U.READ did attempt to supply bibliographic instruction in the first year of operation. The Instructional Support Librarian travelled to sites and met with classes, describing the resources available in the local libraries and how they would be best served by those collections. However, the resources available in many of these libraries were at best inadequate. Sessions on the use of the University Library's microfiche catalogue were ineffective and of little use to the off-campus client. With limited resources available to conduct the research process, bibliographic instruction provided on-site was of little interest to the client and question periods often turned the discussion to the document delivery aspect of U.READ.

After the first year, this type of travel virtually stopped. The number of requests had increased substantially and document delivery took precedence over travelling to provide bibliographic instruction.

Marie Kascus and William Aguilar have noted that it is the libraries role to facilitate independent learning and U.READ never forgot this. Since the experience of the first year, U.READ has endeavoured to facilitate this independent learning with bibliographic instruction tools designed to be used without the need for an on-site visit by a librarian. U.READ wishes to place the onus of selection back on the remote users' shoulders and in so doing demonstrate the research process and the role it can play in a quality education. The tools U.READ employs are: a Library Video, a Library Guide and Citation Lists.

**U.READ Videos**

The University delivers three classes through the Saskatchewan Communication Network (SCN) and these videoconferencing classes are delivered via satellite to potentially 50+ sites. Each site is supplied with a television and VCR. It was felt that if the library went to the client with a visual record of what resources were available on-campus, then U.READ would break the magic hat syndrome of "presto," a package is received in the mail after one phone call.

The result was a two-part video that displays the variety of resources available in an academic research library and the process U.READ completes to determine the best possible materials for each individual request. A tour of the Main Library and its resources/services became the first part. The second is an outline of the U.READ service and how clients can tap the wealth of knowledge on-campus. In effect, the video displays how U.READ goes through the research process by following the staff as they fill a subject request. Although no bibliographic instruction of actual sources are discussed, it is felt that this video performs a very important function. It describes for the student the different TYPES of resources an academic library houses and how they are all accessible. The tour video has also served as an excellent "ice-breaker" for students participating in the librarys introductory BI classes given on-campus.

**U.READ Library Guide**

U.READ goes into more detail about the research process with its library guide. Working on the visual description of the research process outlined in the video, the library guide goes into a fuller, more complete discussion of the steps involved including: "Defining the topic," "Looking for books and journals," and "Putting the paper together." The guide describes the basics of using catalogues, indexes, LCSH, CD-ROM, and OPACs. Sources from each category are exampled for those students who may visit a local library or make the trip to the libraries on-campus. Students are encouraged to get "hands-on" with the sources discussed.
U.READ Citation Lists

The third piece of bibliographic instruction provided by U.READ is CITATION LISTS. U.READ staff complete searches of the OPAC, as well as the print and CD-ROM indexes pertinent to the topic requested. The lists from these sources are then searched to determine what is available in the library and the call numbers are noted. A cover page is attached to outline the list's source (e.g. Wilson's Social Science CD-ROM). Clients are asked to mark the sources they wish to receive and the list is returned to U.READ to be filled.

These Citation Lists have successfully placed the onus of selection back on the shoulders of the client. They are basically permitted to browse the stacks for available materials and determine which would be suitable to them. The potential of these lists is tremendous. However, experience shows that lists can only be used for the first part of the semester. Mail time and due dates do not permit U.READ to use them after the middle of the semester. The key is to promote to the student to call U.READ at the beginning of the semester and with a conscious effort, these lists will play a stronger role in filling requests.

Conclusion

Bibliographic Instruction offers the greatest challenge for any Distance Education librarian. Students are frustrated by their distance and the handicap of being separated from the mainstream. Instruction must place less emphasis on "how to use" the sources, and more on the process itself. The sources are often not accessible but their use and value must be explained. As technology opens the doors to remote OPACS and indexes, instruction should then be adapted to include these sources. It is far more important to explain to the client the various steps involved in looking for research. The on-campus client acquires that information as soon as he/she poses a question to a reference librarian. Incorporated in the response is the description of the source being used and why that particular type of resource is important. But for the distance education client, that explanation is not provided, only the information obtained from those sources.

Distance education students are truly imaginative in their methods for obtaining information: talking to local specialists, visiting nearby museums, or local social service agencies, writing to authors. If distance education librarians focus their BI tools and techniques to the process, then the combination of the information that document delivery provides, the ingenuity of the distance education student and the theory of the research process could produce the truly *well-educated* students of the future.
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Bibliographic Instruction of Off-campus Students
Using Local Area Libraries

Monica Hines Collier
Central Michigan University

One of the goals of Central Michigan University's Off-campus Library Services (CMU, OCLS) is to provide bibliographic instruction; "instruct users about systematic methods of identifying, retrieving, and using information" (Central Michigan University, Off-campus Library Services, 1988). Over the years the CMU off-campus librarians have made a concerted effort to provide bibliographic instruction to as many CMU off-campus students and faculty as possible, to assist in their use of library resources, as well as to market the library services.

It has been stated in the library literature that the type of bibliographic instruction most favored by users is point-of-use instruction, which strengthens user confidence by addressing immediate needs on site (Peyton, 1982). CMU's Off-campus Library Services setting is mainly decentralized, apart from the main campus library, thereby requiring the use of local libraries and referral agencies to provide point-of-use bibliographic instruction. The Michigan Metropolitan (MIMET) region of CMU's Off-campus Library Services has utilized several local libraries for the provision of bibliographic instruction for the MSA 600, Administrative Research Report Method course.

This paper will examine the outcome of resource sharing through the bibliographic instruction sessions provided by CMU librarians for CMU off-campus students, at local area libraries.

Background

Central Michigan University Extended Degree Programs offers both undergraduate and graduate courses in approximately 55 centers throughout the United States, Canada and Mexico. Seven professional librarians work with off-campus students and faculty to provide reference and referral assistance, and bibliographic instruction.

The MIMET Region offers courses to approximately 3,000 off-campus students in the Detroit metropolitan area. Two off-campus librarians located in Troy, Michigan, work exclusively with the MIMET students.

In January, 1990, the MIMET region began to offer MSA 600, a course in administrative and research methods as a prerequisite to the core courses for the Master of Science in Administration (MSA) degree. The course is designed to acquaint students with research processes and tools used in selecting and developing a problem, project, or issue for analysis. The course is the precursor for the final integrative project for the MSA curriculum, MSA 685. The course methodology includes lecture, discussion, and group work for the development of working research proposals and instruments. The fourth class session is comprised of reviewing the literature...library resources and procedures. It is during this class session that a CMU librarian provides a bibliographic instruction session.

The CMU OCLS librarians worked as a group to create a bibliographic instruction module for the MSA 600 course. The CMU MIMET librarians contacted local librarians to acquire permission to use their facilities to present the module. The local librarians approached were all acquaintances
or colleagues of the MIMET librarians, which increased the chances of acceptance. In addition, the CMU MIMET administrators advised that interactions be limited to local libraries whose institutions and programs were not in direct competition with CMU's extended degree programs. MSA 600 bibliographic instruction sessions were scheduled for two and one half hour intervals at the Troy Public Library for Troy Center students, at the Henry Ford Community College Library in Dearborn, and the Schoolcraft College Library in nearby Livonia for Dearborn Center students, and at the Mott Community College Library, and the Flint Public Library for the Flint Center students. Sessions were held during the evenings when the local librarians expected the least amount of local library patrons. Each library provided a conference room for lectures/ demonstrations and question/answer periods, and the use of the reference section for the hands-on use of card catalogs, indexes and abstracts, electronic sources, and specialized reference sources such as Statistical Abstracts, and The Encyclopedia of Associations. Sources that were not owned by the local library were provided by the CMU librarians.

The goal of the sessions was to assist the students in creating the beginnings of a bibliography which could be used for the research project proposals compiled in the MSA 600 class. Students were given handouts which included work sheets to use in conjunction with the demonstrations and hands-on library exercises. During the demonstrations and library exercises, students were cautioned that the local library may not hold "everything" on their topic due to the curriculum or community supported, but were still encouraged to try. Fortunately, each of the libraries subscribed to the basic indexes such as Business Periodicals Index, and Social Sciences Index, and Infotrac; and were members of consortiums thereby allowing students to locate books on their topic through card catalog networks.

Students were also given evaluation forms which were collected at the end of the sessions for immediate feedback. Additional responses to the library sessions which were given on the instructor's end-of-course evaluation were forwarded to the librarians. As the number of MSA 600 classes increased, and the number of students per class also increased, it became difficult to schedule all of the bibliographic instruction sessions in local libraries. Some of the sessions were held in the CMU off-campus classrooms, while others remained in the local libraries. The hands-on use of the card catalog was obviously eliminated; instead the use of on-line catalogs was emphasized with specific instruction on the use of CMU's on-line catalog, CENTRA. Copies of indexes, abstracts, and specialized sources were brought to the classrooms for hands-on use. At a later date, students from both the local library and classroom bibliographic instruction sessions received another evaluation form, thus allowing the librarians to compare the sessions.

Outcome

Overall, local librarians, colleagues, and local library patrons were very accepting of CMU's bibliographic instruction sessions in the local libraries. The host librarians were extremely cooperative and even offered to assist in the sessions. Local library patrons appeared interested in the sessions. During the hands-on exercises, several patrons mistook the CMU librarians for local librarians and asked for library assistance. The colleagues of the local librarians seemed intrigued; however, in one case, a local librarian had not informed his colleagues of the CMU visit, nor was the colleague aware of CMU's off-campus library service. The colleague expressed her displeasure that CMU would "take advantage" of her library's collection.

Most of the CMU MSA 600 instructors are adjunct from the fields of business and education. The instructors valued the bibliographic instruction sessions whether they were in the library or the classroom setting. It was noted that a two and one half hour block of time away from their lecture was welcomed by most and disdained by a few. In fact, midway one of the sessions, one instructor asked that the librarian "cut it short!" However, two of the instructors who are professors at area
colleges insist that the sessions continue in the local libraries regardless of the sizes of the classes, and the dates available.

Many of the MSA 600 instructors try to convey knowledge useful to the final integrative project in the proposal writing done in the MSA 600 class. They feel that the library sessions are valuable in assisting the students in the beginning preparation of the literature review needed for the integrative project. The instructors have also commented that they have "learned a few things" from the bibliographic instruction sessions.

Student responses were also favorable. Evaluations of the bibliographic instruction sessions in the library compared to the classroom sessions were evenly divided, even though written comments seemed to favor the library setting. Students felt that the wide variety of resources available in the library such as Infotrac made the library sessions more beneficial. They also commented that becoming familiar with the location of resources in the library was another advantage. "The visual reinforcement of the library setting lends to the understanding and familiarity of the research process. This familiarity makes one more comfortable in returning to the library setting."

Comments in favor of the classroom setting included closer interaction with fellow students, the ability to hear the questions and answers during the hands-on library exercises, the convenience of attending the session in one's own classroom, the familiarity of the classroom setting which is more conducive to open discussion.

Additional favorable comments included requests that the sessions be held earlier in the class, and for more practice time.

The only unfavorable comments consisted of problems with parking, the feeling that a great deal of class time was wasted on concepts that should have been learned at the undergraduate level, the long length of the sessions, and "stolen class time."

**Summary**

CMU off-campus students found the use of the local libraries for bibliographic instruction very beneficial. Their evaluation comments mainly focused on the content of the sessions rather than the location. The information acquired in the MSA 600 was useful in their research experiences in other courses, but particularly for the literature review for the final integrative project.

The initial information provided by the MSA 600 instructors seemed to play a role in setting the tone of the expectations of the students, as well as in their attitude about its importance. Many preconceived impressions and library/librarian stereotypes were erased.

Kelly, in her discussion of library privileges for off-campus faculty and students has stated that local libraries have a professional obligation to serve as a means of encouraging reciprocity in resource sharing (Kelly, 1988). CMU's use of local libraries for bibliographic instruction for its off-campus students has thus far proven to be successful, as displayed by its students and extremely cooperative local library colleagues.
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The Role of Librarians in Faculty Development Activities

Julia A. Daniels and Robert Trullinger
Central Michigan University

Professional development activities for university and college faculty have traditionally been seen as content-centered conferences where papers are presented and discussed. Only recently have these conferences included sessions on the teaching of content and examples of how individuals have made their classes, particularly at the survey level, more interesting to students. In general, colleges and universities, even within the education departments, have not stressed effective teaching methods and strategies nor have they committed time and resources to training faculty in the potentials and the use of state-of-the-art teaching technologies.

Faculty development in-service training in teaching strategies has become increasingly important as the academy has become older and as the student body has become more diversified in age and ethnic origins. The day of facing a classroom full of mostly blank faces and lecturing on the course subject with dulling persistency is gone. The issue is not that contemporary students have been raised on the immediacy and hype of television. They have been and they expect entertainment, but what is much more important is that we know so much more about how people learn and about the importance of variety in instructional approaches so that, at some point during the class, we touch on the most effective learning style of each student. Also, the increase in computer-assisted instructional tools as well as the new and comprehensive means of accessing information have improved the ways in which the instructor can provide content information for the students. In addition, the development of accessible academic programs for working adult students and others who lack the means of matriculating on a campus as full-time students has meant that new scheduling formats have been created. Instructors have had to modify their teaching approaches to be more effective with students who bring considerable experience and practical knowledge to the classroom and who are looking for information that can be readily and effectively applied in their work and personal lives. Faculty from traditional institutions often have problems adjusting to the longer class sessions entailed in evening and weekend courses, to the students who seek to participate actively in discussions and who challenge professorial assertions and theories, and to the use of new instructional technologies. Often faculty are put in these non-traditional teaching situations with little or no training, and, when the experience proves unsatisfactory, they are critical of the students and of the institution's efforts to be more accessible to new clientele groups. Without properly training instructors, non-traditional programs set themselves up for considerable frustration and anger on the part of both the students and faculty.

Consequently, faculty development activities in non-traditional programs are a key element in successfully meeting the expectations of the students and assuring that the instructors are most effective and receive the intangible rewards of knowing and feeling that they have done a good job. The instructor must be given the general profile of the students he or she will be teaching, must be introduced to adult learning theory so that he or she will understand his or her own learning style and be aware of the importance of developing some instructional activities which speak to the learning styles opposite of his or her own, and must be introduced to the instruction tools and services that are available to instructor and students alike. Information should be presented on the various instructional strategies that might be used in various combinations, such as small group discussions and projects, integration of films and videos into the course, computer applications,
effective writing assignments to accomplish the learning objectives, and computer-assisted instruction. In carrying out professional development activities for faculty in both non-traditional and traditional programs, librarians can and should play an active role. At the very core of their role within the higher education community and within society as a whole, librarians are committed to preserving the accumulated knowledge of human existence, making it accessible to all who are interested in acquiring that knowledge, facilitating the learning process, and participating in both formal and informal educational activities to ensure that the necessary information is available. Librarians are an essential element in assuring the academic integrity of the educational process. Therefore, their role in the faculty development activities is important because of the information and insights that they have regarding the instructional process and in building strong ties between themselves and the faculty.

While this paper is based on the experience of a large, non-traditional extended degree program at Central Michigan University, its basic themes are applicable to traditional campus programs. Improving instructional effectiveness for traditional students should be as important as for non-traditional students. Librarians on campus often are isolated in the library, away from the departmental faculty, and are not viewed as they should be as an integral part of the instructional process and as they are in many non-traditional programs. Every effort must be made to encourage both administration and faculty to understand that librarians do not just catalogue books and check them out to students and faculty, but that librarians are committed to an active involvement in the improvement of the instructional process in the classroom whether it be on campus or off.

The involvement of librarians is very important for the regular campus faculty who work within the academic environment and have easy access to the library, but it is even more crucial for the part-time and adjunct instructors who are not associated with the institution on a daily basis. The part-time instructors need to learn about the services offered to them and their students and to be brought up-to-date regarding the technology available in accessing library materials and information. Many of the faculty, both regular and part-time, did their undergraduate and graduate work at a time when the highest technology available in the library was the card catalog and the typewriter for preparing past-due notices. Computerized card catalogs, data-based searches, and electronic delivery of documents are new to many instructors who must be trained in their usage before they can expect their students to use them effectively in their class.

Areas for the Librarians' Involvement

Probably the most important contribution that librarians can make as part of the professional development activity is the description of the services provided to both students and faculty and how these services can be utilized before and during the course.

Professional academics as well as conscientious students are loath to admit that they might not have all the skills necessary to use the library. This is particularly true because the use of technology in libraries has changed dramatically the way information is accessed and the range of sources that can be utilized. Faculty and students are supposed to be comfortable in the library, and, if not, they believe they will undercut their credibility as instructors. Consequently, it is always good to approach faculty in a non-confrontational manner with information about the library and the new services that are available to them and their students. Through the informational presentations, faculty are exposed to current library procedures, shown how to use the computerized catalog either within the library or from a distance, and encouraged to make more extensive use of the library's resources. The faculty will find the librarian to be eager to help, non-judgmental about their questions, and ultimately very approachable and professional.
Particularly for part-time faculty it is mandatory to provide an orientation to the library services. By definition these people are removed from the campus and usually have not had a first-hand experience with the library. Also, they are often not current on the academic literature relating to the content of their course and need assistance in identifying appropriate textbooks and soft-ware as well as keeping their supplemental reading lists current. In all cases, the librarians can provide considerable information and assistance in these tasks which seem so simple from the campus perspective but which are very difficult for the occasional instructor.

Preparation of Research Assignments

It is common knowledge to librarians, but not to most faculty, that the librarians can provide much useful information to the instructor about how to structure research assignments during his or her course and what information to give to the students about how they can access the needed research materials. Writing and research assignments are often given by faculty in the most sketchy way without the student having a clue about what the instructor wants and how to be successful in completing the assignment. This is often due to the instructor's own lack of certainty about the procedures involved in gathering the information. By providing information to the instructors about contemporary research procedures and methods as well as providing valuable assessments of the resources available to the students undertaking the research, librarians can perform a great service for both the instructor and the students. A research assignment in which the librarian has had input should give the students the information they need to be successful, if they are so inclined. Once instructors realize how helpful the suggestions of the librarians can be and that librarians want to provide this type of service, the relationship between librarian and faculty will be sealed.

Copyright Information

Another important service that the librarians can provide for faculty is a clear and precise definition of the laws relating to restrictions on reproducing copyrighted materials. The recent steps taken by publishers and the FBI to protect copyright holders must be described, and faculty must realize that the simple act of copying articles or portions of books for one’s class without getting permission from the copyright holder is a crime. The librarians are in the best position to describe what needs to be done to obtain permission to use copyrighted materials, and hopefully the library service will provided assistance in securing the needed permissions before course-packs, handouts, etc., are produced. As part of this discussion, the librarians should also address the same issues as they relate to video-tapes made from radio and/or television broadcasts.

In the past faculty have been able to ignore the copyright laws and have justified their actions on the basis of educational needs and the importance of the instructor having available the best and most current information. Faculty will be resistent to the notion of getting copyright permissions, but the librarians must make the case in favor of legal behavior and must give the faculty a fairly simple procedure to use for obtaining the permissions in the most convenient way possible.

Participation in Round-table Discussions

Another way in which librarians can contribute to the professional development activities is by participating in the development of the materials that serve as the basis for the faculty in-service seminars on teaching effectiveness.

The Extended Degree Programs at Central Michigan University has developed video-tapes on faculty development topics that are used in in-service presentations. These tapes deal with such issues as teaching in compressed formats, improving the writing skills of adult students, and teaching quantitative subjects to non-quantitatively oriented students. The process for developing the tapes
involves identifying faculty with excellent reputations in the topic area, bringing them to campus for a day-long round-table discussion that would be video-taped, and then editing raw tape into short presentations that can be used to stimulate discussions in faculty development seminars.

The roundtable discussion between six to eight faculty and experts in the specific area creates a lively exchange that encourages the evolution of new information and practical suggestions that will improve teaching effectiveness in the program. These round-table discussions have often led to insights and directions for new work that were not anticipated when the round-table was originally planned.

Frankly, librarians were not involved directly in the first endeavors which dealt with compressed teaching formats and the teaching of quantitative material to students who do not possess particularly strong quantitative skills. A librarian was involved in the planning and was present off-camera during the taping of the round-table to provide immediate suggestions and evaluation.

For the round-table discussion on improving the writing of adult students, a librarian was one of the on-camera participants and provided a unique and complementary perspective to the contributions of both faculty who teach writing and those who use writing extensively in their subject matter specialties. Because so much instructional writing is the result of research through library materials, the librarians are intricately involved in the student's endeavors. They are particularly aware when an instructor gives paper assignments that are not clear and do not give the student enough direction in regard to the nature of the writing expected and to the definition of the topic. The librarian on the round-table was able to address the appropriate role for the library services and to articulate the librarians' concerns that they often spend considerable time helping the students define their topics, determine the appropriate level of research to be undertaken, and figure out the direction that the assignment should take. From this round-table discussion, the importance of the librarian in helping faculty develop fully their writing assignments was highlighted and appreciated for the first time by many instructors. It would not have occurred if a librarian had not actively participated on the round-table panel.

In addition, the librarian played a vital role in contributing a supplemental reading list for the published materials about good assignment development for instructors which evolved out of this particular roundtable discussion.

Class Presentations

The role of the librarian in helping the instructor develop clear, complete, and useful research assignments was discussed above. Another aspect of this same issue, but outside of the formal faculty development activities, is for the librarian to participate in the classroom discussion of the research project and related activities. This participation should be more than just simple bibliographic instruction; it should be related specifically to the research that will be expected in the course or in the degree program in which the student is enrolled.

The most crucial aspect of this activity is found in the pre-planning between the librarian and the instructor. The librarian and instructor must work closely so that the information provided regarding research materials and procedures will meet the needs of both the students and the instructor and that the instructor is involved in the presentation. Often instructors view the librarian's presentation as a necessary evil that has the silver lining of giving him or her a break from formal presentation. However, as the instructor understands that the librarian's practical information will enhance the educational experience for the students and sees that the librarian's portion can be most meaningful for the students if they see the instructor's commitment to serious
research, the success of the presentation for the students is assured. Consequently, every effort should be made to develop a team approach with the instructor. In most cases, it will be the librarian who must walk the extra mile to make certain that this is accomplished.

Curriculum Development

A more indirect faculty development activity, but no less important, is the role of the librarian in discussions, research, and assessment of resources in the construction and revision of academic programs and degrees. Librarians can make important contributions in the development and revision of curriculum. They bring to the discussions knowledge of the ways to gather information about similar programs and about changes in the content area.

Information about programs at other colleges and universities can be used by the faculty to assure themselves that they are on the right track and also to show them how their academic program will be positioned in the academic marketplace. Occasionally, the faculty may even discover that their program is too "run-of-the-mill," and they will want to tailor it differently to give the program a unique quality. However, in most cases, academic curricular bodies do not like to venture too far into the realm of innovation so they will be most interested in how the new or revised program reflects those at "prestigious" or comparable institutions.

In addition, librarians can provide the faculty with lists of the available literature, both books and serials, in the content area. With this information, the librarians can give an assessment of the institution's library holdings in the areas on which the new or up-dated curriculum will concentrate. This is particularly significant because adequate library support for a new or revised program is essential if the program is to have any academic credibility and substance. At the graduate level this is especially true. Students must be able to undertake appropriate supplemental reading and pursue substantive research assignments without having to rely heavily on libraries at other institutions. Also, accrediting bodies are very concerned that the institution's library has adequate resources to support its degree programs.

This assessment will give the faculty and the institution's administration some idea of one major cost factor in developing or revising an academic program. If the library's collection is judged to be at least adequate, large expenditures for new book and serial acquisitions might not be necessary. If the collection is not adequate, bringing the library's holdings up to a reasonable standard might be more costly than the institution wants to pay or can afford. Regardless of the outcome, the librarian's involvement from early in the curricular process is essential for efficient and thoughtful curricular development.

Conclusion

Librarians can play vital roles in faculty development activities for both traditional and non-traditional programs and institutions. Their most obvious function in these activities is to orient the instructors to the services that are available to them and their students from the library. Less obvious but in many ways more important, is using these activities as a way of building relationships between librarians and faculty and encouraging faculty to understand that librarians can be a direct and indirect source of information, advice, and direction which will contribute to the effectiveness of their teaching. Faculty will see that librarians can give them beneficial information that will lead to better research by students and better written assignments being turned in as well as having more current reading lists for their course outlines and more useful information about how to conduct their own research.
Above all, the most important benefit of all in having the librarians play an active role in faculty development activities is to foster the notion among faculty that librarians are vital members of the instructional team who contribute in many and varied ways to the success of the educational process both on campus and off.
Contracting With Local Libraries For Off-Campus Library Services

Allen Dollerschell
Rochester Community College

Many colleges offering off-campus programs put great effort and expense into delivering library services to their students, regardless of the distance involved. In many cases, the courses are offered in another educational institution with a library, often a community college. However, a formal arrangement rarely is made with another library to provide service for off-campus students.

In southeastern Minnesota, three colleges offering off-campus courses in Rochester have contracted with Goddard Library at Rochester Community College (RCC) to provide library service for their students. By pooling funds from these colleges, Goddard Library has been able to increase its hours, service, staff, and collection. This benefits students from all four institutions.

Rochester, population 65,000, and located in a county with a population of 106,000, reluctantly claims to be the largest city in the United States without a four-year college. This isn't entirely true, as the Minnesota Bible College offers a baccalaureate degree to about 25 students each year, but only in religious studies.

Somehow, Rochester never attracted a liberal arts college or university, nor even a branch of one. When the perquisites were being assigned during the early years of statehood, Rochester was given a state mental hospital rather than a teachers' college. When the Lutherans and the Roman Catholics were establishing colleges throughout Minnesota, Rochester was passed by. The city fathers even named a street College Street, but it attracted nothing but houses.

In 1915, Dr. Charles Mayo, as a member of the Rochester school board, introduced a motion to add a two-year "university department" to the high school, and Rochester Junior College was born.

Perhaps Dr. Mayo foresaw that the Mayo Clinic, already attracting national attention, would develop into a world-renowned medical complex of clinics and hospitals—employing 16,000 by 1991—and have a critical need for educational opportunities for its employees, especially in the medical sciences and support areas.

In 1956, IBM opened a research and development plant in Rochester, resulting in a housing boom that continues today. Currently, IBM in Rochester employs 7400, and has an ongoing need for programs in electrical engineering and computer science to attract, develop, and hold its employees.

Such a demand for higher education made the city an attractive market for regional colleges interested in offering upper division and graduate courses. Several colleges responded, but they were reluctant to make long-term commitments. Individual courses were offered as long as they made money, but there were no promises of a total program offering leading to a degree.

In the late 1960s, the state funded a consortium office to plan and coordinate course offerings, and prevent duplication. Unfortunately, after several years a state budget crunch occurred, and the consortium disappeared.
Probably the only lasting contribution made by the consortium was its effort to bring the city's librarians together to discuss ways of providing library service to students taking classes miles away from the offering institution. As a result of those meetings, the greatest need that emerged was to develop a union list of periodicals in Rochester libraries. The consortium funded the compilation of a list identifying periodical holdings at about 40 sites. Many of these sites could not be called "libraries," but they hold back files of professional journals, and are willing to allow student access. This list continues to be updated regularly under the leadership of the Rochester Public Library.

In 1964, Rochester Junior College evolved into Rochester State Junior College when the Minnesota legislature created a state-funded system of junior colleges. A few years later, the name was changed to Rochester Community College (RCC) to reflect more accurately its mission to the local community, despite its state-wide funding. With the opening of a new campus in 1968, RCC began a period of rapid growth in enrollment as it established an identity separate from the local school system. In that same year, RCC established an associate of arts degree in nursing, absorbing two local hospital diploma programs. Additional programs in other health sciences, marketing, mass communications, and technology soon followed.

In 1972, the Mayo Medical School was established. Thus, higher education in Rochester continued to develop with a growing lower division college and a graduate school but with only a haphazard offering of upper division courses in-between.

In 1984, Dr. Thomas Stark, president of Winona State University (WSU) saw Rochester as a focal point for WSU expansion. WSU is a former teacher's college located 40 miles east of Rochester. Because WSU had been a provider of courses in Rochester since 1926, Dr. Stark now proposed to the legislature that since Rochester's demand for WSU's services continues to grow and because WSU has developed strong supportive ties with Rochester Community College, a two-plus-two concept has emerged as a cost-effective way to provide an answer to long-felt education needs of Rochester. The two-plus-two concept merely divides the course work leading to a baccalaureate degree between RCC and WSU. Rochester Community College offers the first two years and Winona State University offers the final two years. In addition, WSU offers graduate programs, while both institutions offer continuing education and special purpose courses. (Stark, 1984)

To facilitate the cooperation, he proposed sharing services and facilities, such as library, bookstore, and cafeteria.

The legislature endorsed the proposal, and the Rochester community responded enthusiastically, with a grant from the Rochester Area Foundation to fund $125,000 to acquire library resources over a five-year period. The acquired materials (periodicals, a small reference collection, and audio-visual hardware and software) were housed in a former Rochester elementary school where WSU held its classes.

Ironically, when the legislature voted to close the Rochester State Mental Hospital in 1985, it opened the educational window of opportunity that had eluded Rochester in the 1850s. The legislature sold the hospital site and buildings to Olmsted County for one dollar. The county then sold the major portion of the facility to the U. S. Bureau of Prisons for a federal medical prison, and used a part of the proceeds to erect a building on the RCC campus to house the WSU programs.
With the opening of that building in 1986, Winona State University-Rochester Center (WSU-RC) was firmly established as an education provider in Rochester. It offered all necessary course work for 14 majors and three master's degrees (nursing, business administration, and counselor education).

To confirm this commitment, WSU-RC entered into a formal contract with Goddard Library at RCC to provide library service for its students. The agreement stated as its objective: "Rochester Community College's Goddard Library will provide equal access of its facilities and holdings to RCC and WSU students" (Interinstitutional agreement, 1986).

Since the Rochester Foundation Grant expired at this time, WSU-RC had to find funds to continue its periodical subscriptions, develop a permanent book collection, and provide personnel assistance. WSU-RC agreed to fund a reference librarian from 4:30 to 7 p.m. Monday through Thursday, and for four hours on Saturday. RCC had not had a librarian on duty during those hours, and it was anticipated that many WSU-RC students would use the library during that time frame. Since the majority of the WSU-RC students were non-traditional, most of their classes met in the late afternoon and evening so they could continue their day-time employment.

WSU-RC also agreed to fund a 3/4 time technician to assist with interlibrary loan and periodicals. Although the major portion of the WSU-RC materials budget was spent on periodical subscriptions, the need to borrow articles and books increased rapidly. Additional funds were provided to cover the costs of cataloging and processing the materials collection.

The two-plus-two program with WSU-RC has become a successful complement to RCC's offerings, especially in the areas of nursing, computer science, and business (accounting, business administration, business finance and marketing). Other WSU-RC undergraduate programs include elementary education, psychology, sociology, and social work. Approximately 1,550 WSU-RC students enroll in more than 75 courses each quarter. About 20 full-time Rochester-based WSU faculty are actively involved in developing the Goddard Library collection. Each department is assigned a portion of the library budget by the director of the WSU-RC, and faculty recommend purchases to the acquisitions librarian. All funds are transferred to the Goddard Library budget, but are accounted for separately. Upon receipt, all materials are stamped as "Goddard Library-WSU-RC," but are integrated into the Goddard collection.

Although some part of each librarian's salary is paid for by WSU-RC, each is an RCC employee and works under the contracts of that institution; no one is designated as a WSU-RC librarian.

The University of Minnesota-Rochester Center (UM-RC) offers about 50 classes each quarter at a location about two miles from RCC. Many of its courses are aimed at IBM employees and are offered via ITV from the Minneapolis campus. UM-RC offers the master's degree in computer science, electrical engineering, and several areas of education, plus courses in the liberal arts and health sciences.

Following the lead of WSU-RC, the UM-RC agreed to contract with Goddard Library beginning in the fall of 1988. This contract provides for 520 hours of library staffing per year, and the purchase of periodical subscriptions and books to support their programs.

In May of 1991, ground was broken for a legislatively funded $17 million university center addition to the RCC campus. When completed in 1992-93, this building will bring the UM-RC classes onto the RCC campus, and provide for a 10,000 square feet addition to Goddard Library.
Use of Goddard Library by UM-RC students has been slow. This may be because their courses are offered away from the RCC campus, many U of M students are IBM employees with access to the company library, and the professors generally commute from Minneapolis, and are unfamiliar with local library opportunities, despite repeated efforts to inform them. Use is expected to increase dramatically when the university center is opened.

St. Mary's College of Minnesota-Rochester Center is one of two graduate centers operated through St. Mary's College in Winona. They provide five master's degrees in education, health, and business. About 110 students enroll in 25 courses offered during each of three semesters each year.

The St. Mary's contract with Goddard Library, which began in the fall of 1989, pays the cost of employing a reference librarian for four hours each Sunday. The remaining funds allow additional office time for other staff members. Because the St. Mary's College graduate programs in Minneapolis and Rochester operate independently of the undergraduate campus in Winona, the home campus library had no reason to offer support to its graduate programs offered elsewhere. Like the WSU-RC and UM-RC students, many of the St. Mary's students were familiar with the RCC library, and it seemed natural for them to continue to seek its services and use its collections.

Advantages of the Contract System

1. LOCAL LIBRARY. Faculty and students have a local library they feel is theirs, and that will respond to their needs. Faculty prefer to work with one library staff with contracted responsibility to provide reference assistance for them and their students, and which will recommend, order, process, circulate, and borrow material. Many of the students are former or concurrent community college students, and are comfortable with familiar staff, collection, setting, and policies. While they may use several other libraries in the city, they know at least one is responsible for their needs.

2. LARGER SHARED COLLECTIONS. Combining funds from four budgets into developing one collection makes a larger selection available to all students. This avoids the duplication that would be necessary if each of the colleges were to build its own collection at four sites in the city. Community college students have access to many indexes, references, and periodicals not ordinarily available in a lower division college library.

3. LONGER HOURS. Pooling funds allows for more hours of access than could possibly be available if four libraries operated independently. This is especially important when serving non-traditional students who may need to juggle library hours around work, child care, social, and civic obligations.

4. STRONGER STAFFING. A reference librarian is on duty all of the 75 1/2 hours the library is open each week, providing quality assistance and service to library resources at any time.

5. ADDITIONAL SERVICES. Faculty and students have access to database searching, interlibrary loan services, and bibliographic instruction. Goddard Library is a participant in the PALS online catalog, which indexes the collections of about 35 Minnesota academic libraries and ten State agency libraries. The Rochester students who also take classes on the home campus can access the catalogs of their home library as well. The PALS terminals also can access ERIC files. Loading additional periodical databases into the PALS system is under consideration. A terminal that accesses the online catalog of the University of Minnesota (LUMINA) is also available for student use. All services and materials are available to ALL students.
Interlibrary loans are handled through MINITEX, a state-funded network, which makes the collections of nearly every library in Minnesota available to students within a few days. A direct plan with the WSU-Winona campus library is being perfected to allow requests submitted by electronic mail to be filled the next day. Fax delivery has been used in several emergency situations.

Over the years, the staff of Goddard Library has developed a close working relationship with the other libraries in the Rochester area, particularly the Rochester Public Library, the Mayo Clinic library, and the two hospital libraries. A daily courier system connects the city's libraries to facilitate interlibrary loan and to make it possible for a patron to return a book to any library and expect to have it routed back to the correct site.

Problems of the Contract System

Despite the success of this contractual arrangement, there are conditions which complicate its administration.

1. INCONSISTENT CALENDARS. Each of the four colleges has a different calendar, which means that almost any day of the year at least one of the four has classes meeting. Trying to stretch a staff over this extensive time and still provide consistent quality service requires ingenuity and flexibility.

2. IDENTIFYING STUDENTS. The institutions are not consistent in requiring student identification cards to assist in circulation. A short-term solution may have to be sought if the prospect of an online circulation system keeps being pushed back for economic reasons. Because each college likes to have statistics that verify library use by their students, a reference log is maintained to record the questions asked and the college from which it came. Often the student will identify his/her college, or it becomes evident from the nature of the question, but sometimes an educated guess has to be made. There is a reluctance to ask the student outright, out of concern that an uninformed student may feel if any response other than RCC is given that service may be denied.

3. FACULTY INVOLVEMENT. Working with part-time and/or one-time faculty can be frustrating. Often a professor will commute reluctantly from his/her home institution to teach one class, and will have little interest in planning ahead to be sure the necessary library resources are available. Nor do temporary faculty have much incentive to develop a collection for future students.

4. CONSISTENT SUPPORT OF ALL PARTICIPANTS. The success of this package depends on the consistent support of all its components. The temporary withdrawal of any segment disrupts the whole. This became apparent in the summer of 1991 when, faced with a budget shortfall, the Chancellor of the Minnesota Community College System announced he was canceling the second summer session at all the community colleges. To save additional money, support services such as libraries would be closed during this time. As the major provider of library staffing, RCC's withdrawal of support caused a problem for the other three colleges which did not have their session canceled. Funds were juggled to make up some of the difference, but total hours of service had to be reduced.

Administrators, faculty, and students have expressed very positive comments about this cooperative effort to provide library service to off-campus students. Its success has become a model for other areas of cooperation, particularly the bookstore, audio-visual services, and duplicating.
A contractual arrangement seemed like a logical step as students continued to use a familiar library located near their classrooms. The combination of funds from the four institutions has provided a larger collection, longer hours, and stronger staffing than any institution could achieve on its own given the current budget limitations.

The future success of the library component of this cooperative effort is dependent on funding and, more importantly, the continued enthusiastic spirit of the participants.
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Up and Down the Ladder: Interinstitutional Cooperation

Nancy Finney
College of the Sequoias Library
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In their conference paper "The Importance of Interlibrary Cooperation to Off-Campus Programs," Lori Keenan and Janet Kendall (1989) advised: "Knowing what you want this arrangement to do for you and what you are willing to give for it are essential to the success of your venture" (p. 258). When College of the Sequoias Library entered into its collaborative effort with California State University, Fresno, we knew what we wanted. Stumped on how to provide the services we thought essential to our students and faculty, given our sadly inadequate budget, we saw collaboration with CSUF as a way into deep pockets, a way to improve our services to our clientele at a price we could afford. The challenge: to extend our services to a new clientele, CSUF/COS Center students, while expanding our services to our primary clientele, COS students and faculty. Before examining our response to that challenge, however, some background information is in order.

College of the Sequoias is a community college of some 9,000 students located in Visalia, a growing city of 80,000 in the heart of California's prime agricultural region, the San Joaquin Valley. As the representative academic library in the community--CSUF's Henry Madden Library is forty miles to the north; California State University, Bakersfield's sixty miles to the south--COS Library traditionally has fielded information requests from local teachers, city and county personnel, and college students. We've felt this was our obligation to the two area public libraries, Tulare County Library and Kings County Library, both of which have often felt the burden of our students on top of their own primary clientele. Like all California community colleges, COS is committed to open enrollment: because of this, our library users range from highly sophisticated to frankly terrified. The average age of our students is 26. Most of the 22% of our students who transfer to four year institutions go on to CSUF, which enrolls about 20,000 students. The University's most popular majors are business administration and education. Generally, about 25% of the bachelor's degrees awarded each year by CSUF are in business administration and about 20% are in education.

Given the strong local interest in classes leading to the teaching credential, CSUF began its off-campus program at COS in 1986/87 with liberal studies classes preparatory to the elementary credential, offering ten classes to 103 students. Since then, the CSUF/COS Center program has expanded dramatically: in Spring 91, almost 600 students were enrolled in sixty-five sections of Center classes offered on the COS campus, and ninety-one of them were awarded Liberal Studies BAs. Students can now complete all the coursework for both the BA in Liberal Studies and the elementary teaching credential on the COS campus. In addition, the Center now offers classes leading toward master's degrees in business administration, counseling, special education, school administration, and social work.

In keeping with the Center program's modest beginnings, collaboration between the Center and the COS Library began modestly as well. COS librarians conferred with librarians from the Madden Library and with the acting director of the CSUF/COS Center on where to begin. Our working relationship dealt with the basics. A majority of the classes offered by the Center are in the late
afternoon or early evening, so it was decided that the greatest boon to both institutions would be the opening of the COS Library between 4:15 - 6:15 Monday through Thursday. (Traditionally the Library had been closed at this time due to lack of funds and to the fact that those two hours were the least busy in the day. The Library then reopened from 6:15 to 9:15 with a separate evening staff which, unfortunately, did not include a librarian. The Center agreed to foot the bill for this.

With the joint approval of the COS head librarian and the acting director of the Center, a Center librarian was hired to work in the COS Library ten hours a week. Eight hours of clerical staff time and sixteen hours of student assistant time per week were funded as well. The COS evening staff were given the option of working the eight clerical hours, which they accepted. Given the size and layout of the COS Library, this was a skeleton staff. The Center librarian did not have time to visit classes for bibliographic instruction or to visit the Madden Library on the home campus: in fact, she could not leave the COS Library during the two hours daily that she was on duty, since she was the only librarian in the building during that period. However, from the COS Library point of view, we were delighted to be able to keep the Library open straight through the day, to have a librarian available to students after 4:15, and to gain those additional staff hours.

Now that we'd added Center library staff members to our existing staff, we worked out procedures for placing materials on reserve for CSUF faculty. CSUF reserve materials, supplied by the home campus, were processed by a clerk salaried by the Center and were kept in the COS Library reserve area on a separate shelf, with cataloging and indexing in a separate binder. Circulation of those materials, however, followed COS Library procedure, using COS supplies. In addition to reserve materials, CSUF Library purchased around one hundred books in education for the COS Library that first year, to be added to the general collection. These were cataloged and processed by Center librarians according to COS Library procedure (DDS rather than LC) and interfiled with COS holdings.

It was during these beginning days that a basic philosophy of service was ironed out which has continued to the present: CSUF students and COS students will be given equal service by any librarian available. Although CSUF students may be directed to a Center librarian if one is on hand, they are not turned away or told to come back later if one is not. Conversely, a Center librarian helps all students, both CSUF and COS, during her time on duty at the reference desk. If CSUF students' or COS students' needs can be met with the materials at the COS Library, they are encouraged to use them. If the Madden Library has the most appropriate material for Center students or for COS students, interlibrary loan requests are forwarded to that library. In general, the Madden Library, as home library, is the primary source of materials for Center students, and the Center librarian is the primary means of access to those materials. The benefits to COS students and faculty stemming from this philosophy are obvious.

The next developments in our collaboration evolved out of the daily realities we encountered as the Center program grew. To better serve its students working toward the elementary teaching credential, the Center funded a COS Library subscription to the Krauss curriculum series and purchased a microfiche reader/printer to go with the subscription. When the Madden Library converted to an online circulation system, it provided us access to the records in that system—a great part of its collection—through a search-only terminal located in the COS Library. While this wasn't as flexible as online catalog access searchable by subject, COS librarians were happy to be able to scan the Madden Library collection of 830,000 volumes by author, title or LC number for our faculty and students. Interlibrary loan requests from our primary clientele increased, keeping pace with the growing number of ILL requests from Center students.

This increase in ILL called for an improved document delivery system. The Center established a daily courier service between various points on the CSUF campus, including the Madden Library,
and the COS campus. This allowed for rapid delivery of ILL materials from the Madden Library, the source from which we fill over 80% of our requests from COS students and faculty. The courier service also allowed us to set up a simple, student-friendly return process for Madden Library materials turned in at the COS Library.

To our mutual rejoicing, Center librarian hours were increased from ten to twenty per week in Fall '90. Conferring with COS librarians, the Center librarians (by now, two shared these hours) decided on 3:30 to 7:30 as the most appropriate schedule, as this allowed for half hour overlap with COS librarians, so we could keep better in touch. This increase has allowed the Center librarians to visit classrooms during the beginning of each semester in order to introduce the library services available to CSUF students and to set up appointments for bibliographic instruction with Center faculty. In their bibliographic instruction sessions, the Center librarians touch upon what is available in the host library at COS and in the home library on the CSUF campus. Many students have indicated that they feel intimidated by the size of the home library and the wide scope of materials to be found there. We try to lower this university library anxiety by providing pathfinders that suggest the subject headings, specific reference sources, and specific areas of the Madden Library such as the curriculum library, map library, and multicultural library which they might find useful. In the host library we help Center students define their search, collect search terms, and use the indexes available to discover the sources necessary for their paper or project, while reminding them that university level courses usually call for the support of the more extensive collections available at a university library. Our forthcoming access to the Madden Library's online catalog will greatly enhance our ability to introduce students to the Madden's collection. Center librarians feel that they have a unique opportunity to help students make the transition from the effective use of a small library to the effective use of a major university library. COS librarians, meanwhile, are pleased that Center librarians are available also to do bibliographic instruction for COS classes meeting in the late afternoon and evening.

Our challenge was to extend our services to CSUF/COS Center students while expanding our services to our primary clientele, and to do both well. As a result of our collaboration, COS students and faculty have benefitted from extended hours of library service staffed by Center librarians familiar both with our collection and with the Madden Library collection. They've benefitted from access to the wonderfully extensive book and periodical collections of the Madden Library. They've benefitted from improved ILL service, thanks to our newly-revised cooperative agreement, and from faster ILL service, thanks to the courier system. Meanwhile, Center students have benefitted from immediate local access to reserve and reference service, ILL and bibliographic instruction, and from access to five sympathetic librarians--two funded by CSUF; three funded by COS.

In the future, we hope for even greater benefits. As we've mentioned, we're soon to have online public access to the Madden Library catalog, now in the process of conversion. As soon as funding will allow, CSUF will provide COS Library with several new, vitally-needed CD-ROM work stations and indexes, among them ERIC and Psych Lit Abstracts, as well as a number of journal subscriptions which, while supporting Center course offerings, will also be of particular interest to COS faculty. When CSUF is able to fund librarian and support staff schedules beyond the present 20 hours a week, we plan to open the Library on Saturdays--presently the COS Library is open only Monday through Friday--the need for this having been voiced with considerable ardor both by our clientele and by Kings and Tulare County Libraries, now swamped with COS and CSUF students on weekends.

Lest this should seem an impossibly rosy picture of interlibrary cooperation, we want to acknowledge several areas in which potential problems have lurked. The first involves interpersonal relations. The small and closely-knit COS staff of librarians and paraprofessionals have, over the
years, developed very comfortable working relationships based on cooperation and respect for individual autonomy. Some anxieties have been voiced regarding the introduction of newcomers into our midst, especially newcomers from institutions valuing worker autonomy less than we do. Administrative concerns have touched upon the question of who reports to whom: are Center librarians responsible chiefly to the home library at CSUF or to the host library at COS? Who evaluates Center librarians, the home library or the host? We think we've resolved these issues by agreeing that COS librarians and staff will carry the vote in the selection of Center librarians, and that Center librarians will report to and be evaluated by the COS head librarian. In addition, we've found that regular and informal meetings between Center and COS librarians and staff go a long way toward defusing occasional misunderstandings.

We've also found that interpersonal problems arise occasionally between Center instructors and students and COS library staff. CSUF faculty and students sometimes assume that the 80,000 volume COS Library can provide them resources, services and facilities identical to the 830,000 volume Madden Library and are aggrieved when they discover that is not the case. Further, Center instructors often struggle between feeling that their students should be required to use the home library to complete their assignments and understanding the difficulties involved in that. By the nature of the Center program, many of its students work full time and have family obligations: the ninety minute trip to and from the home library constitutes a hardship for them. We've addressed this problem by working with Center faculty to refine assignments, allowing students to spend an optimum amount of time at the host library while emphasizing that university coursework must require some visits to a university library. Again, we've found that regular staff meetings help smooth feathers ruffled by the occasional harried and belligerent Center student or instructor.

Occasionally, anxieties over space arise. Like most libraries, the COS Library finds itself increasingly cramped for office space and shelf space. Center librarians share office space with COS librarians. Materials added to the collection by CSUF in support of Center classes have to be chosen with care, and always with an eye to their place in a core collection aimed at community college students. We've found it helps to clarify for ourselves to what extent COS students and faculty are actually being shortchanged by encroachments on space, and to make decisions based on that understanding.

While these kinds of tensions are bound to surface in any cooperative effort, we recently encountered a process bottleneck that is probably unique to our two institutions. When the Madden Library joined OCLC's ILL subsystem in Spring '89, their lending requests increased 300% within one year. There was no increase in ILL staff. Not surprisingly, turn around time for requests from COS slowed considerably. Even more significantly, Madden Library was forced to make some tough policy decisions regarding ILL: no more copying of microfilmed articles for anyone, for instance, and a priority list ranking CSUF-originated requests first to be filled, while all others languished. Again, candid discussion of the factors which were interfering with our common goals led to a solution: Madden Library agreed to copy microfilmed sources for Center students and for COS students, and to move COS student/faculty ILL requests up to top priority position, equal with CSUF requests. The Center agreed to provide Madden Library's Lending Department ten hours of student help a week for filling COS requests specifically, and the bottleneck problem was resolved.

We've noted earlier that our cooperative effort has evolved out of the daily realities of dealing with an expanded clientele. Working with CSUF's Center program has made us very aware of our responsibility to COS students enrolled in our own off-campus program in Hanford. Our efforts to provide library service on a shoestring to those students are outlined in the appendix. Those efforts have helped us focus on an area of need common to both Hanford Center and CSUF/COS Center students, one addressed at a previous conference by Evan Ira Farber (1989), who spoke of students facing a familiar dilemma:
either they use a very superficial approach to searching for information—an approach on the level of the Reader's Guide, or Infotrac—that is, access to information that is quick and easy to get, or, by making use of the new information technology, they'll be overwhelmed by material the student doesn't have time to read, nor the expertise to cull it or evaluate it and absorb it.

In light of this, Farber continued:

the role of the librarian as teacher will be ever more important. Only the one-to-one relationship between student and librarian permits the subtleties of searching for information and evaluating sources. The conceptual nature of these topics demands discussion, questions, interactions...Helping students shape their searches, showing them how to evaluate information, will increasingly become the librarian's role (p. 95, 96).

We see examples daily of students turning to superficial sources because they've never been taught how to find their way to valid sources. It's becoming increasingly clear to us that, just as we work hand in hand with COS faculty, shaping the collection to their assignments, helping them shape their research assignments to the collection, so, with even more tact, we must work to build that same kind of collaboration with Center faculty. Of course, Farber's one-on-one comment is especially relevant here: twenty librarian hours a week can only be stretched so far. Given CSUF's commitment to good library service to the Center program, however, we have great hopes for the future.

Looking at these daily realities brings us back to Keenan's and Kendall's pithy comment, "Knowing what you want this arrangement to do for you and what you are willing to give for it are essential to the success of your venture." We—the COS librarians and the CSUF/COS Center librarians—want to provide better service to our students and faculty. We want to improve our students' chances for academic success. We want to give them at least a glimpse of those endless vistas of possibilities that libraries have conveyed to us. What are we willing to give for it? Patience, tact, compromise, tolerance, good will in working through the nitty gritty details of everyday library cooperation, plus an occasional chunk of unpaid overtime. The cost is minimal, given our belief in the value of our goal.
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Appendix

The College of the Sequoias Hanford Center is located in downtown Hanford, Kings County, 20 miles west of the COS campus in Visalia. The city of Hanford, with a population of 30,000, sits on the far western edge of the COS district. Agriculture is its primary industry. The Hanford Center houses the COS Hanford office and four classrooms. Classes are also held at the two Hanford High School campuses.

The Hanford Center was established in 1988. In the '88 Spring semester, 55 classes were offered through the Center, with an enrollment of 1,300 students. In the 1991 Spring semester, 63 classes were provided, with 1,690 students enrolled. Generally, about a third of the total enrollment is made up of students who are taking classes in Hanford only, and whose access to the main campus is limited. The COS Library became increasingly aware of its responsibility to provide college level library service to those students.

In August of 1990 a librarian was hired to work ten hours per week to develop and provide library services to Hanford Center students. This included setting up Ebsco's Magazine Article Summaries (MAS) periodical index on CD-ROM, coordinating document delivery, interlibrary loan and reference services from the main campus library to the Hanford Center, providing library instruction in the classroom, and developing a small reference collection.

Since there is no library housed at the Hanford Center, MAS on CD-ROM is the primary access tool to periodicals for Center students. MAS has been programmed to identify periodical titles owned by COS Library and those held by Hanford's Kings County Library. Using MAS, students print out a bibliography, select and mark a maximum of four citations, write their name, address and phone number on the printout, and leave it at the front desk in the Hanford Center office. These bibliographies are delivered daily to the COS Library by the Hanford Center supervisor, who acts as courier between the two campuses. Articles are copied and sent back to the Center for student pick up via the same courier. Turn around time for articles from magazines held by COS is three days. Although students are encouraged to limit requests to titles held by the COS Library, interlibrary loan requests for journal articles outside our holdings are forwarded to other libraries: students are reminded, however, that delivery on these requests may take up to two weeks. While we regret having to limit student requests to four per week, COS staff limitations make that necessary. In the seven months following MAS installation at the Hanford Center, 418 articles were delivered to Center students.

MAS is a fairly easy system to use but generally requires some instruction for first time users. Most of our students have limited computer experience and even fewer are familiar with Boolean logic operators and their functions. The librarian has therefore found library instruction in the classroom to be the best avenue for introducing MAS and for presenting information on how to do college level library research at the main campus library. Librarian-created handouts on beginning research in relevant subject areas are distributed to students during these classroom visits. Students are encouraged to use the college library rather than the local public library for their research. In reality, most still use the local public library because it is closer and because they are already familiar with it. A core reference library consisting of a set of encyclopedias and approximately 15 other reference sources is housed next to the MAS work station in the Center. This collection will expand as budgetary resources allow.
Plans for the future include installation in Spring '92 of a dial-up terminal connecting the COS Library's DataTrek online catalog to the Hanford Center. Students will then be able to print out a bibliography and request COS Library books to be delivered to the Hanford Center. In a survey of Hanford Center students conducted in Spring '91, access to the COS Library catalog and collection, plus a delivery and return system for books requested, were the two library services most frequently cited as top priority.
Measuring the Effectiveness of an Off-Campus Library Programme: A Case Study at the University of Birmingham, England

Raymond K. Fisher
University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, England

Background to the Study

In the United Kingdom most of the off-campus library service in higher education are those provided by universities in support of their extramural courses (Fisher, 1991). These extramural course are almost entirely liberal adult education for the general public, undertaken for personal interest and fulfillment and not normally leading to credits or degrees. Traditionally they are courses of one or two terms, consisting of classroom, face-to-face teaching, and of meetings held once a week in various locations at a distance from the parent university. They are to be distinguished from Open University courses, which are strictly campus-less and which involve home-based individual learning for credits and degrees, and which may be said to have filled a gap left by the failure of conventional universities (so far) to provide off campus degree programs.

The nature of the teaching in university extramural courses to some extent determines the kind of library service needed to support it. Because extramural students are not normally required to write essays format, they only rarely need access to research libraries or to sophisticated information services. What they do need, however, if they are fully to benefit from their courses, is easy access to the relevant core texts in sufficient quantities, together with some carefully chosen supplementary books, at the right time (the term "books" in this paper including journal articles, music scores, maps, and any relevant published material). Historically the most efficient way of serving this need has been the provision of a collection of books and other materials, tailored to the precise needs of the course and deposited in the classroom for its duration. Some courses are on quite specialized subjects and it has been shown (Fisher and Bolton, 1989) that public libraries and beaux are a poor substitute for this "book-box" system. This provision has normally been made by separate dedicated extramural libraries and only exceptionally by a university main library.

Clearly this is a simple, unsophisticated system of library provision, and so far in the UK it has not involved any extensive use by off-campus students of modern information technology. However, it is likely, as universities develop their own on-campus high-speed networks over the next year or two, that off-campus teaching centers will be linked to these networks to enable students and lecturers to have full access to national and international databases at a distance from their parent institution. It is also possible that over the next few years individual students will be able to manage their information and book needs through their own domestic workstations, either independently of the traditional library (Rumsey, 1990) or by "borrowing" materials in digitized form from an electronic library (Martyn, 1991). These developments may bring enormous benefits to off-campus students, but at the same time we should not regard them as a panacea. The new technology is expensive and we should not allow expenditure on it to starve our libraries of funds for the traditional services (Buschman, 1990). I believe that whenever a class of students meets in an off-campus location there will always be a need for the provision of conventional printed materials, to ensure immediate access for group teaching and to avoid total dependence on expensive hardware. I therefore make no apologies for the fact that this paper is based entirely on a "document delivery" library service in the old fashioned sense.
The national programme of university extramural courses for adults is now funded in England by the Universities Funding Council, and universities have recently been promised sufficient resources to ensure the continuation of this programme at its present level for the next four years (1991-95), provided that each can satisfy the UFC that it is maintaining high academic standards and overall quality. But there is a general feeling that the continuation of such funding after 1995 is uncertain, and that extramural/continuing education departments will thereafter have to diversify if they are to compete for funds effectively with other university departments. This implies a greater emphasis on-campus continuing education courses, on vocational education and training, at the expense of off-campus liberal education; and the beginning of this trend can already be seen. So there is a conflict between the need to maintain the quality of the liberal programme and the need to reduce expenditure on this programme in order to diversify. As a result a cloud hangs over off-campus extramural courses and over the library services which have been developed to support them.

The Review at Birmingham

This is the Climate in which the School of Continuing Studies at the University of Birmingham decided to set up a Working Party in order to review the library services which it provides for its own courses. The financial pressures and the recent (and forthcoming) changes in the School's curriculum on-campus led it to ask whether the present off-campus service (to nearly 400 courses a year) provided by the School's own Continuing Studies Library (independent of the University Library) was "efficient and effective" and gave "value for money," and whether any changes in the service needed to be made. The Working Party consisted of four members of the full-time academic (teaching) staff of the School and the Continuing Studies Library. It began work in January 1991 and reported to the School in April 1991. Its brief included the Library's service to on-campus courses, but this paper deals only with those issues relating to off-campus provision.

The Problem of Measurement

I believe that there are many aspects of life, such as human values and culture, which are not quantifiable in any meaningful sense. And yet there are few activities nowadays which seem to escape the measurement game. The Prince of Wales recently stated in a lecture ("Prince makes a plea", 1991), "We live in an age obsessed with the tangible, with discernible results, and that which is measurable," going on to stress the need to counteract this by making sure that we retain our literary heritage in our educational curricula and that we do not sacrifice it to short-term vocational needs. Similarly we could argue that the effectiveness of an academic library service, involving the use of books, reading, and intellectual development, cannot strictly be measured. As one of our lectures said in his response to the Working Party (on the question of student participation in courses through reading the views of other scholars), "In this matter it is vital that we should not be misled by figures or questionnaires."

In spite of all this, unfortunately we cannot duck the issue. As librarians we are accountable to a person or an institution in the money we spend, and they are entitled to ask if we are spending it wisely.

What the Working Party looked at, then, was the overall "effectiveness" of the current service; for this term can be said to cover both educational and financial value, and the notion of efficiency is also implicit within it. But the effectiveness of an off-campus library service is particularly complex, as there are so many variables, such as the location of courses, the number and background of the students, the nature of the subjects and the objectives of the lecturer. The first task was to look at the reading needs of our students and the current objectives of the library service.
 Assessing the Reading Needs of Students

A range of opinion emerged on the issue of students' reading needs. It has already been stated that the reading needs of most extramural students are not extensive, because of the nature of liberal adult education. On the one hand, in some subjects, and with certain styles of teaching, a course could be pursued which involved only a minimal amount of reading. On the other hand, in many subjects immediate access to the public texts is essential for the successful running of the courses. Against all this it was argued that a university course ought by its very nature to involve students in reading, and that it should not be offered at all if it was not going to engage them in this way. This latter view lay behind the current objectives of the library service, which was stated as "playing its part in enabling students to learn effectively, by making available to them the learning materials which they need at the time and place when they most need them." This philosophy of providing opportunities for learning also implied a plentiful supply of essential books and the supply of a wide range of supplementary reading, a point stressed by Line (1990). This in turn implied adequate researching. The contrary view was that precisely because many students seemed to attend courses for leisure interest only and undertook little or no reading, then the provision of texts to them was an expensive luxury which could not be afforded in economically difficult times. The latter view was compounded by the argument that the programme of on-campus courses deserved more resources because it contained all the degree (and other award-bearing) courses. So we had an ideological dilemma, involving the academic policy of the School of Continuing Studies. This dilemma underlined the need for the Library to have an agreed set of objectives, without which its performance could not be measured in any meaningful way (Ford, 1989).

Those who argued that much of the off-campus service was unnecessary claimed as one reason that it was "under-used." Against this it was argued in turn that low use was not a reason for cutting a service and that in a university context the answer was to "raise standard" and seek ways of improving usage. But what in fact was meant by "under-used"? The term implied the existence of same objective measures, and the next step was to try to establish what these measures were.

The Measurement of Usage

Under this heading the only items which are quantifiable are (a) the number of books supplied to courses, and (b) the number of loans to students from their class collections. Statistics of these have been kept by the Library for several years. Average loans per student per course in 1989-90 ranged from 11.25 (Russian literature) to 0.4 (Mozart), with an overall average for all courses every year of little over 2. Some further examples are given in Table 1.

The overall average number of loans is often described as "the tip of the iceberg" and can be very misleading. For it is known that many loans (including transfers between students) are not recorded, that many books (including items such as music scores) are used in class and not recorded as loans, and that one recorded loan may represent a text borrowed by a student and read intensively for six months. There are also different ways of looking at the same figures. In Table 1 the last course is tabulated as "low usage" (0.66 loans per student); but it could also be represented as "two thirds of the students borrowed books; all the books supplied were borrowed, some more than once," and this sounds better. However, in this particular case it might be assumed that if more books had been supplied there would almost certainly have been more loans, so that the Library was only partially successful in trying to meet its objectives. But more information about the educational use of the books would be needed before this conclusion could be confirmed.
Table 1

Books supplied and average loans per student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>No. of students</th>
<th>No. of books supplied</th>
<th>No. of loans</th>
<th>Average loans per student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women's writing</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>7.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The short story in English</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art in the early medieval world</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology in Shropshire</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology of Ancient Near East</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A new way of measuring usage has been tried for the first time this year (1990-91). Each Continuing Studies student has been given a course evaluation questionnaire to complete at the end of his or her course. It included one question on the library service:

"The book box - did you use it?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is the kind of question to be avoided. The answer will not tell us anything significant, and may actually be misleading; for they will be subjective--without a given yardstick each student's perception of what constitutes "A lot" or "A little" will be different. Only if we have the reasons behind the answers will they be of any use. Fortunately this question did not form part of the Working Party's investigations.

Sample loan figures were also obtained from those other extramural libraries in the UK which use the book-box system as their main method of provision. These too revealed wide discrepancies among courses but a similar overall average. National figures produced for the Library Association's (1978) published standards gave almost identical results. There was therefore no reason to think that Birmingham University extramural students were either any worse or any better in this respect than any other extramural students.

Measurement of "usage" in this quantifiable sense has only a very limited application. The term also implies the kind (or extent) of use of particular books by particular students; this brings us to the notion of educational effectiveness, which in turn brings us to the next stage of the survey.

The Measurement of Effectiveness

Here we have to look at (a) costs (input measures) and (b) educational effectiveness (output). As already stated (b) is largely unquantifiable, but the real problem is in trying to match (a) and (b) to see if the service is providing "value for money."
Cost Effectiveness

Here we should take into account direct library costs, such as staff, book-fund, equipment and transport. It should be possible to calculate an overall average cost per book bought or supplied, or an average cost per student. But this will have little meaning unless comparison is made with the actual costs incurred by similar libraries in other universities, and also with the likely costs involved if a similar service were operated by the University's main library.

On staffing costs it turned out that, in relation to the scale of service in each CP there was no significant difference between the Continuing Studies Library at Birmingham and its counterpart libraries at other universities such as London, Liverpool and Nottingham. Our book fund turned out to be about average—in a "league table" of 14 universities, based on an average expenditure (on books) per course supplied, Birmingham came eighth, and in a similar league table based on an average expenditure per book supplied it came seventh. Comparative figures for expenditure on transport, equipment, postage and telephones, have not been available, but verbal communication has indicated that they are relatively small in all cases. It was thus established that there was nothing exceptional about the costs incurred by Birmingham's service.

The University Librarian was interviewed by the Working Party and he expressed no desire to "take over" the off-campus service—largely because no savings would be made (the same expenditure would be incurred by the University) and because it was a function which does not fit easily into a conventional university library system. In those universities in the UK where the size of the off-campus program of courses is small, the extramural library's function and stock have in a few cases been absorbed into the main library; but such an amalgamation has invariably resulted in a reduction or abandonment of the off-campus service.

Educational Effectiveness

Here, as already stated, we are dealing largely with intangibles—questions of academic quality, levels of learning, teaching styles, the readability of texts, and the kind (or extent) of use of particular books. But there is no doubt that librarians can learn a great deal about the educational value of their service, in a subjective sense, the feedback from lecturers and students. Formal reports, informal correspondence and verbal communications all provide useful channels of information about student and staff perceptions of the service.

Indicators of "efficiency," subsumed under the overall term, are easier to identify than those of effectiveness. From the lecturer's point of view they would include: the proportion of books supplied to those requested; the supply of books on time, in sufficient numbers, and to the right place; good communications between lecturer and library about what is available in stock and what will be supplied; and the speedy provision of extra titles on request. Students will judge efficiency largely in terms of the availability of the right books in sufficient numbers at the time required.

The 1987 survey at Birmingham (Fisher and Bolton, 1989) revealed an overall satisfaction with the service on these points of efficiency and effectiveness at that time. This year's Working Party asked all the full-time academic staff of the School the following four questions:

"How would you evaluate the service provided by the library for (a) your teaching programme (b) the programme for which you are responsible?

Are there any changes in the service provided by the library that you think would be useful to your programme?
Do you think that the existing book box service is essential for your work—or could it be modified or even discontinued?

Are there aspects of the library service that (a) you would be prepared to lose and (b) you would like to extend or develop?

These questions aimed to discover the lecturers' perceptions, and by implication the educational effectiveness, of the existing service. The replies indicated that it was the clear view of the great majority of the teaching staff that the supply of books to classes was essential to their work and to the work of the School as a whole, and most of them expressed general satisfaction with the way the service was currently provided. This response was particularly gratifying in view of the considerable financial pressures currently facing the School. At the same time it was felt by some that more discrimination could be exercised in allocating books to classes, in the sense that some courses by their nature may need fewer books or even no books at all, while others may need far more than they were currently receiving. Some felt that there could be a more effective use of books in classes, and that this could be achieved partly by closer attention being paid to the suitability and readability of texts requested and purchased, and partly by a closer control of the circulation of books among students.

Matching Cost and Educational Effectiveness

As the costs of the off-campus library service at Birmingham were no higher than average, and as there was overall satisfaction with it among the teaching staff, it could be concluded that in general terms the service was giving value for money. In my own view the service could be made even more effective by spending more on it (a more plentiful supply of materials ensuring that all students had adequate opportunities for learning). I believe it would still be giving "value for money," but this claim would have to be substantiated all over again. In its report the Working Party fought shy of the phrase, and drew attention to those points needing improvement or change. But the match between costs and effectiveness had been made, although balancing the equation had involved a great deal of enquiry work.

Recommendations for Future Practice

Many of the Working Party's recommendations were concerned with the Library's on-campus service (symptomatic of the current trend already mentioned), such as longer opening hours (allowing for more direct borrowing) and greater expenditure on materials for vocational courses. These were to be achieved with the same staff and the same overall book-fund (this kind of expectation, being asked to do a lot more with the same, is currently facing all university libraries in the UK—see MacDougall and Pearson, 1991). One result would be less staff time and fewer funds available for the off-campus programme, as it was thought that the latter had been receiving the lion's share of resources in the past. The recommendations also included a tighter control (involving the School's academic staff) on the purchasing policy for off-campus courses, and a more discriminating approach to provision, with the overall emphasis on attempting to supply only what was likely to be used.

The last point was, in my view, cardinal, as it raised again the whole question of the Library's, and the School's, objectives. In a programme of liberal adult education there are likely to be several courses each year which are on new subjects, or highly specialized subjects, on which the Library currently has little or no up-to-date or relevant stock. Such courses need to be offered if the programme is not to be static. But for the Library they represent high risk—most of them need Library support, but if they fail (for lack of enrollments) the Library can be accused of wasting funds on materials which may not be used again, and so of not providing value for money. A policy of
supplying only what is likely to be used implies a certain degree of "playing safe," or even of stagnation, which may be fatal in the context of university adult education. In other words, this is a special field which involves some academic risk-taking and which should therefore accept, as an occupational hazard, an element of loss in its library purchasing. A university should not offer a course if it cannot support it with the necessary library resources. This is where the concept of service overrides that of value for money, a point which brings us back full circle to the problem of measuring effectiveness.

A Summary Methodology

In this final section I give an outline of the methodology adopted at Birmingham for its review. I have also included a few features which, in my view, ought to have been included. While recognizing that the review applies to a peculiarly UK situation, there may be some elements in it which have a wider relevance for other investigations. The process is given in sequence.

1. An assessment of the reading and library needs of students. This involves an examination of course objectives, teaching methods and styles, the range of subjects involved, and the location of courses (including a reference to the availability of local library resources). Integral to this first stage should be a statement of the Library's set of objectives.

2. The measurement of library usage. This involves the establishment of criteria for measuring the amount of usage of the library service by students, and the gathering of statistics on loans and on any other kinds of use which are strictly quantifiable. Comparative figures should be obtained from other libraries operating the same or similar systems with similar objectives.

3. The tabulation of library costs. This involves tabulating direct library costs such as bookfund, staff, and transport, and making various calculations such as average book expenditure per course or per student, or average expenditure per book supplied.

4. Comparison with the parallel costs of similar libraries.

5. The measurement of educational effectiveness. This should involve questionnaires, correspondence and interviews with teaching staff and students, in order to obtain their views on the efficiency of the library service and on the value of the service in educational terms. The findings from this stage should be linked with those from stage 2 on usage.

6. The measurement of overall effectiveness. This final stage involves a common-sense matching of 3. and 4. with 2. and 5. If costs are seen to be not higher than average, and if there is general satisfaction with the current level of service, the Library can be said to be "effective" and giving value for money. Any major discrepancies in either side of the equation should be the subject of close examination and form the basis of any set of recommendations to be made.
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Assessing the Adequacy of Book Delivery to Off-Campus Clientele

Jack Fritts and Carol M. Moulden
National-Louis University, Evanston, Illinois

"To complete the retrieval cycle, items identified in a search must somehow reach the user."
(Pao, 1989, p.199)

Introduction

Kascus and Aguilar (1988, p. 32) recommend "... providing off-campus students with the same level of services available to on-campus students." National-Louis University provides that level of service in many ways. In addition to the centralized services offered by the Evanston Campus library, an Evanston-based coordinator of off-campus library services supervises part-time librarians at each of the academic centers whose duties include bibliographic instruction, patron counseling, and liaison with local faculty. National-Louis University also has contractual or reciprocal borrowing agreements with some local academic libraries to provide additional support services to our clientele. However, "regardless of what local support has been established, the campus library should serve as a back-up for those instances when a student cannot obtain the necessary material or information from a local source" (Slade, 1989, p. 431).

National-Louis University is a private, independent university which offers accredited bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees at campuses located in Evanston, Chicago, and Lombard, Illinois; several Illinois extension sites; and six academic centers outside Illinois. The academic centers are located in McLean, Virginia; Tampa, Florida; Atlanta, Georgia; St. Louis, Missouri; Milwaukee/Beloit, Wisconsin; and Heidelberg, Germany. The University serves more than 16,500 students annually, the majority of whom do not have direct physical access to the Evanston Campus.

National-Louis University is a member of the ILLINET Online system (LCS). This integrated online catalog system currently provides direct borrowing access to the NLU collections and the collections of 37 other academic libraries within the state of Illinois. It also allows browsing access to the collections of approximately 800 other libraries and systems in Illinois. Fortunately Illinois also has a well developed network of multitype library systems which sponsor a statewide delivery system to assist in the timely movement of materials. "These document delivery services, funded by the Illinois State Library, serve to tie together the LCS resource sharing package by providing efficient and effective delivery of library materials" (Sloan, p.28). Each of the NLU off-campus centers has been provided access to ILLINET Online through on-site telecommunications equipment linked to the Chicago Campus of National-Louis University. In addition, all students and faculty with access to personal computer-based telecommunications systems can dial into the ILLINET Online system from their homes or offices. Continued training of local faculty, staff, and students needs to be an ongoing priority in order to continue to improve our services to the off-campus clientele.
The National-Louis University Library provides centralized interlibrary loan and document delivery services to all students and faculty from the Evanston (Illinois) Campus. These services are provided by 1.5 FTE paraprofessional staff and approximately .75 FTE student aides. This staff processed over 7,000 requests (borrowing and lending) during the 1989-1990 fiscal year. Approximately 77% of these requests were filled. The logistics of physically delivering this quantity of materials from the library to its patrons is of prime importance in maintaining high quality and meaningful service standards. This unobtrusive study utilized interlibrary loan and document delivery records to test assumptions about the delivery of books to off-campus students and faculty.

National began offering degree programs to off-campus clientele in 1978. The NLU Library off-campus services program is similar to the model proposed by Kascus and Aguilar (1988, p. 35) in that "the home library is the primary source of materials; the off-campus librarian is the primary means of access and delivery; and agreements with nonaffiliated libraries provide an enhancement of library resources and services at a specific location." National-Louis University has a strong commitment to providing library support for on- and off-campus students and faculty. As stated by Courtney and Tiller (1989, p. 121), "... library service must be as available to off-campus faculty and students as it is to those who utilize the home campus. Access to the sponsoring institution's library services is as important as the knowledge of the availability of other libraries that off-campus students might use more conveniently."

Statement of the Problem

The NLU librarians who serve off-campus programs wanted to evaluate the book delivery service to these patrons. Currently, all books are mailed First Class to the patrons' homes at no charge. We were interested in knowing, first, which off-campus locations requested the most books. It is almost certain that the number of requests for materials from our off-campus patrons will continue to increase, based on projections of continued growth at all academic centers. As Kilpatrick (1990, p. 36) states, "Libraries, as service organizations, must respond to the needs of their clientele in order to maintain viability. Since the provision of on-demand material has become an important aspect of library service, interlibrary loan and resource sharing can only increase." As technology changes, the book delivery service should also change to increase efficiency. Among the methods of book delivery under consideration were to continue using traditional First Class mail, or to begin using overnight mail, or non-postal delivery systems such as UPS or Federal Express. Other delivery possibilities included establishing a policy of sending all books to the nearest NLU campus or academic center to be picked up by the patron or establishing on-site interlibrary loan offices at the out-of-state centers.

The second area of interest was whether the University Library collection contained those materials most often needed by the off-campus patrons. If the University Library owned the most frequently requested books, the delivery time would be much faster than if those titles needed to be borrowed through interlibrary loan. Information regarding ownership was considered necessary in order to make more informed collection development decisions.

Methodology

To determine the possible need to revise the method of delivering books off-campus, we wanted to assess the volume of the requests for books from each off-campus area. The requests for books were compiled for one year, from April, 1990, through March 1991, using dBASE III PLUS. The data collected for each transaction included the off-campus location to which the book was mailed, determined by the home address of the patron. For example, books mailed to addresses in Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, or Washington, D. C. were recorded as requests from the McLean Academic Center. The information about which geographic areas used the book delivery service the most was
helpful in making recommendations about methods of delivery to be used, location of interlibrary loan personnel, and the size of staff needed in order to improve services.

The other component of this study was the adequacy of the NLU book collection to support the needs of the off-campus clientele. "Collection management is an important duty of librarians. Because of budget decreases, increases in price, and space limitations, etc., collection use must be monitored" (Bleeker, Tjiam, Volkers, and Smith-Bogers, 1990, p. 345). We were interested in knowing what percentage of requests were filled through interlibrary loans in order to make recommendations for collection development. The data collected for this purpose included bibliographic information for each title and whether the request was filled in-house or through interlibrary loan. Those titles not owned by NLU that were requested more than once by different patrons were considered for addition to the collection. We also identified the patron status (student or faculty) for each request to compare their needs for books. We were also interested in determining the reasons for unfilled requests, but the interlibrary loan/document delivery departmental procedures did not allow for adequate collection of data related to unfilled requests.

**Review of the Literature**

The majority of the published literature deals with journal article delivery. Traditionally, little research has dealt specifically with book delivery services or procedures. As the demand for the provision of books to off-campus patrons increases, researchers are beginning to discuss these questions. The 1982 ACRL Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Services identified three assumptions regarding interlibrary loan/document delivery services. The first has a direct bearing on this investigation. It states that "The academic library is primarily responsible for identifying, developing, and providing resources and services which address the information needs of students and faculty in extended campus programs" (ACRL, 1982, p.87). The most recent ACRL Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Services (1990) specifically identified the major areas of service as interlibrary loan, reciprocal borrowing, and prompt delivery of materials.

The only source specifically dealing with the prompt delivery of materials was Lessin's (1986, p. 96) comment that "Books are loaned ... with a working objective of a twenty-four hour turn-around ..." Two of the key ingredients which must be present in high quality off-campus library services programs according to Slade are specific requests and interlibrary loans. First, if a library is "... willing to send specifically identified material to an individual off-campus student ... [it] implies that the library has assumed a degree of responsibility for supporting off-campus education and for meeting the information needs of individual students" (Slade, 1985, p.166). Secondly, "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" (Slade, 1985, p. 170).

National-Louis University has been concerned with the quality of such services since the institution began offering off-campus programs in 1978. In a paper presented at a conference in 1983, Marilyn A. Lester, Director of the National-Louis University Library, stated that "document delivery is the most important factor to off-campus students. Books delivered by mail, United Parcel Service, or shuttle service are popular methods, although there are always speed and reliability problems. ... If the requested item is not in the main library collection, an interlibrary loan request is placed and the item is mailed when it arrives" (Lester, 1984, p.218). This emphasis on the importance of document delivery is still a primary component of the NLU Library service philosophy. From the beginning our policy was that "... books that were requested more than once by off-campus students were purchased" (Lester, 1984, p.221).
Other sources deal with the specifics of providing quality interlibrary loan and book delivery services. In a study of extended campus library services offered by similar institutions conducted by the Western Kentucky University library, it was found that "... each of these programs offer a combination of services which include document delivery via courier, U.S. mail and/or telefax ..." (Strickler, 1989, p. 4). The University of West Virginia College of Graduate Studies offers, "... non-traditional free library services for students and faculty at a distance [which] include: ... delivery by mail of books ... owned by the library and 'automatic' access to interlibrary loan for items not owned" (Corrigan, 1990, p. 1065). The costs of delivering books have been mentioned in only a few sources, including Gilmer's (1989) report on document delivery presented at the 1988 Off-Campus Library Services Conference.

Use of interlibrary loan records for collection development purposes has been reported in the literature.

*. . . There should be a close working relationship between the ILL department and collection development in an academic library. Since academic collections are developed and maintained in support of the instructional and research needs of faculty and students, information on those needs is critical to collection development. . . . before ILL information can be incorporated into collecting decisions, a systematic method of generating and disseminating meaningful ILL data in a useful format must be developed." (Williams and Hubbard, 1990, p.32)

The information that can be extracted from interlibrary loan records can be helpful in making collection development decisions. "Interlibrary loan statistics are captured in a way that also gives much useful information to collection development staff" (Jackson, 1989, p.88).

Research Results

Data were collected during the one year period between April, 1990, and March, 1991. During that year 345 books were mailed to National-Louis University off-campus patrons, the majority of which were delivered to NLU patrons within the state of Illinois. A total of 212 (61.4%) books were sent to Illinois patrons. The next largest number, 58 books (16.8%), went to the McLean (Virginia) area clientele; St. Louis and Milwaukee/Beloit patrons received similar numbers of materials (approximately 7% each); and very small numbers of books were sent to the other three centers (Atlanta, Heidelberg, and Tampa).

Of the 345 filled requests, only 70 (20.3%) were supplied from the University Library's holdings, while 275 (79.7%) of the titles were requested through interlibrary loan. Unique titles accounted for 293 (84.9%) of the processed requests. Three titles were requested three times each, and 49 titles were requested twice. Of the 49 twice-requested titles, NLU owned 15 or 30.6%. NLU owned one (33%) of the three titles that was requested three times. Of the 52 titles requested more than once, 36 (69.2%) were not owned by National-Louis University.

The results showed a marked division in level of use of the University Library's book delivery service between students and faculty. Student requests accounted for 272 (79%) of the mailed books, while 73 (21%) were requested by faculty from the off-campus centers.

Interpretation of the Results

The results of this and similar studies can be useful as the basis of planning for future services and policy changes. *Data are the raw material for decision making. When analyzed, the results can help guide policy making, collection development, the extent and types of public services offered,
budget allocation, staffing and scheduling, processing systems, and marketing" (Witucke, 1989, p. 444).

During the course of data collection for this project, only 345 book requests were processed for mailing to off-campus students. This relatively small number may be partially explained by the fact that the National-Louis University Library is not the only source of books available to the NLU students and faculty. The University Library has contracts with some academic libraries in other states to provide library cards and services for our students. The bibliographic instruction program emphasizes that the NLU Library is the students' primary source of library resources; however, they are also encouraged to utilize local resources, including public, academic, or special libraries where appropriate and available. Dial access to ILLINET Online has only been available to the out-of-state academic centers since September, 1990, so direct access was not an option during the first few months of this study. Since access is now available, we expect to see an increase in requests from those sites.

The research showed that the book collection still lags in terms of meeting the needs of our off-campus clientele, but informed collection development activities should continue to be based on interlibrary loan records in order to help to fill this gap. Only 70 (20.3%) of the requests were filled in-house, while 275 (79.7%) were requested through interlibrary loan. The vast majority (239) of those were unique titles, making the use of interlibrary loan appropriate. Those titles were not considered for purchase.

The titles not owned by NLU that were requested more than once (36) were evaluated in terms of their appropriateness to the curriculum to determine whether purchase recommendations should be made. "ILL requests represent a demonstrated need by the faculty and students for materials not in the library..." (Williams et al, 1990, p. 32). A further assumption was made that future use is implied by multiple requests for materials; therefore, adding these books to the collection is a justified expense. "If the library is going to spend money to purchase materials for off-campus use, there should be some guarantee that the materials will have a certain amount of use" (Johnson, 1988, p.253). Since purchase recommendations to come from this study are based on multiple requests, we are fulfilling that directive. The decision was made to not purchase those titles requested only once.

Recommendations

The results of this evaluation of the adequacy of the NLU book delivery services to off-campus clientele indicate a need to add specific book titles to the University Library collection at the Evanston Campus, as that is the current location of the centralized interlibrary loan/document delivery service. In terms of timeliness of delivery, books owned and housed at the Evanston Campus library will be readily available for fulfillment of off-campus patron requests. Only those titles requested more than once were recommended for addition to the NLU collection. The 16 books already owned by NLU that were requested more than once were evaluated for possible purchase of additional copies.

The results do not support any decentralization of staff or services at this time based on the statistical data which clearly indicates that the present service is primarily used by off-campus clientele within the state of Illinois. The current level of use of the interlibrary loan and document delivery services by the McLean (Virginia) Academic Center does suggest that this policy should be re-evaluated within the next five years, since this location has the largest out of state enrollment and institutional projections indicate continued growth.
Suggestions for Further Research

Other approaches to collection development should also be investigated. These might include increased participation of off-campus faculty in selection decisions or recommendations, the acquisition of those titles identified as supplementary readings in the curricula, or the development of subject bibliography specialists within the University Library faculty.

The need for a survey of the students and faculty at the various Academic Centers to evaluate the timeliness of our current delivery method (USPS) is also indicated. The consideration of delivery time might prove to be a factor in the relatively small number of actual book mailings identified during the year of the study. A study such as Johnson’s (1989) involving the inclusion of postage-paid return cards would provide a relatively simple tracking mechanism to determine delivery time. Some of the possible problems with book delivery services which the survey might address are loans taking too long to arrive, packaging returns, and getting returns to a dispatch location (Winter, p. 39). An additional survey designed to determine the level of local awareness of library services and access to materials as well as perceptions of the quality of those services should also be considered. Such a survey should also be designed to investigate the students’ willingness to pick-up and return materials at a centralized location, such as the local academic center, as is done in Canada at this time (Slade, 1989, p. 430-431). This delivery method, if acceptable to the students, would lend itself to some potential cost savings as multiple items could be shipped and returned in bulk. This approach would also relieve the students of the responsibility of packaging materials and paying the return postage.

References


Off Campus Bibliographic Instruction at The University of Saskatchewan

Linda Fritz
University of Saskatchewan Libraries

The province of Saskatchewan suffers from too much geography. It consists of 251,000 square miles of lakes, rock, trees and wheat fields yet has a population of less than one million, 40% of whom live in rural areas (Canadian almanac, 1991). In an attempt to overcome physical isolation as a deterrent to post secondary education, the provincial government has encouraged the province's two universities, the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Regina to provide credit courses at a distance.

At the University of Saskatchewan, the Extension Division is responsible for providing these courses. Although both credit and non-credit courses have been offered by the University since it was founded in 1909, it was during the 1980s that Extension moved toward providing courses in a planned manner. Previously, courses had been offered only as requested and/or if there was a qualified instructor available. This meant that in some cases the same course could be taught year after year at the same location with little alternative for those who wanted to work toward a degree. The programmed approach means that a variety of courses from the Faculty of Arts and Science would be available in any given year. It is made possible by a number of factors. The Saskatchewan Communications Network (SCN) and the Saskatchewan Tele-Learning Association Inc. (STELLA) have provided 52 communities in the province with the technology to participate in an interactive television link. As well, traditional face-to-face courses continue to be offered in classrooms provided by the ten regional colleges in the province. The colleges in three medium size cities, North Battleford, Prince Albert and Yorkton became heavily involved in the program, offering the whole range of courses both televised and face-to-face. It is now possible for students living in each of these cities to choose a selection of courses that can provide credit for one year of general B.A. studies. Independent studies courses also continue to be available.

In the 1990/91 academic year, the University of Saskatchewan offered 72 full-time equivalent face-to-face undergraduate credit courses in 13 locations, 30.5 f.t.e. independent study credit courses and 4 satellite credit courses in 52 locations. Over 5,200 students took advantage of these course offerings. The number of students increased approximately 20% over the previous year. In the 1991/92 academic year a fifth televised course will be offered.1

At the time that the Extension Division was expanding, the University of Saskatchewan Libraries were undergoing major technological changes. By the mid 1980s the computer based catalog system, GEAC, was up and running. Besides public terminals in all seven branches of the library, GEAC was available to professors with terminals in their offices through the University computer network. Today it is available to anyone with a personal computer and modem.

Meanwhile, the library staff was developing a database search service, INFOACCESS. Commercial databases such as the Humanities Index and Canadian Business and Current Affairs, and in-house creations such as U of S Government Publications and Special Collections-Theses have been mounted on the system. The service, which is free, makes information in the university library available to anyone, anywhere, at any time of the day or night. The INFOACCESS system recently
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received the first Innovative Achievement Award from the Canadian Association of College and University Libraries. Access is achieved through local Datapac nodes.

The University of Saskatchewan Libraries have always supported courses administered by the Extension Division. Traditionally, it sent course related blocks of books to the local branch of the public library system, and provided books on request to students registered in off campus courses. Although library staff agreed in principle with Kascus and Aguilar (1988) that "off campus students are entitled to the same level of library services provided for on campus students," the reality was that off campus students received a lesser service. Subject requests particularly were treated on an ad hoc basis. Someone, usually an overworked member of the reference staff, had to figure out exactly what the student wanted, often with the vaguest of information provided by whoever had accepted the telephone call. Both the Main and Education Branch Libraries handled the requests. No bibliographic instruction was available.

In 1989, the author was appointed to coordinate off campus library services. The staff consisted of two part-time library assistants, one each in the Main and Education Branch Libraries, and a student assistant during the term. The reference librarian was also available in the Education Library to handle subject requests as necessary and the weekend circulation supervisor in the Main Library helped out with retrieval during peak times. Because of the popularity of the off campus program, the number of staff hours has increased dramatically. The aim of the service is the same as that on campus: to enable the students to do their own research, using all the resources available to them. Off campus students are encouraged and allowed to assume a share of the responsibility for their own learning (Kascus & Aguilar, 1988) by means of the new technologies. A librarian will intercede if necessary to check print resources and CD-ROM indexes which are not yet available through the library network.

The problem of teaching over 4,500 students living all over Saskatchewan how to use library resources effectively is, to put it mildly, a challenge. As stated by Culkin (1980), "the objective [is] to teach reasoned information access [and] to guide users to a certain proficiency level before letting them begin serious research." The Extension Division provides all its students with materials on how to research and write a paper. Off Campus Library Services produced a detailed handbook to complement this material. However, on the principle that a handbook is consulted only as a last resort, a lot of the information went unread. We continue to believe that printed material is valuable, however, so we are reformatting the handbook with the goal of making it more accessible. Other handouts containing specific information such as bookmarks and database fact sheets are also provided to the students.

In the summer of 1989, the author armed herself with a laptop computer, modem, and an overhead image projector in order to demonstrate library searching techniques. Overheads were also produced in case of the inevitable system failure. She travelled to the three large program centres as part of an orientation committee that included university administrators and the professors teaching the televised courses, and demonstrated the techniques used by on campus students to find library materials. Unfortunately, as noted by Jacobson and Albright (1983) non-required courses can lead to non-attendance. Only a small percentage of students turned up.

Realizing that Witucke (1990) was correct in her analysis that instructors are the major influence on library use the author contacted the face-to-face instructors and volunteered to tailor the instruction sessions to their subjects. When the offer was taken up, it worked well; for example, a psychology instructor in Yorkton provided classroom time for a lecture and then provided extra time for the individual students to try a search themselves. She required each of her students to produce a bibliography of materials using the databases on INFOACCESS, and to find the call numbers of the journals available in the University Library before the students actually ordered the material.
The students who actually practise on the equipment are the ones most likely to do their own research. According to Kascus and Aguilar (1988), "it would be feasible to place terminals in strategic locations near a given off-campus site." The University Libraries budgeted for this and planned to place computers and modems in the public libraries of the cities of Yorkton and North Battleford as well as the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology Library in Prince Albert. Prince Albert didn't in fact need the equipment. They have used their own computers from the day that they learned they could access the university library at no charge to themselves. Yorkton's computer was installed in May 1991. We are still working with North Battleford to get theirs in place.

In the fall of 1990, it was decided to bring some of the full-time students from Yorkton to the Saskatoon campus for an orientation that included a session in the computer lab. The Libraries' Bibliographic Instruction and Orientation Committee are developing a lab instruction course for on campus students, but had not used it at that time. Using Psychological Abstracts on INFOACCESS and GEAC we simulated the process they would use in Yorkton when they prepared their research papers. It was a useful exercise, and seems to have had the desired result. More author/title requests have come from Yorkton classes than subject requests. When we do receive subject requests from Yorkton students, it is clear that they have spent some time thinking about the topic. The questions they ask are fairly specific as opposed to a word for word repetition of the instructor's assignment. Laboratory instruction, whether on site or in Saskatoon, is a method we would like to continue, but is, of course, subject to lab availability in the various towns and to budget restraints.

Many of the problems encountered in off campus orientations are those identified on campus. As stated previously, only a small percentage of students will attend a voluntary session. The option of submitting a subject request is available because we do not have online databases in all disciplines mounted on INFOACCESS. The students who do not attend orientation have been known to expect the library staff to do everything but write the paper for them. We are planning to implement a policy whereby a student cannot submit a subject request until s/he has found a relevant citation. We hope that by requiring this, the student will try to use the available resources, including the course related blocks of books in their local libraries, and perhaps be better able to summarize the request.

Access to the equipment is turning out to be less of a problem than we originally anticipated. As stated previously, the University Libraries are installing terminals in the major program centres. At the same time, all of the province's regional colleges are installing computers with modems and these will be available to students. The university's Office of Information Technology Services sends a letter to all first year students recommending that they purchase a computer because of all the things they can use it for during their university careers. We intend to reinforce this message to off campus users with a letter of our own recommending not only a computer, but a modem as well.

We have encountered minor technological hitches. In order to sell the North Battleford library board on the advantages of computers in the library, we arranged a demonstration. It didn't work. We learned afterwards that the City of North Battleford is on a "key system" telephone line which is incompatible with our modems. The regional college in North Battleford went so far as to have a telephone line strung from a city a few miles away in order to be able to use the computer network. Northern Saskatchewan may be subject to the same kinds of problems.

A second technical hitch concerns Datapac. Although the university picks up the cost of any out-of-town user, the user has to be able to access a Datapac node. There are 10 such nodes in Saskatchewan and one 800 number. If a user lives in a centre where the node exists, the service is indeed free. Unfortunately, if s/he lives outside such a centre, s/he has to make a long-distance call
to the nearest centre. For reasons not yet clear, the 800 number will not accept our Datapac address.

We know that the technology is being used, however. In December 1990, between the hours of 11 am and 1 pm it was nearly impossible to access the university library computers. All of the lines were busy. This was also happening in the evenings between 7 and 9 pm, which was more of a problem for the author, because that is the time she was usually teaching her classes. This supposedly has been overcome by making more ports available. Further evidence of use was provided by the University Libraries' Systems Department. Usage of INFOACCESS databases by off campus users increased by 47.5% in 1990/91 over 1989/90.

The immediate future means more time on the road. As well as providing bibliographic instruction to the three larger centres a number of smaller towns are requesting orientations. Since all of the regional colleges will have terminals, there is no reason for their students not to use them and we want to show them how.

Our experience has shown that the direct approach is best in introducing staff and students to both the library and its technologies so we will continue face-to-face instruction; however, we are investigating working with the professors who teach the interactive televised courses (English 110, psychology 110, history 112, mathematics 104 and in the 1991/92 academic year, native studies 110) to produce a library component. To date, we have not produced a video and look forward to seeing the results of the University of Regina's efforts. We are also interested in developing a computer assisted instruction package and are watching with interest the University of Alberta's newly developed online access to information course (Montgomerie et al., 1990).

A number of specialized organizations such as the Saskatchewan Urban Native Teacher Education Program (SUNTEP) have applied for off campus library services. We are more than happy to work with them, but we insist that they have the appropriate machinery in place. The Coordinator of Off Campus Library Services provides basic orientations to the SUNTEP staff, and they, in turn, teach their students. The process of teaching staff members will also occur with the regional college located in the town of Melfort. They too will teach the students.

Unlike the University of Regina, the University of Saskatchewan has not used a dedicated 800 telephone number for off campus library services because it has not been economically feasible. Students call collect, fax or mail in their requests. However, SaskTel, the provincial telephone network has recently made us an interesting offer for an 800 number. We are looking into the feasibility of such a line.

In summary, off campus library services are growing quickly at the University of Saskatchewan. While subject oriented bibliographic instruction now takes place at the request of individual instructors, we are providing more formal general orientations at the three large program centres. We are also beginning to require more preliminary work from the student before s/he can ask a librarian to do a subject search. Our hope is to arm the first year off campus student with the same tools as those on campus. We want them to see the library as a major source of accessible information, not as a technological roadblock to their research interests.
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Footnotes

1. Figures provided by the Extension Division, University of Saskatchewan.

2. Saskatchewan originated the "one province library system" in Canada. The system is administered by eight library regions, two large urban libraries, and a government run Provincial Library. Patrons have reciprocal borrowing privileges in any of the 500 branches located in cities, towns, villages and on Indian reserves. The University of Saskatchewan has an informal agreement with the library regions whereby they house the course related books and provide interlibrary loans to university students.

3. The library assistant in the Main Library has gone from 1/4 to 3/4 time and her position is being reviewed for upgrading. The student assistant's hours have increased from 6 per week to 15. In the winter term 1991, a second student assistant was hired for the Education Branch Library and extra equipment such as photocopiers have been installed in both the Main and Education Libraries. A librarian was hired on a casual basis in the 1990/91 academic year to handle the increased number of subject requests.
Reflections on Recent Changes in Regional Accreditation with a Focus on the Assessment of Off-Campus Delivery of Services in Light of Emerging Informational and Scholarly Technologies

Edward D. Garten
The University of Dayton

Colleges and universities are faced with rapidly evolving local, regional, national, and international programs and services being developed and offered to faculty by libraries, networks, private and for-profit information providers, and computer groups. These changes will increasingly affect (a) local organizational response to libraries and computing facilities; (b) the manner in which scholars, teachers, and researchers conduct their business; (c) financial and staffing arrangements on local campuses necessary to provide these new services; and (d) the manner in which off-campus and extension program scholarly and information delivery systems are constituted and managed. Those involved in self-study work will need increasingly to ask both different and more complex questions as they seek to determine whether academic support services in the new, emergent environment are supportive of the local academic mission.

There is little question that the role of information technology on university campuses continues to evolve rapidly and often dramatically. Both management styles and organizational models are being challenged by these changes. Traditional management styles often view information and scholarly technologies simply in terms of technologies to be deployed and factions of clients to be served. This posture fails to recognize the strategic relationship of emerging information and scholarly technologies to the achievement of institutional goals. The resulting divisions (information hegemony?) can easily lead to unproductive competition and inefficient use of resources. Clearly, the accreditation process is currently the only external sanction which induces an institution to examine its enterprise systematically and as a whole.

Self-study steering committees, in their review of campus academic support services—especially those services supportive of off-campus instruction and libraries—have a very real opportunity to provide campus leadership by recognizing that all information technology units, no matter where placed on campus, can mutually benefit from concurrent and joint planning, review, and cooperation. While the organizations on campus that provide information services may in fact remain separate, they clearly need to have a common planning focus from an institutional perspective and a common self-study focus from the steering committee perspective.

It is apparent that the dispersion of computing within the contemporary academic environment has made it difficult for academic units to work in support of the common institutional mission. Self-study steering committees and subcommittees are challenged to seek new ways of organizing themselves to ensure inclusion and participation by diverse academic support service constituencies. Especially, they must seek to include institutional staff charged with managing off-campus instructional programs and the information centers that support these programs. No doubt the more traditional model of organization of services that emphasizes departmental autonomy offers compelling advantages of flexibility. Conversely, the inherent problem of transportability is raised to a new level. It becomes very difficult at times for managers from one department on campus to adapt to systems used by another department. Campus networks, while supposedly the great hope of integration, will not resolve the problems created by redundant, and at times inconsistent, use of information. Here steering committees are compelled to grow in their awareness of and have
important responsibilities to explore places where such redundancies and inconsistencies exist on campus.

Given the new and emergent information-laden environment, academics involved with self-study steering committees as well as those who are charged with managing off-campus information delivery programs, are urged to give attention to a number of issues relative to the organization and effectiveness of information and scholarly technologies. Increasingly, regional accreditation bodies and their visitation teams are beginning to investigate whether such issues are being raised and dealt with on campuses.

1. Common unified management structures, while often facilitating university planning, should allow for various alternative structures that can be equally effective. Some colleges and universities have found that distributed information system management can be effective if clear, central information technology leadership is identified. This person serves as chief spokesperson and advocate for information and scholarly delivery systems, both campus-wide and in off-campus instructional settings. Sometimes, however, this approach can be inconsistent with the prevailing campus culture. Some campuses have found that academic and administrative computing can be merged—not without difficulty, but merged—while the library and the programs it serves both on and off-campus stand on the same ground. Other campuses have found that, given local culture and reasoning, the academic computing program can be easily merged with the university library, and administrative computing will need to stand alone. Self-study investigators need to determine if at least somewhere in the college or university there is a clear level at which all aspects of information and scholarly technologies are brought together for planning and coordinative purposes. Team visitors, in the same vein, need to uncover during their first day or so on campus where this planning and coordinative responsibility lies. Self-study visitors will find it helpful, as well, to speak with appropriate individuals responsible for off-campus library and information delivery programs.

2. Whatever planning process for campus and off-campus information technologies is uncovered by the self-study steering committee (as well as the visitation team later in the process) that process must show evidence of involving all persons responsible for managing information on and off-campus. Broad representation is critical to a consensus laden, common direction.

3. Whatever organizational model is adopted, be it centralization, decentralization; or a modified form of one or the other, computing standards must be promulgated that will allow resources to be interconnected both on and off campus. Self-study steering committees and evaluation team members should discover evidence of this interconnectivity.

4. Recognize that differences between the needs of various campus constituencies do exist. Self-study steering committees should not focus their attention solely on whether there is organizational consolidation or decentralization; rather they should remember that models of organization and structures are simply tools providing services and planning. These planning exercises and resulting services must always, in the end, inform the strategic direction of the institution.

There will likely remain only a few choices for campus organization of informational and scholarly technologies. As is typically the case with the "organized anarchy" known as the academy, one option will always remain disorganization. Steering committees have a ripe opportunity to discover the liabilities attached to such disunity in the provision of information and scholarly services to on and off-campus instructional programs. They have the corresponding opportunity of
discovering the operating rationale—and affirming that rationale if it deserves affirmation—of the centralized model of information technology, a model often characterized by evidence of a strong chief information officer. The less dramatic approach, for which there are more than a few variations, and for which there can be equal affirmation if justified, is the comprehensive and integrated planning process with overall university-wide governance structures for information resource management. While the effectiveness of such bodies has yet to be proven conclusively, such coordinative committees or councils can often allow for widespread discussion of the host of issues surrounding information and scholarly resource development and implementation and can help dispel the totalitarian images which often, unfortunately, accompany the “information czar” type position now found on several campuses. Self-study steering committees, in their investigations, may discover that some campus coordination (perhaps even sufficient coordination) is achieved through “dotted-line,” or more informal reporting arrangements, joint appointments, or other more contemporary and collegial arrangements.

Information and scholarly technologies have reached a critical juncture in their development. The environment in which we now work is one in which information technologies will be put to use largely by campus professionals who know their jobs best. One does not need a crystal ball to realize that the roles of information professionals increasingly will become those of “planner” and “consultant.” Increasingly, all of us who serve in information management roles, those of us responsible for off-campus library support programs, as well as many academic and administrative leaders who serve on local self-study committees, will be part of a process ensuring access to and connection between many diverse local, regional, and international information resources. If we are to meet the task, we will all have to become more general in both our orientation and in our appraisal and assessment skills as we ultimately come to appreciate and understand the evolving needs of campus scholars.

In all documents produced by self-study steering committees and made available to the evaluation team there needs to be explicit and detailed description of campus working, reporting, and staffing relationships, as well as financial arrangements, supportive of the delivery of information and scholarly technologies and services support of all academic programs whether they be on-campus or in extension.
Setting Up Online Circulation for an Off-campus Library Service

Pamela Grudzien
Central Michigan University

An online circulation system offers a library many ways of enhancing service to its users. Hold/recall functions are handled efficiently; check-out and renewal processes are quick so people do not wait long; check-in is also done quickly so materials are returned to the shelves faster and are available for users. An integrated library system is even more helpful. Instantaneously, circulation information about location and availability of items is displayed on public access terminals. This provides library users with time-saving data that can prevent a futile search in the book stacks and direct the person to the appropriate service desk for further assistance.

Circulation functions are generally designed with the idea that library users are present at the circulation desk and its terminals. When serving clientele in an off-campus situation, circulation’s basic functions must be adapted to work efficiently. Questions about circulation policies and procedures, loan periods, and patron use statistics must be reviewed from an off-campus service viewpoint.

Central Michigan University Libraries serves an off-campus population of over 12,000 students across the U.S., Canada and Mexico. Through the Off-campus Library Service (OCLS) Document Delivery Office, these remote students are provided with material to complete their studies. Books requested and owned by the CMU main library are circulated to these off-campus borrowers. In 1990-91, 10,117 books were requested; 5298 books were mailed out—a fill rate of 52%.

In 1989, a NOTIS Circulation Task Force was created to review the current circulation policies, discuss changes in light of automated functions, recommend new policy, and write the circulation tables for NOTIS implementation. Librarians and staff from the main library circulation section, Interlibrary Loan, Off-Campus Library Services, and Technical Services participated in this group since these four areas would use circulation functions either partially or completely. In past years, most of the vagaries of OCLS’s initial circulation set up had been changed to bring its policies and procedures parallel to the main library’s. It became clear early on that OCLS still presented some unique situations.

One of the first questions the Task Force dealt with was whether automated circulation procedures and policies would continue to be the same for the main library and OCLS. The Task Force recommended that, wherever possible, the same circulation policy be shared among the four circulating areas. OCLS’s policy differs from the main circulation section in three ways: 1) length of loan in the computer for books sent to Canadian and Hawaiian students; 2) grace periods for overdue and recalled items; and 3) the number of times an off-campus student may renew an item. These variations were recognized because of the long enroute mailing periods especially to Hawaii, the customs delays at the Canadian border, and the need to limit renewals to ensure that material was returned to the campus library in a reasonable time period.

The establishment of four separate circulation service units, OCLS being one of them, was another important recommendation. In NOTIS, all overdue notices, bills, and recall notices are generated with the address of the particular service area that handled the transaction printed at the top. If the four circulation areas were coded into the NOTIS tables as /service unit, all notices
would bear the same generic address. Overdue notices for material sent by the OCLS office to a student in Hawaii would have the same originating address as notices sent to students in the residence halls on campus. The resulting confusion for off-campus borrowers and the high probability of borrowers calling in and being transferred from one circulation area to another for clarification were important public relations problems to be considered.

The other problem with a single circulation service unit was that separate circulation statistics for each area could not be obtained. OCLS's numbers would be added into those of the main circulation section, Interlibrary Loan, and Technical Services. One of the most useful elements of online circulation—statistics keeping—would be lost. And so, each of the four circulation areas, including OCLS, became a separate NOTIS service unit for ease in identification and for statistical purposes.

Beyond the large, general statistic for the number of items circulated from its service unit, OCLS was also interested in knowing circulation statistics by category of borrower. Initially, four categories were identified: off-campus graduate student, off-campus undergraduate, off-campus faculty, and OCLS librarians and staff. Since loan periods and overdue policies are key to patron categories in NOTIS, and since OCLS wanted a longer loan period for Canadian and Hawaiian students, the four categories became five: off-campus continental graduate students, off-campus continental undergraduates, off-campus Canadian/Hawaiian students, off-campus faculty, and OCLS.

The issue of overdue fines and billing fees was solved easily. Previous to NOTIS implementation, OCLS had charged the same $5.00 overdue fine, $8.00 bill processing fee, and followed the same Bowker Annual average replacement cost chart for billing as the main circulation section did. The philosophy had been "a CMU student is a CMU student" no matter where he/she might live. All students, and for that matter, all faculty on or off campus, should follow library rules and regulations and if necessary, pay the same consequences. Since no change in charge amounts was to be made, this philosophy was written into the NOTIS circulation tables. Overdue and billing charges are set up to be processed the same way for on and off-campus students and faculty.

Perhaps the most problematic issue for OCLS online circulation was issuing patron library cards. The Task Force debated several questions. Should the individual library cards be mailed to each off-campus student and faculty member? Should the cards be sent only after circulating material has been requested? Should the cards go to each person or remain in a file at the OCLS Document Delivery Office for ease in processing requests? What would happen to the card when the student graduated or left the program?

The Task Force recommended that the individual patron cards, 2" x 3" plastic cards with unlinked bar codes imprinted, be kept in the OCLS office for easy processing and for security reasons. There were concerns that remote borrowers would not have the cards available when they called in their requests necessitating additional keyboard work for OCLS staff and increased costs. The possibility of cards being lost in the mail or lent to another student brought up security concerns.

Initially, assigning a plastic card to new borrowers and keeping them in a file worked well. But, as more students called in and were registered, the larger and more cumbersome the file became. The plastic cards were soon replaced by simple 3" x 5" index cards with an unlinked bar code label stuck to it. The individual's name, address and social security number were also printed on the card. This file was easier to access than the slippery plastic cards, took up less space, and was less costly. When a student graduates or leaves the program, the paper card with the inexpensive label is thrown away.
These were the major issues facing off-campus online circulation at Central Michigan University: setting circulation policy, identifying patron categories for statistical purposes, setting overdue fines and billing fees, establishing a separate circulation service unit for OCLS, and handling library cards. Together, the members of the Circulation Task Force answered these concerns and created a circulation system that is unique for each service unit, yet tightly enmeshed in the NOTIS environment. Fortunately, circulation policy and procedures for both OCLS and the main circulation section were almost the same and the manual circulation operations were tied closely together. With the flexibility of the NOTIS system, the small differences could be accommodated easily helping OCLS maintain the high quality service it provides to off-campus borrowers.
A Comparison of References Cited by On-campus and Off-campus Graduate Library Science Students

Catherine Hoy and Martha L. Hale
Emporia State University

Introduction

One of the criticisms of off-campus programs is that students do not have access to adequate research resources. In other words, critics contend that off-campus students suffer because they do not have at hand the same body of research materials or the same research apparatus readily available to on-campus students—such things as a collection of professional books and journals or the knowledge of scholarly sources resulting from ready online and CD ROM access to various professional data bases.

The question that lay behind this study was this: Will off-campus students be hampered in producing scholarly work because they have fewer research resources at hand than on-campus students, or will their work reflect the same quality of research to be found in that of on-campus students? Our study is based on data obtained from a required course in the Master of Library Science program of the School of Library and Information Management (SLIM) at Emporia State University: LI 803 Information Transfer and the Diffusion of Knowledge. One of the standard assignments in this course is a research project, which requires a bibliography of sources. The bibliographies prepared for this assignment from four different sites were compared: on campus, where students have access to the university library; in Kansas City and Denver, where students have access to the resources of metropolitan areas; and in Sioux City, where students are scattered geographically among a variety of small communities over four states with limited access to large libraries.

While this study attempts to consider possible differences among the groups, it is important to note that the students in all four sites are demographically more similar than different. The average age is approximately thirty-five. There are a few full-time students on campus, but even at the Emporia site most of the students live in towns within one hundred miles of Emporia and commute one day a week or for weekend-intensive courses. In Colorado the largest proportion of the students live in or near Denver and therefore have access to large and various libraries. A few students in the Colorado program do live in small towns and drive into Denver for the weekend classes. Most of the students at the Kansas City site live in the metropolitan area and, like the Colorado students, have many libraries available. The Iowa students, on the other hand, for the most part live and work in small towns in Iowa, South Dakota, Minnesota, and Nebraska (a few live in Omaha) and commute from one to three hours in order to attend weekend-intensive classes. This is the group of students who it could be predicted would have the most difficulty locating resources because of the lack of access to large libraries.

Almost all of the students at each site are employed full or part time in some kind of library setting. Many have families and community responsibilities. In other words, very few, even on the ESU campus, are traditional full-time students. In addition to their demographic similarities, students at each site must meet the same admission requirements: 3.0 undergraduate GPA or a
total score of 1000 on the verbal and quantitative sections of the GRE, three letters of reference, and a personal interview.

Methodology

Between spring semester 1989 and spring 1991, Dr. Herbert Achleitner was an instructor of sections of LI 803 Information Transfer and the Diffusion of Knowledge, taught at all four locations. Although the course was updated each semester, still a consistent assignment was the following: A major paper which must address one or more of the policy and social processes of information transfer and must contain references to research and a full bibliography.

Sources identified in each bibliography were analyzed by number of citations per bibliography. In order to compare the resources used by students at each site, the citations were coded into the following categories: 1) Books and Dissertations, 2) Scholarly Journals, 3) Other Professional Publications, 4) Newspapers and Popular Periodicals, 5) Published Reports, and 6) Other Sources. Scholarly journals were defined as periodicals presenting the results of research in library science or in other fields. The category Other Professional Publications included journals, magazines, and/or newsletters from various organizations and professions both in library science and other areas that were primarily informational in content. Newspapers and popular periodicals included materials that generally could be purchased at a newsstand even though many were specialized in subject matter. Published Reports included ALA or other organizational treatises as well as reports from meetings and conferences. The final category included anything that would not fit in one of the others—such things as television or radio programs, personal interviews, class notes, etc. The publication date of each citation was also coded in order to determine currency of materials used.

From the unified presentation of this data, comparisons were based on frequency percentages. No attempts were made to conduct more sophisticated statistical analyses because of the preliminary nature of this project. In fact, our findings are based on only a sample of the bibliographies from each group and do not claim statistical significance. Rather, this investigation takes the form of initial observation and an attempt to establish the groundwork for a continuing effort to find answers to these questions.

In other words, our purpose in this paper is to establish a methodology, not to convey final results. We plan, in future, to acquire LI 803 bibliographies systematically, whereas for this study we had to rely on voluntary submissions from students who, in some cases, had taken the course two years ago. Even though we are not at present claiming definitive results, we do believe that the system described can, with modifications and supplements, eventually produce such results, as well as to improve resource availability for all students, both on and off campus.

Findings

I. What different types of materials were cited? Were materials used by on-campus students more scholarly than those accessible to off-campus students?

Books and dissertations was the category cited most frequently for three sites: Emporia (44% of entries), Kansas City (30%), and Colorado (33%). In the Iowa group books comprised the second most cited category (27%), behind Other Professional Publications (32%). We found in general that the books listed in the bibliographies from all sites were primarily nonfiction with recent copyright dates, many of the titles derived from recommended reading lists for SLIM classes. There was no apparent discrepancy in quality of citations in this category among any of the four groups.
The second category, Scholarly Journals, is undoubtedly the most indicative of quality, up-to-date work. According to this indicator it would appear that being off campus and far from a metropolitan library presented no particular disadvantage. The Iowa students, in fact, showed the highest percentage of scholarly sources, 19%, followed by Kansas City with 16%, Emporia with 11%, and Colorado with 10%.

The use of Other Professional Publications was consistently high among all groups. One might not expect such extensive usage of these sources, considering that LI 803 is only the third sequential course offered in a 42-hour curriculum and thus comes early in the students' program when many are being introduced to standard works in the field. Perhaps, however, students are more aware of these sources because, as noted above, so many of them are employed in libraries and have thus already encountered some of these publications before beginning graduate library education. Emporia students cited 24% Other Professional Publications, Kansas City students cited 28%, Colorado students cited 29%, and Iowa students cited 32%. The higher proportion in the Iowa group might indicate that this level of material is more readily available in more locations. However, since the Iowa students cited more Scholarly Journals than other students and were lowest in Books and Dissertations, it might also indicate more utilization of data base searching rather than the use of a particular print collection of a large library. All except the Emporia group, which was about evenly divided, cited more non-library than library professional publications in this category, which indicates an understanding of the necessity, which is encouraged in our SLIM program, of looking to other professions for information rather than being limited to only the library perspective.

For Newspapers and Popular Periodicals the Colorado group had the highest citation rate, 20%, and the Emporia group had the lowest, 6%. For Kansas City it was 14% and for Iowa it was 19%. This could be considered the least scholarly category, but it should be noted that although this category was comprised of publications that could be bought at newsstands, still the choices were primarily specialized titles such as Business Week, Byte, The Futurist, Nature, Omni, Science, and Scientific American. Newspaper citations often included major papers such as the New York Times and the Washington Post.

In the category of Published Reports, which included organizational reports, publications, and proceedings, the Emporia group cited 10%, Kansas City 7%, and Colorado and Iowa 3% each. These results probably reflect the likelihood that more of these publications would be found in a library that supports a library school and was one category that was more available to the on-campus students.

The final, catch-all category included anything that did not fit into the previous four, such non-traditional sources as class notes, personal interviews, and electronic media presentations. Emporia students cited this category for 5% of their bibliographies, as did Kansas City and Colorado students, while the Iowa group did not use this category at all. Perhaps the possibility of using these less traditional sources simply did not get established during the Iowa class. Certainly, there seemed to be a tendency for the Iowa group to follow more traditional scholarly procedures throughout.

This preliminary survey indicates that students from all four locations found and used an appropriate variety and number of good sources, that distance from campus or from a metropolitan area had no adverse effect on the use of quality research sources.

II. Was there a difference in quantity of materials cited? Did off-campus students have fewer citations per bibliography? Did students in the major metropolitan areas cite more sources than those in smaller towns?
The most interesting difference in the quantity of materials cited is that the students with access to larger libraries actually used fewer sources. The Emporia group had an average of eight citations per bibliography, the Kansas City group had nine citations, the Colorado group had ten citations, while Iowa students had 12 citations per bibliography.

Because the Iowa group, which is predominantly made up of students from small towns, had the most citations per bibliography and used scholarly materials more often than their counterparts, it would again seem to indicate that access to either metropolitan or university libraries was not essential for locating a quantity of research materials of high quality. In fact, it might even be said that distance-education students from small towns or rural areas tend to develop better research skills because they have to look at more sources.

III. Was there a difference in currency of material cited? Did off-campus students rely on older material? Did newer material appear in on-campus bibliographies more frequently?

Because in the regional programs LI 803 is offered approximately only once every two-and-a-half years, we could not compare bibliographies from the same semester at each location. Therefore, for the purposes of this investigation the four sections that fell closest together were considered. For the Emporia group it was Spring 1991, for Kansas City it was Fall 1990, for Colorado it was Fall 1990, and for Iowa it was Spring 1989. It should be pointed out that variables such as delays in the publication of journals made this a difficult category to analyze.

For the currency questions we looked at only the three categories of Books and Dissertations, Scholarly Journals, and Other Professional Publications. In these three categories Kansas City students had a 60% citation rate for materials published within one to five years, followed by Colorado with 57%, Emporia with 47%, and Iowa with 45%. Iowa led in cited materials published within six to ten years of the class offering, 41%, compared to 35% for Emporia, 29% for Colorado, and 22% for Kansas City. For all materials published over ten years beyond the course offering, Emporia and Kansas City each had 18% while Colorado and Iowa each had 14%. When one looks separately at the figures in each category, however, some interesting distinctions appear. With recently published books (one-to-five years), for instance, Emporia and Colorado top the figures with 45%, followed by Kansas City with 38% and Iowa with only 25%. In Other Professional Publications for the same one-to-five year period, Kansas City had an 86% citation rate, followed by Colorado with 76%, Emporia with 60%, and Iowa close behind with 58%. Probably the most important category, however, Scholarly Journals within a one-to-five year period showed Kansas City leading with a 55% citation rate, closely followed by Iowa and Colorado with 50% each, and trailed perceptibly by Emporia with only a 25% citation rate.

The above figures seem to indicate that students at a university library have greater access to newer books, perhaps because faculty members on a university staff are more apt to order for the library newly published books in their field. Metropolitan libraries would seem have larger holdings of Other Professional Publications, if the totals for Kansas City and Denver students are indicative. In seeking out publications in Scholarly Journals, however, the students from Iowa suffered no disadvantage whatever.

Conclusions and Implications

In returning to the question that formed the basis for this study, we can conclude that off-campus students appear not to be at a disadvantage in gaining access to scholarly work. If, in fact, there is a disadvantage, then the students at the non-metropolitan distance site were able to compensate by overcoming the obstacles they met and indeed equaled or exceeded students in other
sites, as exemplified by the Iowa group who topped the field in the use of up-to-date scholarly articles.

Certain geographic areas do seem to have enjoyed some advantages in certain categories. For example, the students in the metropolitan areas were able to use libraries that had extensive subscription lists of Other Professional Publications, while students using the Emporia State University library had access to more Published Reports and books that had been recently published. These advantages, however, seem to have been counteracted by the more innovative research techniques employed by the Iowa students in searching out scholarly journals. In short, off-campus students did not have to rely on older, less scholarly materials, nor were there any crucial differences in the type, the quantity, or the currency of materials cited among the four groups.

The observations begun in this study will be continued, with the eventual goal of providing better access to research materials for students at all types of locations.
Statistical Summary

Average Number of Citations per Bibliography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ESU</th>
<th>KC</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>IA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency of Citations

Scholarly Journals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ESU</th>
<th>KC</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>IA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Books and Dissertations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ESU</th>
<th>KC</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>IA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Professional Publications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ESU</th>
<th>KC</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>IA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Newspapers and Popular Periodicals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ESU</th>
<th>KC</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>IA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Published Reports:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ESU</th>
<th>KC</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>IA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ESU</th>
<th>KC</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>IA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Currency of Citations from All Sources

One-to-Five Years:
ESU: 47%   KC: 60%   CO: 57%   IA: 45%

Six-to-Ten Years:
ESU: 35%   KC: 22%   CO: 29%   IA: 41%

Eleven Years and Over:
ESU: 18%   KC: 18%   CO: 14%   IA: 14%

Currency of Citations from Scholarly Journals

One-to-Five Years:
ESU: 25%   KC: 55%   CO: 50%   IA: 50%

Six-to-Ten Years:
ESU: 67%   KC: 23%   CO: 42%   IA: 50%

Eleven Years and Over:
ESU: 8%    KC: 22%   CO: 8%    IA: 0%
Currency of Citations from Books and Dissertations

One-to-Five Years:
ESU: 45%    KC: 38%    CO: 45%    IA: 25%

Six-to-Ten Years:
ESU: 32%    KC: 32%    CO: 33%    IA: 35%

Eleven Years and Over:
ESU: 23%    KC: 30%    CO: 22%    IA: 40%

Currency of Citations from Other Professional Publications

One-to-Five Years:
ESU: 60%    KC: 86%    CO: 76%    IA: 58%

Six-to-Ten Years:
ESU: 27%    KC: 10%    CO: 18%    IA: 42%

Eleven Years and Over:
ESU: 13%    KC: 4%     CO: 6%     IA: 0%
Library Services to Off-Campus Sites: An Assessment Survey

Karen E. Jaggers, Eve M. Tallman, and William D. Waddell
Northern Arizona University

Northern Arizona University offers instruction through its Field Services program in over forty class sites within Arizona.1 These off-campus programs are administered by site coordinators located in nine regional offices. Because Arizona towns and regions differ culturally and economically, each site has its own distinct personality so that classes taught in urban areas such as Phoenix and Tucson differ from classes taught in towns such as Bullhead City and Douglas and from rural locations on the Navajo or Hopi reservations such as Chinle and Kykotsmovi. The type and level of library resources also differ from region to region. Even when classes meet in locales which have research facilities at universities, community colleges, public libraries and school libraries, students and faculty often commute great distances to classes. Commuting time reduces the time available to access library holdings to meet class requirements.

To meet the need for library resources, NAU Cline Library established the Field Services Department in 1986 to act as an extension service for classes taught outside Flagstaff. Students may request computer searches, photocopies, books, interlibrary loans and reference assistance from the department. Requests for material are usually made by phone (toll-free), but are also received via mail, telefaxsimile, electronic mail, and in person. To promote the service, a brochure is distributed to students and faculty, and the field services librarians visit classes and contact faculty members.2

During the fall semester, 1989, 3,518 students were enrolled in field-based classes. At that time, the Field Services Department staff consisted of 1.5 librarians, .5 classified staff and 40 hours per week of student aides. To promote the library service, the field services librarians visited classes and spoke to 320 students. Brochures were distributed in faculty packets and mailed to faculty following telephone contacts. Site coordinators were asked to distribute brochures to students and to mention library services during class registration. This activity resulted in 228 requests for materials from students, 37 from faculty members and 3 from site coordinators.

Concerned with the relatively low number of patrons using the service, and faced with a time of shifting institutional priorities and shrinking budgets, the Field Services staff decided to take a closer look at the resources available to NAU students in the field. Priority was given to gathering information to assist in choosing between increasing the collections in the central library on campus and enhancing library access at libraries located near the off-campus classes. A questionnaire was designed to measure how much support was required, sources the students use to prepare for classes and sources the students would use if they became available. Also, in an attempt to measure the effectiveness of current service levels, questions were asked about use of the Field Services Department and the quality of the service provided.

Specifically, information was to be gathered which would be used for planning, according to the following rationale: if many students use community college libraries or public libraries it would indicate a need to pursue contractual arrangements with libraries which serve NAU students. An indication in the survey that classes do not require research or that sufficient material is provided by the instructor would lead to working more closely with faculty members. If patrons feel no local library can meet class requirements, placing collections in local libraries on a temporary basis might be considered. Another interpretation might indicate that students need more information about
local libraries that can support their research. If the Field Services Department is used heavily and predominantly, library monics might be concentrated on building the Cline Library collection and promoting the library service.

Survey Methodology

The questionnaire was designed by the Cline Library Field Services staff to sample students taking classes in one of the eight-week sessions of Spring Semester 1990. The questionnaire posed eighteen questions, three of which were subdivided into categories. Survey forms were sent to 115 classes, with each geographical region represented. The forms were sent to faculty members who were asked to distribute the questionnaire in class, gather the forms after the class and return them to the Field Services Department in a postage-paid envelope which was provided. Forms were mailed to arrive three weeks before the end of the class. Fifteen classes returned blank forms because the class had ended, the students had completed the survey in another class, the questionnaires were mailed to an incorrect address, or the class was not held because of low enrollment.

The response was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cochise</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconino</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gila/Graham/Greenlee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo/Hopi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima/Santa Cruz</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinal/E Maricopa</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Mountains</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses were compiled for the population as a whole and by regional sites. The statistics reported indicate valid responses, discounting those which lacked a response and those in which the response was incorrectly recorded on the survey form.

Results

Need for Material and How Needs are Currently Being Met

Respondents were asked how many classes they were taking and how many had assignments requiring materials other than the textbook or required readings. Answers indicated 81 percent were taking two or more classes, and 71 percent of classes required material other than the textbook or required readings. This indicates that students need access to libraries or the Field Services Department offerings.

The traditional means of providing material for field-based classes is for the instructor to transport books or journal articles to share with the class. To ascertain whether this was still predominant, respondents were asked how often they used material from instructors or from various other sources. Responses indicate that students used materials provided by the instructor (82%) followed by personal book/periodical collections (68%), local school systems (62%), community college libraries (42%), libraries at Arizona State University in Tempe and University of Arizona in
Tucson (40%), NAU Field Services Department (36%), Gold Files in site coordinators' offices (19%) and the NAU library in person (14%).

These statistics are significant indicators for service if they are divided by Regional Sites. Each area used instructor-provided material followed by either personal book/journal collections or local school systems. Beyond this, in the metropolitan areas of Phoenix, Pinal/East Maricopa County and Pima/Santa Cruz, local school systems or ASU/UA libraries were most used. Of the more rural areas, three utilized community college resources, and four used the NAU-Field Services program. In each of the rural areas classes were held on community college campuses and at public schools. Many public schools are in locations remote from community college libraries. This may account for the division between the use of community colleges in one area and the Field Services Department in another. Each of these areas had low use of ASU/UA libraries, the NAU library in person, and Gold files. Gold files were most heavily used in Gila/Graham/Greenlee (32.6%) and Pinal/E.Maricopa (29.5%).

Of the choices given, respondents had to travel the greatest distance to get to the NAU Library in Flagstaff. Forty-seven percent gauged the distance at over 150 miles, 30% said it was between 6 and 150 miles. Fifteen percent of the population lived more than 150 miles from either the Arizona State University library or that of University of Arizona. Each of the remaining sources were within five miles of the homes of over 50% of the survey population and within 60 miles of over 86% of the survey population.

The questionnaire indicated that if the resources were easily accessible and if the students had time, the students would use the sources with which they have most contact: the professor (91%), the local school system (78%) and their own collection (83%). Next in preference were the community college library (75%) and NAU-Field Services (75%), followed by the three university libraries, ASU or UA (66%) and NAU (62%), with Gold Files (55%) least preferred.

**Satisfaction With Cline Library Field Services Department**

For the population who have used the service, the satisfaction with the material provided was high. The service was used by 34%-36% of the respondents. Of those who used the service 85% indicated that they received materials which were adequate for the assignment, 46% received more material than they expected, 91% said the materials were pertinent and 89% said the librarian interpreted the request correctly. The material was received on time 90% of the time.

Respondents learned about the Field Services program mainly from regional site coordinators (36%) but also heard about it from faculty members (27%), from other students (14%) and from a brochure received through the mail (5%). Class presentations by Field Services librarians was not listed as an option and therefore statistics on this most visible form of publicity were not gathered.

Respondents who did not use the Field Services program were unaware of the program (44%), did not need the service (23%), had access to sources locally (29%) or did not identify needs in time (5%).

Regionally, utilization of the Field Services program divided into three levels. Of Cochise County respondents, 62% used the services provided. Usage from other rural regions fell between 40%-50%. Pima/Santa Cruz respondents answered in this range, perhaps because classes are taught on public school campuses and not at the community college. Pima/Santa Cruz respondents also indicated high use of ASU/UA materials. In the urban areas of Phoenix and Pinal/East Maricopa counties usage ranged between 10%-30%. The low figure for Phoenix of 10% was for Phoenix classes excluding those taught at Luke Air Force Base which responded separately at 41%.
Demographics

Of the respondents, 71% were graduate students, 21% undergraduate and 8% were non-degree students. Six percent were under twenty-five years of age, 39% between twenty-six and thirty-five, 38% between thirty-six and forty-five and 16% over forty-five. Seventy-six percent had taken previous field-based classes. Forty-nine percent of the respondents lived in towns with populations of less than 25,000; 19% lived outside town limits or in towns with fewer than 5000 population.

Discussion

Several conclusions can be drawn from the questionnaire results. First they indicate a need to reevaluate instructor-provided material. Traditionally, instructor-provided material consists of journal articles, books from the campus library and packets of reproduced background materials. To provide them to the class, the instructor must be responsible for the materials, for their transportation, distribution and retrieval. The material provided may be limited in scope. The Field Services department needs to increase its contact with faculty members to supplement the instructor-provided material or to offer substitutes, such as computer-generated bibliographies of materials which can be mailed at the student's request, free CD-ROM computer searches, predominantly in the ERIC or PsycLIT databases, and photocopies provided at a minimal cost.

When a reserve collection of specific books is provided to instructors through the Field Services Department, the library, not the professor, is responsible for the books. For remote areas, books may still be distributed and retrieved by the instructor; however, community college libraries and public libraries have been very cooperative in receiving and managing reserve collections.

The second area needing to be addressed is the use of community college libraries. Since the survey indicates that the community college libraries are used by our students, we need to investigate interlibrary cooperation which will encourage this usage. This may involve contractual arrangements which might result in enhancing periodical collections or computer access within the community college libraries. The impact our students have on those libraries needs further study. Also, the various services available locally need to be investigated and information about the services provided to our students so they will be aware of the library hours, the collections, and the policies which promote access.

The survey also indicates that the Field Services Department is necessary to our students and that the students who use the service are satisfied with the materials they receive. The service needs to be promoted more broadly, particularly in the Phoenix area.

Further Research

This questionnaire supplied the information we intended to gather. Another survey should be done within five years for comparative purposes. In that survey a question should be added to quantify how many Field Services users find out about the service from class presentations by librarians.

A study also needs to be done which will measure satisfaction with our method of delivery. A small percent of our respondents indicated that material arrived later than expected. This could be measured by including a response form with journal articles and books which could be completed by the patron and returned with the books and/or payment for the articles.
Footnotes

1. Students in the field-services program can pursue the following studies: certification to teach vocational subjects, Bachelor's in General Studies, Bachelor's Degree in Elementary Education, Bachelor of Science in Education--emphasis in Vocational-Industrial Education, Master of Public Administration, Masters of Arts in Education or Masters of Vocational Education.

2. For a copy of the Field-Services Brochure write Field-Services Department, Cline Library, Box 6022, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Arizona 86011-6022.

3. Gold files are collections of journal articles and microfiche on educational topics. They are made available to subscribers to AEIS, Arizona Educational Information System, Arizona State University. The NAU Regional Site Coordinators can subscribe to the Gold Files and circulate them to students from their regional site offices.
Off-Campus Library Service As A Specialized Knowledgebase and Its Inclusion in Library School Curriculum

Marie A. Kascus
Central Connecticut State University

Introduction

In 1931, the American Library Association recognized that off-campus students were at a disadvantage compared to their on-campus counterparts. Sixty years later, more than a few educators would argue that not much has changed, that off-campus students continue to be at a disadvantage, and that the lack of library support is a factor contributing to this perceived difference in the quality of education.

It would be difficult to argue convincingly that all, or even most, of the courses taught at off-campus locations require a fully staffed library with all of its resources at each location. Many courses have been taught and continue to be taught successfully by dedicated, knowledgeable, creative instructors with a minimal level of library support. It would also be difficult to argue convincingly that available library support, or lack of it, does not impact the courses that are offered or the method of instruction.

There is little doubt that the dedication and creativity of many educators during the past sixty years has ameliorated much of the impact that the lack of funding could have had on the quality of off-campus education. The creative use of technology has helped to offset the lack of a library and librarians in situ and thereby has helped to increase the quality of education for off-campus students.

Will the dedication and creativity of educators and the increased use of technology be sufficient to ensure the continued quality of off-campus education? Perhaps, but more may be needed. In order for the quality of off-campus education to be maintained and improved, librarians and library educators need to develop a heightened awareness of the special problems and needs of off-campus library programs as well as a recognition of their special role in the resolution of these problems.

The development of Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Support, the emphasis on library support for off-campus programs in recent actions of state and regional accrediting bodies, the off-campus library services conference, the Extended Campus Library Services Section of ACRL, the increased representation of off-campus librarianship in the literature, and the dedication and creativity of a group of pioneering librarians have gone a long way toward increasing the awareness of the educational community, in general, and the library community, in particular. But will this be enough?

A survey of ALA accredited library schools was conducted in the late spring of this year to determine the extent to which off-campus librarianship/library service as a specialized knowledgebase is already represented in library school curriculum.

At the time this paper is being written, 22 Schools of Library and Information Science have responded to the survey questionnaire. The preliminary results are revealing. Of the schools responding, none has indicated having a designated course in off-campus librarianship/library service. Of those schools with some representation of the topic, the representation takes place as
part of an established course in the curriculum. Two institutions have representation of the topic at the 6-15% level, six have representation of the topic at the 1-5% level, and fourteen have no representation of the topic in the current curriculum.

It is my contention that off-campus librarianship is a specialized knowledgebase, and, as such, should warrant a dedicated course or, at least, should constitute a substantial part of one or more courses in most library schools. The inclusion of the area in library school curriculum should go a long way toward increasing the awareness of current and future generations of librarians, thereby helping us to discharge our responsibilities in ensuring the quality of off-campus programs.

Some of the dynamics contributing to the development and enhancement of off-campus library service, the rationale for coursework in library science curriculum, and the preliminary results of a recent survey of ALA accredited library schools follow.

Events in the Coalescence of Off-Campus Library Service

There has been a slow evolutionary process at work in recognizing the need to extend library service to off-campus programs and an even slower process at work in providing budgetary support to libraries for that purpose. Considerable progress has been made since 1931, when the American Library Association recognized that extension students were at a disadvantage because of the lack of library resources for this constituency (ALA Bulletin, 1931). The University of Maryland began offering off-campus classes in 1947 and became a pioneer in providing library service on a regular basis to off-campus military students in 1953 via a bookmobile; and the occasion was the subject of a brief announcement in the literature (Hayes, 1953). The University of Wyoming was a pioneer in offering extension classes for credit as early as 1891, with minimal library support, and began in 1983 to develop a major program in off-campus library service with the assistance of an extension librarian for that purpose (Johnson, 1983). The recently published Off-Campus Library Service Directory lists 68 academic institutions throughout the United States and Canada that provide library services to off-campus students and is an indication of the progress that has been made over the last 60 years (Lebowitz and Schultz, 1990).

Six of the factors along the way in this 60 year span of development are noted, in particular, as either directly or indirectly contributing to the improvement of off-campus library service and the emergence of off-campus librarianship as a specialized knowledgebase.

The first factor was the development of the Guidelines for Library Services to Extension Students and their approval by the ACRL Board of Directors in July of 1966 (Association of College and Research Libraries [ACRL], 1967). These Guidelines were intended to serve as a guide to institutions providing library services to extension students. The Guidelines have undergone several major reviews and thoughtful revision has taken place. In 1981, the 1967 Guidelines were reviewed and a new set of guidelines approved "to provide a framework without being prescriptive or enumerative" (ACRL, 1982). A recent ACRL Task Force reviewed the 1981 Guidelines and a new revision was approved in 1990. Questions have been raised along the way as to whether the guidelines should be upgraded to standards in order to make them more effective. The 1990 Guidelines for Library Services to Extended Campus Students have been revised and strengthened in the process, but continue to remain as guidelines. Johnson provides one example of how the Guidelines have been successfully used to plan and implement an effective extended campus library services program in Wyoming. She stresses the importance of not losing sight of a key assumption that the guidelines are based on, and that is that "effective service for the extended campus community may differ from normal library practice" (Johnson, 1984). While the recent ACRL Task Force did not see the need for changing the guidelines to standards in the immediate future, (La
Brake, 1991), this does not preclude the possibility that the guidelines may yet evolve into standards in a future revision.

The second factor is the movement by state and regional licensing and accrediting bodies to seek stricter regulations for off-campus programs. States such as Connecticut, for example, included a provision in the state regulations in 1986 regarding library support for off-campus programs (State of Connecticut, 1986). In the case of one institution in Connecticut, the regulations contributed to a decision to put a moratorium on creating new off-campus sites and jeopardized accreditation. The importance of library support for off-campus instructional programs is acknowledged in the accreditation standards of each of the regional accrediting bodies. The language of these provisions is a clear signal. According to the Western Association of Schools and Universities, it is expected that "where off-campus programs exist, students are provided with ready access to basic collections at all program sites" and that interlibrary loan and contractual arrangements are to be used to supplement but are not used as the main source of learning resources" (Western Association of Schools and Colleges, 1988). According to the Southern Association "an institution must provide appropriate library resources at off-campus locations to insure that they receive the same level of support" (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1983). The flavor of the language varies, but a common message is repeated in the accreditation standards of each of the regional accrediting bodies. The significance of these explicit provisions within the standards of state licensing and regional accrediting commissions is the importance they attribute to library service in contributing to quality and equity for off-campus programs.

A third factor in this evolutionary process was the creation of a national forum in the form of the Off-Campus Library Services Conferences sponsored by Central Michigan University. The first conference was held in 1982. Subsequent conferences took place in 1984, 1986, 1988, with the current conference in 1991 as the fifth such conference. These conferences provide a forum for exchanging ideas on the means and methods that have been used in implementing extended campus library service and are an important support group for off-campus librarians.

A fourth factor in the evolution of off-campus librarianship/library service occurred with the formation of its own special interest group, the ACRL Extended Campus Library Service Discussion Group. What is most significant is that the Discussion Group has now been dissolved and reconstituted under the ACRL Extended Campus Library Services Section at ALA's Midwinter meeting in January of 1990. The first meeting of the new section occurred at the ALA Annual Conference in Chicago in 1990. The group has established by-laws and has elected an Executive Committee, a Planning Committee, and has discussed the need for additional committees including a Research/Publications Committee. This section of ACRL represents a significant development in advancing the status of off-campus librarianship within the profession. Project areas for the future targeted by this group are the development of programs and continuing education opportunities related to extended campus library services and the encouragement of research.

The fifth factor in this evolutionary process of improving off-campus library service is a growing body of literature on the topic. Much of the early work in off-campus library service occurred outside the United States in countries with a longer tradition of distance education such as Canada, Australia, and Great Britain with its Open University. This is evident in Haworth's review of the literature "Library Services to the Off-Campus and Independent Learner" in the Journal of Librarianship (Haworth, 1982). The early U.S. library literature in off-campus library service probably reflects the level of activity and is sparse. Three early articles that appear in the literature are Flanders' article in 1956 "Off-campus Services of the University of Michigan Library" in Library Trends (Flanders, 1956), Littleton's article "The Off-Campus Library Services of Universities" a survey of 74 universities in 1959 (Littleton, 1959) and Ryan's article "Libraries in Off-campus Units," a survey of 24 libraries with branches that appeared to be dependent on main libraries elsewhere

The sixth factor in the improvement of off-campus library service during this 60 year period is the dedication and hard work of many pioneering librarians who provided the all important human element in this evolving process. Off-campus librarianship has benefitted from an international roster of voices, including Margaret Cameron, Christine Crocker, and Ron Store in Australia, Sandy Slade and Sheila Latham in Canada, Raymond Fisher and Kenneth Cameron in Great Britain, and Barton Lessin, Gerard McCabe, and Jean Johnson in the United States, to name just a few. The combined effort of many librarians in the field, who were willing to forge new paths in extending library service to remote users, forms the common thread woven throughout the process culminating in the emergence of off-campus librarianship as a body of knowledge.

Clearly, much progress has been made in advancing this aspect of academic librarianship, but more remains to be accomplished to insure its credibility and its success beyond those who are already committed.

Need for Coursework in Library School Curriculum

Libraries are impacted by the extended campus educational phenomenon, a phenomenon that shows little evidence of subsiding in the future. In Bernard Luskin's vision of the extended campus, the library "serves as the physical manifestation" and "becomes the focal point of the extended university idea" (Luskin, 1974). If libraries are important in the educational process, they should be important both on-campus and off-campus. Faculty should not have to make adjustments to courses because of a real or perceived lack of library support. Students should not be denied an appropriate library experience because of a real or perceived lack of difficulty in providing it.

Rethinking traditional library services and making them accessible in new and different ways has played an important part in the development of off-campus library service. There is much to be optimistic about in the future in terms of further extending library service through knowledge engineering and the design of expert systems delivered to remote users via telecommunication networks. This seems an especially appropriate way for the library to support distance education and to actualize the electronic library. Some see electronic library service as the solution for external learning centers (Brown, 1988). The quality of off-campus education need not be impaired because of the library's lack of a physical presence.

In looking to the future of library support for the extended campus, what seems most appropriate at this point is a greater emphasis on developing a broader based analytic perspective that can be generalized. The focus needs to be on establishing evaluative criteria that can be used to measure performance, collecting data and testing assumptions through carefully planned research, and using the results of that research to forge a common methodology that is valid across institutions.
The next logical step for off-campus librarianship to continue to grow, therefore, is its inclusion in the curriculum of library schools, as a learning experience for new librarians and a continuing education opportunity for practicing librarians. As with distance education, the key to greater acceptability and support for extended campus library service would be to encourage library educators to move towards implementation activities in the current curriculum, so that the next generation of librarians will be introduced to off-campus library service in the classroom and better prepared to deal with it in the field. By taking the initiative, library educators could provide the necessary leadership in developing a common methodology for off-campus library support. Such a methodology can be used to test and to improve extended campus library service and to stimulate research and scholarship in strengthening the practice of off-campus librarianship.

Current and future librarians need to be made aware of the special needs of faculty and students involved in off-campus programs in order to better assist college and university administrators in finding acceptable solutions to the quality and equity issues that have been raised by accrediting bodies. Better solutions to the problems created in the process of administering off-campus programs will come with a broader awareness of the issues and a greater sensitivity to the needs of students and faculty as part of the library education process. Librarians need to acquire at least a generalized understanding of distance education and the skills necessary to develop appropriate library service for remote users and to measure its effectiveness.

Off-campus library service presents a challenging opportunity for library educators and practicing librarians to work together in meeting a library need as part of the extended campus phenomenon in higher education. It provides a further opportunity for library faculty to collaborate with faculty in other academic disciplines, particularly those in adult education, to develop an interdisciplinary course that addresses the information needs of adults and advanced students in a manner that is appropriate to this audience.

Preliminary Results of a Survey of Library Schools

A questionnaire was sent to the Deans of all ALA accredited library schools in the United States and Canada. The questionnaire was designed to assess the awareness and attitudes of library educators regarding the problems and issues associated with off-campus programs and to gather information on the extent to which off-campus library service/librarianship as a specialized knowledgebase is reflected in the current curriculum of library schools. All of the questionnaires have not yet been returned and the analysis is incomplete, but some preliminary observations seem worth sharing.

The questionnaire consisted of 54 items. Based on a small sample of the questions asked, the responses show general agreement that library education is a critical element of quality education on-campus as well as off-campus; that students and faculty perceive the lack of library support as a disadvantage of off-campus instructional programs; that off-campus programs will continue to proliferate; that off-campus librarianship/library service as a specialized knowledgebase is not included in the existing graduate library school curriculum; and that off-campus library service/librarianship is not reflected in existing courses in the curriculum to any great extent.

There is as much agreement as there is disagreement that the present library school curriculum prepares librarians to address the library needs of the extended campus and that off-campus librarianship is adequately represented in the current curriculum.

There is more disagreement than there is agreement, however, that off-campus librarianship is a specialized knowledgebase that needs to be included in library school curriculum.
What seems clear even from a preliminary look at the results of the survey is that the off-campus component is not well represented in the current curriculum of library schools, and that library educators need to be encouraged to strengthen the off-campus component of Library and Information Science curriculum. While some institutions are receptive to modifying existing courses or expanding the curriculum in this area, most are not receptive. Clearly, more work needs to be done to encourage library educators to move towards implementation activities. Library schools need to be encouraged to take the lead at this point in bringing the experience of the field and the tools of the classroom together in continuing the development of the knowledgebase that is off-campus librarianship.

Concluding Remarks

While off-campus librarianship is perceived to be a narrow specialty, there are compelling reasons why a broader awareness of this area of academic librarianship is both logical and necessary.

At the institution level, the most compelling reason is the expectation that the proliferation of off-campus programs will continue. Many factors contribute to this expectation including the following: declining enrollments among the traditional college bound group, diminishing budgets, limited space, competition from other providers of education, the shift to an aging society, increased desire for lifelong learning opportunities, need to update skills and learn new ones due to global changes in society, as well as an expanded mission calling for greater outreach and community service on the part of higher education institutions. Given the potential of this method of delivering courses in terms of its convenience, cost effectiveness, and the emerging technology to do it well, the rationale for this expansion is not difficult to understand. More and more academic disciplines are taking advantage of distance education to expand opportunities to those that are placebound.

At the library level, the most compelling reason for a broader awareness of off-campus librarianship in the classroom is that off-campus library service impacts all aspects of library operations on campus including collection development, interlibrary loan, circulation, acquisitions, reference, bibliographic instruction, etc. and all academic librarians would benefit from a knowledge of distance education and methods of providing appropriate library service to remote users. Off-campus library service has an impact across institutions, particularly public institutions, where users have ready access to collections and librarians regardless of whether they are affiliated with the institution. This is beginning to emerge as an issue, as libraries faced with diminished staffing levels are forced to decide what services to provide and to whom to provide them. For private institutions that means limiting services, such as reference, to the needs of their own students and faculty. Additionally, public libraries have functioned as silent partners in the educational process in supporting students informally by chance and formally through contractual arrangements for that purpose. There are ethical issues and equity issues that will have to be dealt with in the future. The extended campus provides a laboratory for testing new ways of providing client centered library service and document delivery to remote sites and has much to contribute to the state of the art of library practice and much to gain from inclusion in library science education.
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Off-campus Library Services: How Does the Urban/Suburban Experience Compare to Other Settings

Lynn Klekowski and Sharon Mader
DePaul University

Abstract

The characteristics of off-campus library services at urban/suburban sites will be examined in relations to those in other geographic settings. Results from a survey of off-campus sites in the United States and Canada will be reported to provide a comparison of library services, staffing, and collections as they have changed from the first year of operation to the present. A checklist of considerations for planning which can be used in conjunction with the ACRL Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Services will be presented.
Planning a Joint-Use Library

Lynn LaBrake
University of Central Florida

Planning a new library is an important and complex undertaking for an academic institution. A well planned library will be functional for one hundred years or more. A poorly planned one will be inadequate very quickly.

Planning a joint-use library, one to serve more than one institution, can be infinitely more complex. It can also be exciting, challenging, and at times frustrating! The differing standards, requirements, practices, philosophies and priorities of the multiple institutions and their responsible state agencies add to the complexity. It takes more time, energy and diplomacy.

Where different institutions share a campus, a joint-use library facility offers many advantages. It saves construction of separate facilities and eliminates costly duplication of resources, staff and space. It also provides a larger collection to all users than by separate libraries.

This paper will describe the planning for a joint-use library for three institutions located on the same campus in Cocoa, Florida. The three institutions are the Brevard Community College, the Brevard Campus of the University of Central Florida and the Florida Solar Energy Center.

Participating Institutions

Brevard Community College (BCC) is a two-year public institution with four campuses, serving Brevard County. The main campus is located on the shared campus in Cocoa. Enrollment on the Cocoa campus in 1990 exceeded 11,000 students. Established in 1960, BCC currently offers 16 academic, 26 technical and 30 vocational programs as well as continuing education courses. It is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. BCC is an "open door" college with many early admission and educational credit programs offered. Students wishing to continue beyond the two-year program may transfer to a senior institution. A popular option is to remain on the Cocoa campus and attend UCF's Brevard Campus.

University of Central Florida (UCF), Brevard Campus is a state supported, upper division campus enrolling junior, senior and graduate level students. The Brevard Campus was established to specifically serve the students of Brevard County who have obtained an Associate in Arts Degree from BCC, and for transfer students who have completed their freshman and sophomore years at other accredited public or private colleges or universities. Over 1,500 students each semester are enrolled at the UCF Brevard campus. Due to the rapid growth of the Brevard County area, enrollment is increasing at a rate of 8 to 10 percent each year.

The UCF main campus is located in Orlando. UCF is one of nine universities in the Florida State University System (SUS). Its programs are accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. In addition to regional accreditation, a number of scientific, professional and academic bodies have conferred specific accreditation to various programs at the university.

Florida Solar Energy Center (FSEC) is an energy research institute under the general administration of UCF. FSEC is nationally recognized as a leading renewable energy research and
development organization. The FSEC library reflects the Center's research interests involving all aspects of solar energy: solar thermal systems, photovoltaics, building design, equipment efficiency, hydrogen production using renewable resources, ocean thermal energy conversion, and more. Currently located at Cape Canaveral in Brevard County, FSEC will be relocating adjacent to the BCC and UCF Brevard Campuses in the near future.

BCC/UCF Relationship

Brevard Community College and the University of Central Florida have a unique association that began in 1968 when UCF first offered classes on the Brevard Campus. Over the years, the two institutions established an excellent working relationship. In an effective "2 + 2" cooperative program, Brevard Community College provides the first two years of baccalaureate degree programs while the University of Central Florida provides the last two years, and some graduate programs, on the same campus. As a result of this cooperative relationship, students may complete their college education with a smooth transition from one institution to the other.

Many of the facilities at the Cocoa Campus are used jointly by university and community college students. A BCC/UCF Lifelong Learning Center was built in 1983. It was the first community college/state university joint-use facility constructed in Florida, and has served as a State model for joint commitments. The Lifelong Learning Center houses the UCF programs, faculty, and staff. It also has computer labs, a career center, auditorium, day care center, and government institute programs that involve students and faculty of both UCF and BCC.

Support services for UCF students, including the library, cafeteria, and bookstore are provided by the community college. Both institutions are commuter-based, and do not have dormitories or campus housing. Utilizing the resources of the community college by both institutions is a savings to the taxpayers, since it avoids costly duplication and construction of separate facilities in the area.

Current Library Services

Students attending the UCF Brevard Campus currently use the BCC Library. Librarians from UCF and BCC have worked together to establish and maintain an excellent working relationship. Initially, BCC shared its library resources and provided space for a small UCF collection within the BCC Cocoa Campus Library. Later, UCF contracted with BCC for library services, and the collections were merged. BCC's resources were, and continue to be, augmented with materials sent from the UCF main campus library.

During the early years, BCC provided considerably more in terms of collections and services than UCF could have provided for its faculty and students. Duplicated collections and services would have been costly and prohibitive to a young, growing university with limited funding. From the beginning of the joint arrangement, the UCF Library placed catalogs of the main university library in the BCC Library. The early microfiche version is now replaced by on-line terminals. These terminals offer access to the library collections of the UCF main campus as well as the other eight State University libraries. The catalogs combined with a daily courier have made an effective intercampus loan program possible.

Need for Expansion

Brevard Community College's Library was designed and built in the 1960's to serve the community college students and faculty. In 1980, an addition was constructed to house media and television broadcasting facilities. Total assignable space in the BCC Learning Resource Center is
30,543 square feet, with only 22,966 square feet assignable for library collections, seating, services and staff.

With growth in enrollment and expansion of program offerings at both institutions, and the addition of UCF courses at the graduate level, the need to plan for the expansion of collections, services and facilities was evident to librarians of BCC and to the faculty at the UCF Brevard Campus. With the announced upcoming move of the Florida Solar Energy Center (FSEC) to the shared Cocoa campus, the inadequacy of the existing library was compounded.

In 1987, librarians from the three institutions and the branch campus director met to discuss the need for a new library facility, and the possibility of three institutions sharing that facility. It was an exciting meeting where the attendees carefully explored the possibilities. The BCC and UCF members had an established cooperative relationship. They were in agreement about the need and optimistic that FSEC would join into that relationship. FSEC staff were unsure and, quite understandably, fearful they would lose their identity in a joint venture. Through subsequent meetings, the group reached a cohesive commitment to establish an integrated library to serve all three institutions.

Once FSEC agreed to enter into the joint-use library, they were considered under UCF administration for planning purposes. However, the FSEC Library remained a separate entity for input into the library planning. The FSEC librarian was an important member of the planning committee.

Formal library building planning began in 1988. During the next several years, the planning team worked on a number of related projects. They developed and submitted several grants for an integrated online catalog, increased awareness of the need for the new facility with their respective campus administrations, developed staff and collection growth projections, and began deliberations on forecasted needs in the new facility.

**Justification of Need**

While it was easy for the committee to agree on the need for a new facility, it was not as easy to convince the BCC and UCF administrations.

UCF is a young, fast growing university. The first classes were held in 1968 at the main campus and three off-campus sites simultaneously. On the main campus, enrollment grew from under 2,000 to over 22,000 students in less than 25 years. Through those years, funding for the university lagged behind growth. Library funding was no exception. The limited library resources were used to develop collections on the main campus. These collections were available to the off-campus programs from the beginning. At first, professors teaching off-campus transported needed materials. Soon after, the establishment of main library catalogs at the off-campus sites and a courier system made a "books by courier" system of intercampus loan possible. In this manner, library resources from the main campus augmented the collections of the community college libraries where two of UCF's off-campus programs were established.

This system worked well in the early years. UCF administrators believed it was still satisfactory. Some were new to UCF, and had never seen the community college library. Others had not been there in years. Most were not aware that the arrangement would no longer satisfy the university's need, nor the more stringent accreditation standards of the Southern States Commission on Colleges and Schools. The administrators also had many pressing demands on the main campus which were more visible. They had to be convinced that if UCF was to continue or expand their off-campus
programs, and if those programs were to be the high quality UCF represented, then major steps were needed to improve the library.

After conducting appropriate research into the library support provided by SUS and other universities for branch campuses, meetings were held with UCF Vice Presidents. While the meetings did achieve an understanding and more support, it remained obvious that any library needs had to be weighed against the many other valid requests for new space on the main campus. It is more difficult to gain support for funds for a building away from the main campus.

Unique Institutional Requirements

Concurrent with the discussions with UCF Vice Presidents, the committee met regularly to discuss the joint-use facility—what would it contain, how would it be organized, how would it operate. The unique information needs of each institution were addressed.

The community college requires basic collections to support their curriculum, study space for students, and basic reference assistance. Students are shown how to use basic reference tools and how to find materials in the library. The BCC Library also acquires and catalogs for all four of their campuses. In addition, they have responsibility for audio-visual production and distribution, and for the campus television studio. They keep few periodicals titles beyond four years, and these are not bound.

The university branch campus requires more in-depth collections and reference materials in the areas of their programs. Back runs of periodicals are important. Also important are a bibliographic instruction program and more intensive reference assistance.

The FSEC Library is a special library, serving researchers who need in-depth information quickly. They rely heavily on research reports and periodicals. The librarians must have a special library orientation to provide required information in a timely manner. They need to know the needs of their researchers and how to prioritize requests when the demand is heavy.

One of the initial discussions concerned these differences in basic requirements for collections and services for a community college, a university branch campus, and a special library. With the added research requirements of FSEC, and the promotion and tenure requirements of the growing number of UCF faculty with full time assignments at the Brevard Campus, a new approach was needed regarding collection building, retention of serials, addition of research studies, and specialized services. The needs of each institution had to be met with the new facility.

Space Projections

The committee acquired statistics on the current numbers of staff, collections by various formats, students and faculty/researchers by head count and FTE. Future growth projections for five and twenty years were developed. Based on this information and the discussions of building requirements, the size of the facility was estimated to be 150,000 square feet. In addition to a library/learning center, the building was to include four or five "smart" classrooms, a large multipurpose room and exhibit space. These facilities are not currently available on the campus, and were desired by both BCC and UCF.

Year One in Formal Request Process

A document was prepared to gain the necessary support to place the project on the funding request lists of both UCF and BCC. Administrators of both institutions had to approve the project
and place it in priority order with other institutional construction requests. These requests had to be sent to the respective governing agencies at the State level for approval, i.e. the Board of Regents for UCF, and the Division of Community Colleges for BCC.

In addition, because it was a joint project, the State Department of Education (DOE) also had to approve it. At the time, joint projects in Florida were funded 50 percent by DOE and 50 percent shared by the participating institutions. That proportion has since been changed to a 25/75 percent ratio.

In December of 1988, a formal justification of need and request for the new facility was sent to the State Division of Community Colleges. It was a lengthy document including data on current and projected UCF programs and plans for new ones, current and projected enrollment figures for both institutions, justification for the inclusion of the FSEC library in the project, descriptions of current collections and collection development, and preliminary plans for the building. BCC placed the project high (first or second) on their request list. UCF, with many needs on the main campus, later placed it 23rd on their three year request list to the Board of Regents (BOR) for planning funds.

A formal resolution was prepared, signed by all the appropriate individuals and sent to the proper State agencies. This prompted a State survey team visit to evaluate the current facilities. When the survey team made their visit in January 1990, they unanimously supported the need for a new library facility. However, to approve the inclusion of any non-library functions, they would need a separate study of existing classroom and other campus facilities. To avoid further delay, the project was refocused and the "smart" classrooms, multipurpose room, TV studios, and audio visual production and classroom support were dropped from the project. The TV studios and audio-visual services would remain in the present library where they could be expanded.

Building Program Committee

Work intensified on a building program subsequent to the on-site survey. The committee was expanded to include a representative from BCC's physical plant since the building would belong to BCC. Later, a UCF facilities planner, with extensive program development experience, was assigned to work on the committee. An architect on the staff of FSEC was also consulted. His knowledge of lighting and energy conservation, and his recent experience with a library building project were helpful.

A revised resolution was required. None of the committee had had much experience with formal resolutions but with some effort all the appropriate Whereases were assembled. Other documents had to be attached at the time of its submission, including an approved operating agreement and completed building program.

Operating Agreement

All through the process, everyone assumed that BCC would provide the lead role in library management as it had in the past. We had acquired interinstitutional agreements from other joint relationships. A draft agreement was developed calling for an operating oversite committee and an academic advisory committee with representatives from each of the institutions.

However, it became apparent that the management would be more logically placed under the university. New requirements for research support for the Solar Energy researchers and UCF faculty coupled with the need to develop upper level and graduate collections, emphasized the increasing requirements for collection development. More emphasis on bibliographic instruction and in-depth reference assistance was needed. The university was purchasing more materials for the
collection than the community college and the proportion was expected to continue in that direction. Further, it was expected that the university would provide a larger and more stable number of staff positions, once the proposed new library was factored into the state-wide university library staffing formulas.

A decision by BCC and UCF administrations was made that BCC would have the building and provide maintenance for it. UCF would operate the library and all staff would report to the new library director. Initially, the staff would be those of the merged libraries, plus those the state provided to UCF for the new facility. When adequate new positions were added by the state, UCF would gradually provide most, if not all, the library staff.

UCF would provide for the majority of the collection development. BCC would continue to purchase those materials for its own programs, on their four campuses. Operating expenses would be pro-rated by enrollment. The Director would report to the University Library Director, but be responsive to an Oversight Committee and Academic Committee. Both of these committees would be made of appropriate representatives of the three institutions. The first would advise on administrative matters, the second on academic concerns.

**Building Program**

An agreement was also reached by BCC and UCF administrators concerning the size and funding level to be requested for the building. As a result, the size of the building requested in the resolution was to be 100,000 square feet and the funding, $8.5 million. This caused considerable problems when it was determined that $8.5 million was insufficient to construct a 100,000 square foot building. Furthermore, when the initial program was completed, the ideal building came in at 121,000 square feet estimated at $14 to $16 million. After much negotiation and many meetings at all levels, the program was modified to 100,000 square feet at $10 to $12 million.

However, the first program document to be sent to the State had to conform to the $8.5 million stated in the Resolution. The reduction in space was taken from general stack areas, with the hope that it would be factored back into the building at a later date. It was, but six months later.

All the proper documents were signed at all levels and transmitted to the State in the summer of 1990. The outlook was not optimistic. The project was put on the BOR three-year list for planning money, but not to receive funding until 1992/93. It also went to the Division of Community Colleges and to the Department of Education. It was at this time the committee learned that a necessary survey by the DOE had never been requested.

**New Building Program Committee**

Several months later, another "official" program development committee was established. It included more representatives from the university and BCC. There was some initial confusion as to the committee's charge since a program had already been written. The revised charge was to review the program and to assist with the selection of the architects. The committee was encouraged that, with prompt action and the support of both BCC and UCF administrations, the project would be moved up a year.

After two months of meetings, the program was accepted with no substantial changes, except the increase to 100,000 square feet and the updated cost figures. The new costs more accurately covered furniture and equipment costs in addition to the increased size. The room requirement sheets had been submitted to a reputable library furniture dealer and to the UCF computer center for cost
estimates. The estimates were considerably higher than the formula of 10 percent of total construction. The decision was made to make that fact known in the beginning.

Just as the second committee completed its work and the revised Program was ready to route for administrative signatures, notification was received that a representative of the Department of Education was arriving to conduct a facilities spot survey. That survey had been expected ten months earlier, then not at all. The committee was concerned that such a late visit would cause a delay in the process and another rewrite of the program. That site visit was held February 1991, and the committee was reassured that the need for the facility was evident, the report would be completed shortly, and the project should not be delayed.

Timetable

The timetable for building projects for the state is normally quite structured and affected by many external factors. With this project so dependent upon so many different people in the community college, the university, the Board of Regents, the Division of Community Colleges, the Department of Education, and the Florida Legislature, it was difficult to know what was, or was not, happening. One entire year slipped by as documents sat on a desk in Tallahassee (the Capitol). No one on either campus was aware of the delay until it was too late.

In January of 1991, the expected timetable called for funding approval for planning in 1991-92 (hiring an architect and development of construction drawings), construction in 1992-93, and the purchase of equipment in 1993-94. The committee was confident that the building would be complete in 1994.

By April, when the legislature completed funding approvals for 1991/92, the BCC/UCF Library was not included. An investigation discovered that BCC had dropped its priority to fourth, and UCF raised it to fourteenth rather than the necessary tenth place or higher for consideration. Therefore, the project was once more postponed another year.

Planning money is now scheduled for 1992/93, construction for 1993/94 and equipment purchase for 1994/95. With no more delays, the facility should be ready for use by fall of 1995.

Hopefully, the project will remain on target, and no decision, or lack of a decision, will be made in the ensuing year that will delay the project further. There was a tense time in May 1991, when it was discovered that UCF’s newest three-year construction request list delayed the BCC/UCF project to begin in 1993/94! Fortunately, this decision was reversed, and the building remains on the schedule for completion in 1994/95.

Advice to Others Planning a Joint-Use Library

Planning for a joint-use library is a complex undertaking, especially when it is to be located at an off-campus site of the institution. A few suggestions are included here for others embarking on such a project. These suggestions are certainly not all inclusive, but may provide a framework in which to begin, and help prevent some potential pitfalls.

First, make sure that a planning committee with committed representatives from each institution and library is established. It is extremely helpful to have a competent facilities planner on the team, and also someone knowledgeable about the physical facilities and plant of the institution where the building will be located.
Ensure that you have support from the top administrations of each institution. Know who supports it, and who does not support it.

Have the committee agree to discuss, understand, and support the unique needs of each institution, and work to ensure that they are met in the building program.

Make realistic, if not generous, projections for growth of collections, staff, and users of each institution. Remember, it will take from five to ten years from the start of planning to the completion of the project. It would be most unfortunate to plan a facility that will not last.

Become an expert on the business of planning the library. Read the literature, find a guide, such as Metcalf's *Planning Academic and Research Libraries*. Consult with library staff members in all the units of the participating libraries, and affiliated main library or libraries where this is appropriate. Visit other libraries, and note both the positive and the negative features.

Learn what documents and approvals are necessary and determine what steps must be taken to achieve those approvals. These may be more difficult to track down for a joint-use facility. Try to ensure that all the data are provided and that all the deadlines are met. Again, this may be more difficult than anticipated because much of the control is outside the committee.

Keep communication channels open and use them often. Include individuals with responsibilities in academic and business areas of both institutions who can keep you informed and assist in promoting your project. Political channels can be important as well.

If cutbacks or compromises must be made as to size of the building, location, functions, equipment or services to be included, carefully consider the long term consequences of suggested changes. Explore alternative options. Present these options to the decision makers with recommendations for alternative actions. Remember, the committee has the most knowledge about the project, and, therefore, is an informed resource when such decisions are necessary.

Once the project is approved, funded and underway, remain active, involved and vigilant throughout the process. Be involved with the choice of architect. Make sure a knowledgeable committee member attends all meetings with the architects during the design development. Attend all regular construction meetings once the project begins.

Finally, enjoy the process. It is exciting, and the end result will be well worth all the time, effort, vigilance and frustration.
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Sixty Years of Research on Off-Campus Library Services

Sheila Latham
University of Lethbridge Library, Lethbridge, Alberta

In June of 1987, at the Canadian Library Association's Annual Conference held in Vancouver, Alexander Slade made a proposal to the Distance Learning Interest Group. His proposal to prepare a bibliography on library services for off-campus and distance education gained the unanimous support of the Interest Group as well as the commitment of three bibliographers: Alexander Slade, Carol Budnick, and me.

Between June of 1987 and June of 1990 Sandy and Carol and I worked to retrieve, annotate, thematically organize, and index all of the books, articles, papers, reports, theses, and dissertations which we could identify from a wide range of international sources. But, although most of the work was done by this Canadian team, the bibliography can be considered an international work for more than just its international subject content. Librarians from Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States contributed in a variety of ways. In May of 1991, the results of three years' research ended with the publication of Library Services for Off-Campus and Distance Education: An Annotated Bibliography under the triple imprint of the Canadian, American, and British library associations.

For my own part, I must admit that when I agreed to take on the job of coordinating the project and preparing the indexes, little did I realize its enormity. In fact, the project was with me constantly for nearly two years, to the extent that I found myself carrying your articles and papers in my beach bag when on vacation each year, reading and annotating at every opportunity on planes, trains, and buses in five countries. My year's Study Leave in London was the most productive time, and I will never forget the many hours spent in the British Library Information Science Service where in winter, on at least two occasions, I had to keep my scarf and gloves on to keep warm.

The bibliography itself is a useful source of data for the analysis of the growth and character of publication and research in our field. In addition to describing and documenting the publication of 535 individual works by 443 authors from 21 different countries writing between 1930 and early 1990, the bibliography provides data on publication output and growth in terms of date, country affiliation, library type, and subject.

Methodology

In 1989-90 I prepared the typescript of the bibliography with the help of a word-processing and text-retrieval program called Nota Bene. With its indexing facility called "Textbase" this microcomputer software program allowed me to separate and index each bibliographic entry, attach additional hidden key words to entries, and use boolean operators (AND, OR, XOR, and NOT) to search and index the entire database of 535 entries. For the purpose of conducting additional analysis for this paper, I embellished the computer textbase in 1991 by adding distinct codes for publication type, country of origin, and library type.
Publication Growth over the Decades

My graph of publication growth from 1930 to 1990 (Figure 1) shows that library services for off-campus and distance education received scant attention in library literature during the decades between 1930 and 1970. The first growth spurt was seen in the early 1970s when the establishment of open universities in several countries sent public and university librarians scurrying to respond to the needs of students who were not being served by the open universities themselves. The second growth spurt, in 1983, can be attributed to the growth of off-campus and distance education programs in traditional post-secondary institutions, combined with the publication of the proceedings of Off-Campus Library Services Conferences. Since 1985 there has been an average of 55 titles published per year.

Figure 1. Public Growth from 1930 to 1990

In an attempt to analyze the varying perspectives from which publications have originated, I coded each bibliographic entry in the database to indicate its relevance to a library sector or other group: academic, public, special, or other (private industry, government, non-library). The analysis, illustrated in Figure 2, identified the academic library sector as the overwhelming source of publications with 450 titles or 84% of the total. The public library sector followed with 73 titles or
13.6%. Publications which were not affiliated with any particular sector of librarianship comprised 10 titles or 2%, followed by the special library sector which generated 2 titles or .4%. I took a closer look at the two most recent decades, the 1970s and 1980s, and discovered that publications originating from the public library peaked in the 1970s with 35 titles (46% of the total publication output), and declined significantly in 1980s with 25 publications (8% of the total output) while the volume of publications originating from the academic library skyrocketed. I suspect that the increase in the publication activity of academic librarians parallels the increase in off-campus and distance education programs in traditional universities. The decrease in the publication activity of public librarians is more difficult to explain. During each decade the proportion of public-library generated publications dealing specifically with open universities is comparable at about 55%. The total output has simply declined, for reasons that I am not yet ready to offer a speculation.

Figure 2. Publication Output by Library Type
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Publication by Country of Origin

In an effort to analyze publication activity by country of origin, each bibliographic entry was examined to determine its national affiliation and was assigned a country code to facilitate computer searching. The nationality of the author or the national focus or content of each work were the main criteria. Of the 21 countries represented in the bibliography, four stood out as the most highly represented: the United States (with 229 entries, or 43%), the United Kingdom (129 entries or 24%), Australia (83 entries or 15.5%), and Canada (51 entries or 9.5%). Seventeen other countries were represented by 43 remaining entries (8%). See Figure 3.
Figure 3. Country of Origin

The data gathered on the publication productivity of each country was further analyzed with reference to date of publication in order to determine the publication growth rates for the four most prolific countries. Comparing publication output for the 1970s with that of the 1980s, the analysis (Table 1) shows that Australia leads the pack, producing in the 1980s 5.5 times the number of publications it produced in the 1970s. It is followed closely by the United States, then Canada, then the United Kingdom.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>1970s</th>
<th>1980s</th>
<th>80s Output over 70s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5.5 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>5 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.8 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.3 times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Topical Analysis

In an effort to identify the major areas of publication and research emphasis, the entries in each thematic chapter of the bibliography were counted and ranked in order of output quantity and
percentage of the total entries (535). While the bibliography's subject index, with its 310 subject headings and place names, provides a detailed breakdown of the subject emphasis of the literature, Table 2 provides a summary of the subject emphasis with a list of 14 chapter headings and their subdivisions, ranked according to publication output.

Looking more closely at selected categories one is able to identify some interesting trends. Since my "Introduction" to the published bibliography comments on the subject emphasis of the literature in the majority of the categories listed above, I will try to limit my remarks here to a few points of additional information on selected topics.

It is clear that the considerable body of literature on the topic of the "Role of Libraries in Distance Education" has been dominated by public librarians from Great Britain. The level of output has stayed the same during the past two decades, showing that some British institutions such as the Open University have continued to rely heavily upon public libraries to support student library needs.

Table 2

A Topical Analysis of Publication and Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Entries</th>
<th>Percents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roles of Libraries in Distance Education</td>
<td>(105)</td>
<td>(19.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Libraries</td>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>(11.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and University Libraries</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(5.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Case Studies</td>
<td>(81)</td>
<td>(15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>(7.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary Cooperation</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>(9.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and Academic</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(3.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(3.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public and Academic</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special and Academic</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Studies</td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>(8.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(2.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(1.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Works</td>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Instruction</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>(7.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(table continues)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection Management</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines and Standards</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Surveys</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(2.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational and Planning</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and Support Services</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Delivery</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Studies</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second largest category in the bibliography is labelled "Library Case Studies." This category contains descriptive and analytical information on some of the 322 institutions that are listed in the bibliography's "Institution Index." Because case studies are useful for librarians who are trying to identify model library programs and libraries to contact for more information about programs, one would hope that all major off-campus institutions might be represented here, but this isn't necessarily the case. I will have more to say about this later, when we look more closely at library surveys. Central Michigan University and the British Open University clearly stand out as the two most-written-about institutions in the entire bibliography, but model library programs of several other institutions have also been described in considerable detail in the literature of case studies and institutional research. The following institutions have received the most attention:

Athabasca University, Alberta          Canada
California State University, Chico     United States
Central Michigan University            United States
College of Advanced Education, Townsville Australia
Deakin University, Victoria           Australia
DePaul University, Illinois            United States
Indiana University                     United States
Laurentian University, Ontario         Canada
Macquarie University, New South Wales  Australia
National College of Education, Illinois United States
Northwestern University, Illinois       United States
Open University                        United Kingdom
South Australian College of Advanced Ed. Australia
University of Birmingham               United Kingdom
University of British Columbia         Canada
University of Dundee, Scotland         United Kingdom
University of Manchester               United Kingdom
University of Maryland                 United States
University of New England              Australia
University of Queensand               Australia
University of South Africa             South Africa
University of South Carolina           United States
University of Wyoming                   United States
University of Victoria, British Columbia Canada
The literature on "Interlibrary Cooperation" exhibits a dearth of information about cooperation between academic libraries and special libraries. Several examples of cooperation and formal agreements between academic libraries and public libraries, and between the academic libraries of different academic institutions have been described in the literature. The only writings on the concept of a national card comes from Australia, where academic librarians have conducted an investigation into the possibility of a national library card for external students.

Of the forty-six "User Studies" which have been conducted, Australia and the United States have produced over two thirds. Aside from national affiliations, the community surveys have helped to draw a profile of the off-campus student by collecting information about age, sex, employment, number of children, reasons for studying, and geographical distance from the main campus. Additionally, the literature offers a significant number of publications which discuss the library use habits of students and faculty as well as user satisfaction with different types of libraries and services.

The literature on "Bibliographic Instruction" gives serious consideration to the particular learning styles of adults by exploring the concept of andragogy, and describes such methods of instruction as the provision of print materials, production of videotapes, and the presentation of face-to-face instruction sessions. One article describes the use of interactive video conferencing for bibliographic instruction. To date, very little has been written on the subject of teaching remote students how to search automated databases from a distance.

The volume of literature on the topic of "Collection Management" increased significantly during the last decade, thanks to three special issues of the journal Library Acquisitions: Pratctise and Theory. In the 36 articles and papers written on collection management, a few sub-topics emerge: collection evaluation, deposit collections, collection development policy, public library resource support for academic programs, separate versus integrated collections, and instructional materials support. Areas that have been touched upon but which require more exploration and research include: resource sharing, and the impact of student requests on collection development and budget allocation.

Much of the literature on "Guidelines and Standards" originated in the United States which, in 1967, was the first to produce formal published Guidelines. Since that date, the United States has revised its guidelines twice (in 1982 and in 1990), the United Kingdom has produced its Standards for Extra-Mural Libraries (1978) followed by Raymond Fisher's Guide (1988), and Australia has produced its Guidelines (1982). Additionally, on the topic of accreditation and licensure of academic institutions in the United States, six publications have expressed concern about variations in regulations from state to state, arguing for acceptable and consistent government standards. That there is lack of Canadian material on the subject of guidelines is clear, and while I suspect that my colleagues in Canada have been following the guidelines of their international counterparts, I think it is about time that Canada produced guidelines of its own. This may be a worthwhile task for a sub-committee of the Canadian Library Association's Interest Group on Distance Learning.

I was able to identify 29 "Surveys" of libraries. I think surveys are important because they give us useful comparative information and because they identify libraries with which to consult and share information. Looking more closely at the American surveys which have been conducted, one discovers that over the years, data has been collected on selected institutions across the country, on military libraries, on college libraries in California, Texas, and the American South, and on university and college libraries in New York, Ohio, and West Virginia. In 1990, Gloria Lebowitz and Kim Schultz prepared a directory of services provided by libraries represented at the Off-campus Library Services Conference held in Charleston. In the years 1931, 1959, 1973, and 1976, the results of surveys conducted by the National University Extension Association were reported in the literature, but there appears to have been no attempt at a national or regional survey of American libraries in
The library historian could have a field day in our field of off-campus library services. I was able to find only eight publications which could be classified as "Library History." In the United States, the universities of Texas, Wisconsin, and Michigan have received historical treatment. In Canada, the history of off-campus services in four universities in the province of British Columbia has been described. In Great Britain, service to extension students has been included in a general hundred-year-history of public libraries and in a case study of the Rewley House Library at Oxford.

That the last topic, "Bibliographies," is at the bottom of the list is something we all knew before this project ever began, and I hope that by publishing the annotated bibliography in 1991, we have filled the gap in this area, at least for a little while.

In this paper I have attempted to summarize the main features of the literature on library services for off-campus and distance education. Conference participants are invited to pose specific topics which I will now search for in the bibliography's computer textbase, using a laptop computer and portable projection unit. Readers of this paper who are interested in specific topics are invited to consult the indexes to the printed version of the bibliography.
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Teaching Full-text Database Searching to Off-Campus Students

Jerilyn Marshall
Northwestern University

Teaching online searching in full-text sources poses the challenge of involving the students in conceptualization of a type of system previously unknown. When the learners are part-time students in an off-campus setting, there can be problems in scheduling classes that will fit in with students' busy lives. Classes will probably have to be relatively brief, so the problem becomes one of ensuring that students learn enough about the system in a short class period to be able to: (a) design a search strategy, (b) retrieve articles that discuss a particular subject, and (c) feel confident in an ability to search the system in the future.

This paper describes the first year of a program to develop the use of the LEXIS/NEXIS online system in an off-campus environment. We have tried to solve the problems mentioned above by designing tightly-structured classes that are rich conceptually. This paper will describe two instruction methods that have been used to further our program: classroom presentations/workshops and one-to-one instruction in the library. The most successful strategies for instruction will be identified, as well as directions for the future of this program.

Background

The Joseph Schaffner Library, located on the Chicago campus of Northwestern University, serves three distinct groups: undergraduate continuing education students, graduate management students, and graduate journalism students. In the past six years, an active instruction program has been successfully developed for the continuing education students. However, it has been a greater challenge to inspire an enthusiasm for instruction in the other two groups, both graduate professional programs that are not necessarily oriented toward traditional library research. This year, the enthusiasm has finally appeared with the arrival of LEXIS/NEXIS.

In the fall of 1990, Northwestern became one of the first universities to subscribe to LEXIS/NEXIS at a new educational rate offered by Mead Data Central (MDC). The company especially wanted to focus on journalism and management schools, in much the same way that they have reached out to law schools for many years. It seemed a perfect match: Northwestern had the types of students MDC was trying to reach; and the LEXIS/NEXIS service, with its emphases on business and news, seemed to be exactly the type of system that could help Schaffner librarians reach out to students in the professional programs on the Chicago campus. The Medill School of Journalism was more than willing to help pay for the subscription in exchange for departmental use of some of the passwords that the university would receive. In September 1990, NU's subscription began, with three of the nine passwords being used in Schaffner Library.

Students' Resource Needs

Although Schaffner Library is located in the middle of a densely populated area of Chicago, the graduate students who use the library experience many of the same instructional and resource needs as other off-campus graduate students. First, they need and respond well to instruction that is focused toward specific coursework and that emphasizes fast and efficient locating of information. Previous observation of management students using the library has indicated that when they do
library research "information is likely to be wanted in quantity and in depth, and may be difficult to find" (Alexander and Steffen, 1988, p.4).

Another resource need of graduate journalism and management students in off-campus programs is for up-to-date articles that keep them informed of recent trends and current events in their areas of study. Management students are looking for articles in business journals and newspapers, and generally do not want anything over ten years old. They want to find a lot of current information that describes or analyzes a subject. On the other hand, journalism students tend to focus primarily on newspapers for information, although they do use other print and online sources when researching background information for a story. They generally are willing to go farther back in time for appropriate articles than management students are.

The third information/resource need that these off-campus students have is to locate and obtain copies of articles from periodicals that are not held in the library's small collection. Schaffner Library already has an active intercampus borrowing service delivering hundreds of items per month from Evanston campus libraries during peak months. A problem develops, however, when the university does not own a periodical cited in a CD-ROM or print index. Although interlibrary loan is available for obtaining these items, most off-campus students are not able to wait the two or three weeks that the interlibrary loan system takes. Since the interlibrary loan department is located on the Evanston campus, there is an additional delay while items are sent to Chicago. Schaffner librarians have frequently helped students to locate another library in the city or suburbs that owns title not held at Northwestern if the student wishes to travel there to copy the article. However, the other library may be distant or difficult to reach; even more frequently, the student is not able to find time to travel to another library unless it happens to be near his or her home or workplace.

LEXIS/NEXIS has great potential to fill the resource needs of students who use Schaffner Library. The system contains the full text of articles from newspapers and magazines, with a heavy concentration in domestic and international business and trade journals in many fields. The articles are current, with most newspaper stories available by the day after the paper is issued. Many of the publications are available in the system back to the early 1980s, with some going back to the 1970s. Add to the articles the extensive files of court cases, annual reports of businesses, and abstracted files like Medline, and a new problem emerges: how can a student learn to travel through this cornucopia of data?

When the problem changes from one of finding enough information to one of choosing from an overabundance of information, the instruction that students receive becomes the key to success. Teaching students to construct a search, to make the right decisions, and to find the exact information needed were and still are goals of the Library's instruction program. Other goals that are especially applicable to off-campus instruction include teaching students to search the system quickly and efficiently in short class periods that will fit into the schedules of these busy students. The rest of this paper describes the instruction program that we have used for each of the student groups that use Schaffner Library.

**Instruction Program for LEXIS/NEXIS Training**

Rather than attempting to teach all student groups during the first term that we had access to LEXIS/NEXIS, we decided to begin with one school, and to add other programs throughout the year. The journalism students were the natural first choice for training. The Medill School of Journalism faculty were already convinced that LEXIS/NEXIS should be an integral part of the curriculum, partly because many of the instructors had used the system when the school had earlier used it on a trial basis. Also, LEXIS/NEXIS is heavily used and well known by professional journalists. Medill students entering the workplace could only benefit from knowing how to use
LEXIS/NEXIS. Since the Medill School had received four of the nine passwords in Northwestern's subscription, they wanted their students to learn to use it as soon as possible.

**Instruction Models**

We based our initial model for LEXIS/NEXIS instruction on two previous classes. The first was a class session that Schaffner librarians teach for University College's undergraduate continuing education students as part of a course in basic computer literacy. In that session, lasting two and one-half hours, students learn what online searching is, what sorts of databases are available, how to generate search terms on a subject, and how to combine terms to efficiently retrieve what they want. They are given an assignment to go to the library outside of class time and complete a search in Knowledge Index, Dialog's nighttime end-user search service.

Much of the session for University College students is meant to develop an ability to conceptualize the structure of the system and to translate their information needs into language that can be understood by the online system. After showing a short video describing the online search process, we introduce students to Boolean operators. Next the class picks a subject of interest and we brainstorm to generate alternate terms for the most important ideas contained in the search statement or question. During this phase the librarian writes the alternate terms on the board. Then the class discusses how to combine the terms with Boolean operators. One of the objectives here is for the students to realize that there is not one right way to do a search, but that there are searches that are more effective than others. After the class has developed a search strategy together, the class is divided into small groups who are given search statements written by the librarians. Each group is to choose a search from the group of statements, develop a search strategy, and carry out the search on a workstation set up in the classroom.

The other model for our LEXIS/NEXIS instruction was the introductory searching session taught by the training division of Mead Data Central, producers of LEXIS/NEXIS. In that half-day class, all of the most essential factors in the system are described: (a) terminology; (b) connectors that are frequently used; (c) truncation symbols; and (d) techniques for restricting by date, by section of a newspaper, and by segment of a story. Because most of the documents are in full text, knowing how to limit the results becomes very important. The excellent manuals written by MDC have also been mined for information to be used in the classes taught by Schaffner librarians.

**Instruction for Journalism Students**

In teaching off-campus students, a major limitation has been that of time. While the classes taught by MDC last half a day, and the one that librarians teach in University College lasts two and one-half hours, we were limited to approximately one and one-half hours to teach the journalism students to be effective searchers. These students use the system primarily in the school's newsroom, which is not staffed with anyone who knows how to search the system. Although we emphasize in classes that students need only pick up the telephone to call us for assistance, very few of them call us after the initial training. So it becomes important to try to cover as much information about the system as we can in the time allotted.

The initial LEXIS/NEXIS instruction for journalism students incorporated some of the successful components used in the University College course. We began with an explanation of online searching and the structure and unique terminology of LEXIS/NEXIS. Next we brainstormed as a group with sample searches that focus on the subject matter that the group will be studying. Each quarter, there are courses giving experience in writing on legal, economic, or local urban topics. There are also seminars in broadcast journalism and other subjects.
We have designed the class to concentrate on conceptualization and construction of search statements. So that students do not have to be concerned with remembering technical details about the system in the initial training, we have prepared handouts which they may consult to refresh their memories on how to enter the system, how to print, and other actions that will be learned by repetition. The handouts also list the main Boolean connectors used, the truncation symbols, and how to limit by date, among other things.

The journalism students work in a Macintosh environment in the newsroom, and there is no system to project the Macintosh screen to a larger size. This means that the value of demonstrating the system during class time is diminished, since very few of the students can see the computer screen. We have discussed the possibility of obtaining temporary passwords from MDC so that each student can use a different machine in the newsroom. Currently, students who wish to do so are invited to stay after class to practice individually on the system. We have found that other students become uninterested and walk away if only one student is searching, so the other students are not required to stay.

Since there is no computer attendant in the newsroom, Schaffner librarians visit once a week to answer any questions that searchers may have about LEXIS/NEXIS. The questions are usually on search strategy or on technical matters. This indicates to us that they may need more class time to learn the system than we have been scheduled to give them so far.

Now that we have been teaching the class for almost a year, we are rethinking its structure. Should we use small group sessions similar to those used in the University College search class? What would happen if the students were instructed in the library, where there is a projection system but where there is also a DOS environment, not Macintosh? Would that be too confusing for students who would be using the Mac in the newsroom? Should we begin scheduling more than one session for each class? Some of the problems may be solved when the introductory graduate journalism classes taught on the Evanston campus begin receiving basic LEXIS/NEXIS training. That will allow us to concentrate more on helping students enhance their conceptualization skills, since they would already know the basic information about connectors, choosing files, and other basics of the system.

**Instruction for Management Students**

Classes for journalism students began in the fall of 1990. After they were established, we next targeted the students attending the Kellogg Graduate School of Management (KGS) as the next group of potential searchers. In the past, Schaffner Librarians had tried a number of times to interest the students in various workshops, tours, and other classes. These efforts had met with very little success. In 1988, the librarians wrote that "it has been our experience that optional library instruction sessions are not an effective way of reaching evening students" (Alexander & Steffen, p.8). This observation is still generally accurate, but early evidence suggests that LEXIS/NEXIS workshops may prove to be an exception.

Before winter quarter 1991, we looked at a list of scheduled KGS classes and chose five that appeared to be studying subjects (e.g., marketing or international management) that are well-covered in LEXIS/NEXIS. Then we called the instructors of those courses to request that we be allowed to come to the class to promote our upcoming workshops on LEXIS/NEXIS. Some professors turned down our request, but we finally received approval from four of them. Before going to the classes, we prepared a one-page handout listing a few selected business publications in the system. In the promotions we emphasized currency and efficiency of retrieval, because students in KGS are interested in sources that will be of immediate use and that have the current information that they need. The librarians brought a sign-up sheet to the promotional session, and interested persons
were invited to reserve a space in the class. Taking into account that people often change their minds at the last minute, we emphasized that they could also call later to reserve a space. These promotions generated some sign-ups, especially when the professor also verbally encouraged them to attend the training. We were fortunate in choosing professors who could see the value of learning to search in an online database, and who were willing to support our promotional effort.

One reason that the students have to be convinced to sign up for the training is that the KGSM Evening Managers' program is designed for people who have full-time jobs. Normally they might leave work at 5:00, go to Northwestern one or two evenings per week, and attend classes that begin at 6:15. Their schedules allow them to do very little besides travel to class and perhaps quickly get something to eat. Since classes end at 9:00 p.m., there would be very little opportunity to attend a workshop. We designed the classes for management students to be from 5:00 to 6:00, because that is the only time that there is any chance that many people will be able to attend. So far we have been fairly successful in persuading students to attend the workshops. At times more than 20 people have attended, but the typical number is closer to 10 people. We will soon be offering workshops regularly every two weeks because there have invariably been students every quarter who were interested but could not attend the scheduled workshops.

Management students, more than other students on the Chicago campus, seem to respond well to information that is brief, to the point, and businesslike. Given that we have only one hour to teach the workshop, precision of meaning is required. Most of the management students are very interested in gaining access to the information in LEXIS/NEXIS, but they do not have much time to spend in learning to use the system.

The workshop for management students has been designed to be similar to the one taught for journalism classes, but there are a few differences. There is no time for the students to try the system during the session. Since the workshop is not connected with a particular course, there is usually no discussion of methods of finding information on a specific assignment, unless a student asks a question about a project he or she is working on. In these management workshops, conceptualizing the search is again emphasized, and we do a brief brainstorming session to develop a search strategy. The students respond well to the projected image of the LEXIS/NEXIS search onto a screen; it allows them to gain a clearer idea of how the system works. They see the value of the system, and want to start using it immediately.

Although the first part of the training program for management students has been successful, we would like to reach more of them than we are able to through the types of workshops we have been teaching. Ideally, the classes would be longer and the students would be able to use the system during the class. The associate dean of the Evening Managers' Program has been approached with a proposal for LEXIS/NEXIS training to be integrated into the curriculum, with a section of one of the introductory courses being devoted to learning to search in the system. If the proposal is accepted, we expect to begin these more comprehensive sessions in the fall quarter of 1991.

**Instruction for Continuing Education Students**

A third group of students that have different needs in learning to use the system are those attending University College, the continuing education program. For their training, we have approached teachers of particular courses covering journalism or business topics. The instruction sessions have been about one hour long, and have been focused toward particular assignments. Not all University College classes need to learn to use LEXIS/NEXIS, as it does not contain articles from humanities or social sciences journals. At this time, we plan to instruct these students on a course-by-course basis.
One-to-one instruction has also been used with LEXIS/NEXIS. As the system has become better-known among students, many people have wanted to learn the system on a walk-in basis. Since off-campus students are busy people with very little time, we feel strongly that it is important to try to accommodate them at short notice. However, teaching a complex system in this way does strain our resources. The length of time that can be spent teaching the system varies by factors such as staffing, how busy the library is, and other commitments that the librarians have. Since available time to teach the system can vary from five minutes to an hour, the results of this type of training have been mixed. Currently we are developing lessons for self-guided instruction, with the objective of teaching students to be competent searchers who understand the LEXIS/NEXIS system.

Conclusion

Other off-campus sites may want to consider subscribing to LEXIS/NEXIS. The benefits are obvious in terms of access to sources and speed of document delivery. Other points for off-campus sites to consider would concern the cost and equipment requirements. Although the educational subscription comes at a greatly reduced rate, the cost may be prohibitive for some institutions. Also, librarians must have the equipment to conduct searches and to print. Finally, there must be a way to bring the students and the system together. In learning the system there is great potential for the student to acquire a skill that can be used in one's coursework, but that can also be transferred to future use in other settings.

Overall the first year of instruction has been successful in some ways, but has brought a few lessons for the instructors as well. We have been successful in making the students aware of the system and introducing them to online searching. We have also succeeded in working more closely with the Medill School of Journalism, and to a lesser extent, the Kellogg Graduate School of Management, in integrating the librarians' expertise into the students' educational experience. In designing the classes, we have learned as much as the students have. It has been a challenge to design instruction that will fit into busy schedules. Students respond well to the conceptual training, but the lack of experiential time during the short classes is a drawback. We have learned that in a short class, handouts listing the main points covered are essential; they often need to be consulted later to refresh the student's mind.

Off-campus librarians often seek more and better ways to serve their student populations. This paper has described an instruction program that is successful in an off-campus library serving non-traditional students. If class sessions are short, we believe that students will try to fit the training for a system like LEXIS/NEXIS into their busy schedules. A program for online search training may also serve to build cooperative relationships between librarians and faculty, if the training can be integrated into the curriculum. Although it can be a challenge to deal with all of the factors involved, it is very rewarding to see the progress made by students as they learn the new system. The benefits would far outweigh the drawbacks for those libraries that have the resources to implement this sort of instruction program.
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Assessing Library Resource Needs for an Off-Campus Military Education Program

Stephen G. McLeod
Saint Leo College

Saint Leo College is a private, Catholic, coeducational liberal arts college located 25 miles north of Tampa, Florida. The college offers academic programs leading to the Associate of Arts, Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, and Bachelor of Social Work. In addition to these main campus programs, the college offers the Associate of Arts and the Bachelor of Arts through its off-campus Military Education Program (MEP). The MEP conducts five nine-week academic terms per year, with a one-week break between terms. Courses are taught primarily by adjunct faculty. The MEP is administered through 15 centers located on military bases in six Southeastern states: Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia (Saint Leo College, 1990).

In 1986, the college completed a $1.9 million renovation of the main campus library (Quarteroni, 1986). Although the resources of this library are impressive, library support for the off-campus centers continues to come primarily from their respective base libraries. Since these libraries do not belong to the college and were not specifically designed to serve its academic needs, there have been significant gaps between program requirements and available library resources.

In response to this situation, Saint Leo College has initiated a Library Acquisitions Project to identify, acquire, deliver, and evaluate library resources in support of academic programs at the off-campus centers. This paper presents the findings of a pilot study for the identification component of the project. The pilot study was conducted at the Hurlburt Field-Eglin Air Force Base Center in Fort Walton Beach, Florida. The purpose of the pilot study was two-fold: (a) to identify library resources needed at the pilot center and (b) to develop guidelines for identifying library resources needed at all fifteen off-campus centers. In order to accomplish the first objective, a needs assessment survey was conducted at the pilot center. In keeping with the second objective, response rates, request rates, and the requests themselves were analyzed.

Method

Sampling

Nonprobability sampling was used. Faculty to be surveyed were selected from a roster maintained by the staff of the Hurlburt-Eglin Center. This roster listed the faculty members and the courses they had taught during each term of their employment. Since the Hurlburt-Eglin Center employs no full-time faculty, all faculty members on this roster were adjunct faculty members. Only those faculty members who had taught at least one course as of 7 January 1988 were selected to be surveyed. Fifty faculty members met this criterion, but two of them moved before the survey was conducted: thus forty-eight faculty members were surveyed regarding the library resources needed in support of 109 different courses. The members of the sample represented each of the four MEP areas of study: business, humanities, math/science, and social science. In addition, some faculty members taught in more than one of these areas: these faculty were classified as multidisciplinary (Table 1).
Table 1

Distribution of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsample</th>
<th>Number in subsample</th>
<th>Percentage of the sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math/Science</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidisciplinary</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preparation

During the year preceding the survey, there was extensive coordination with MEP headquarters, testing and refinement of the survey instrument (Appendix), and a vigorous publicity campaign that included memos and briefings to Hurlburt-Eglin faculty.

Initial Mailing

The survey packets were mailed on 11 April 1988 (during the fourth week of Term II-88) with a due date of 23 May 1988 (grade turn-in for Term II-88). Each packet contained a cover letter explaining the purpose of the survey, copies of the survey instrument (Appendix)—one copy for each course the faculty member had taught as of 7 January 1988—and a stamped, preaddressed envelope for reply. In all, 219 copies of the survey instrument were mailed. The distribution of these copies by subsample is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

Distribution of the Survey Instrument by Subsample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsample</th>
<th>Number of copies distributed</th>
<th>Percentage of all copies distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math/Science</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidisciplinary</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Follow-up

On the due date, a reminder was distributed. On 9 June 1988, a second reminder was mailed to those who still had not responded. On 16 June 1988, the Director of the Hurlburt-Eglin Center included a reminder in his memo to Term III-88 faculty. To those who still had not responded, another reminder, signed by the Director, was mailed on 9 July 1988. Data collection continued until 1 August 1988 (grade turn-in for Term III-88).

Results and Discussion

Response Rates and Request Rates

Overall Rates

Thirty-eight faculty members responded to the survey, for an overall response rate of 79%. Twenty-nine faculty members requested library resources, for an overall request rate of 60%. Administrative emphasis constituted the critical factor in eliciting these high rates.

Response and request rates by subsample

While faculty in all subsamples exhibited acceptable response rates, the overall request rate might have been improved by a special appeal to the two groups whose request rates fell farthest below the overall request rate: math/science faculty (50%) and multidisciplinary faculty (33%) (Table 3). This impression was strengthened when the comments from nonrequestors in these two subsamples were examined.

Math/science. Comments from nonrequestors in math/science were particularly revealing. Among these comments were the following, both from math professors:

"In general, I am unable to use the library for my classes."

"Additional resources/library support is NOT [sic] needed for these courses due to the nature of the material covered."

These comments indicated that some math professors were unaware of the benefits that additional library resources might provide for their students. This was perhaps due to the way in which math has traditionally been taught: through a "no frills" approach that involves only the textbook and a blackboard. While faculty who teach math in this manner may need no additional library resources in order to do so, their students may need additional library resources in order to learn more effectively. This consideration further suggested that data collection would have been improved by including students in the process.
Table 3

Response Rates and Request Rates by Subsample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsample</th>
<th>Responders</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>Requestors</th>
<th>Request rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math/Science</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidisciplinary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multidisciplinary. While comments from multidisciplinary faculty were generally less indicative of their reasons for not requesting library resources, two comments provided clues:

"I just don't have time to research what is needed."

"I have only taught [Composition and Literature] and [Introduction to Psychology] once in two years—so I feel that it would be futile to make suggestions for those two courses."

The first comment may reflect interference from the summer vacation period that coincided with Term III-88, since the faculty member who made this comment taught during Term II-88 but did not teach during Term III-88. This consideration suggested that a better request rate might have been obtained by synchronizing data collection with the academic schedule for Term II-88. The second comment indicated that a better request rate might have been obtained by surveying faculty only regarding those courses that they were actually teaching during the data collection period.

Response rates and request rates by teaching activity

Thirty-three members of the sample were teaching during the data collection period, and 15 were not. The response rate for the teaching subsample (85%) was 18 percentage points higher than the response rate for the nonteaching subsample (67%) (Table 4). While this difference in the response rates was not statistically significant (z = 1.43, p < .05, one-tailed), the 30 percentage point difference between the request rates for the teaching (70%) and nonteaching subsamples (40%) was (z = 1.97, p < .05, one-tailed). This finding indicated that, for the MEP-wide needs assessment, a better request rate could be obtained by surveying only those faculty who were teaching during data collection.

Table 4

Response Rates and Request Rates by Teaching Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Responders</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>Requestors</th>
<th>Request rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonteaching</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Requests for Library Resources

There were 649 requests for library resources. From these requests, a list of items to be purchased (too long for inclusion here) was compiled, and the distribution of the requests was analyzed. Due to the method of calculating requests for this analysis, there was not a one-to-one correspondence between the number of requests and the number of items on the list. (If, for example, two faculty members requested the same item, two requests were added to the total but only one item was added to the list.)

A look at the distribution of requests by subsample revealed that the percentage of requests from math/science faculty (6%) and multidisciplinary faculty (4%) fell far below the percentage of requests from social science faculty (46%), humanities faculty (25%), and business faculty (19%) (Table 5). This result was consistent with the low request rates elicited from these two subsamples (Table 3) and provided additional evidence of the need for a special appeal to these two groups.

Table 5

Distribution of Total Requests by Subsample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsample</th>
<th>Number of requests</th>
<th>Percentage of all requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math/Science</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social science</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidisciplinary</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>649</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This impression was strengthened when the percentage of the survey forms distributed to each subsample (Table 2) was compared with the percentage of requests received from each subsample (Table 5). In contrast to business faculty, who received 11% of the forms (Table 2) and made 19% of the requests (Table 5), math/science faculty received 12% of the forms (Table 2) yet accounted for only 6% of the requests (Table 5). Unlike social science faculty, who received 23% of the forms (Table 2) and made 46% of the requests (Table 5), multidisciplinary faculty received 21% of the forms (Table 2) yet accounted for only 4% of the requests (Table 5).

A look at the distribution of requests by category showed that requests for books predominated (Table 6). Requests for books accounted for 86% of all requests, while requests for periodicals and audiovisual items made up much smaller percentages of the total (6% and 8%, respectively). The predominance of book requests suggested that Hurburt-Eglin faculty were oriented to the traditional concept of education as "book learning" and that they were not fully aware of the educational potential of other media.
Table 6

Distribution of Total Requests by Category of Library Resource

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of requests</th>
<th>Percentage of all requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodical</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiovisual</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>649</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This impression was strengthened when the distribution of requests was examined in greater detail.

Requests for Books

Requests for books accounted for the overwhelming majority of all requests from social science faculty (96%), math/science faculty (83%), business faculty (82%), and humanities faculty (76%), and for over half of the requests from multidisciplinary faculty (56%) (Table 7).

Social science faculty accounted for over half of the book requests (51%), but substantial percentages of the book requests came from humanities faculty (22%) and business faculty (18%). Math/science faculty accounted for only 6% of the book requests, and multidisciplinary faculty accounted for only 3% (Table 8).

Table 7

Distribution of Requests from Each Subsample by Category of Library Resource

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsample</th>
<th>Book requests from this subsample as a percentage of all requests from this subsample</th>
<th>Periodical requests from this subsample as a percentage of all requests from this subsample</th>
<th>Audiovisual requests from this subsample as a percentage of all requests from this sample</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math/science</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social science</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidisciplinary</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Requests for Periodicals

As might be expected, business faculty accounted for the largest percentage (49%) of all requests for periodicals (Table 8), and requests for periodicals made up a substantial portion (16%) of all requests from business faculty (Table 7). These data were consonant with the need for business faculty and business students to stay abreast of the constantly changing economic situation.

Social science faculty accounted for 17% of all requests for periodicals (Table 8), yet requests for periodicals made up only 2% of all requests from social science faculty (Table 7). This result could be partly attributed to the base libraries' rather extensive periodicals collections in the social sciences.

In the field of humanities, however, this was not the case. Although the base libraries held relatively few journals in the humanities, requests for periodicals made up only 6% of all requests from humanities faculty (Table 7).

A similar situation existed in math/science. The base libraries held few periodicals in math/science, yet requests for periodicals made up only 5% of all requests from math/science faculty (Table 7), and math/science faculty accounted for only 5% of all requests for periodicals (Table 8).

Table 8

Distribution of Requests for Each Category of Library Resource by Subsample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsample</th>
<th>Book requests from this subsample as a percentage of all book requests</th>
<th>Periodical requests from this subsample as a percentage of all periodical requests</th>
<th>Audiovisual requests from this subsample as a percentage of all audiovisual requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math/science</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social science</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidisciplinary</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results underscored the need to increase faculty awareness of the role that periodicals can play in helping students learn. The results also underscored the need to include students in the data collection process.

Requests for Audiovisual Items

An examination of requests for audiovisual items revealed another area where faculty awareness needed to be increased. For example, one would have expected requests for audiovisual items to make up a larger percentage of requests from faculty in business and social science. Although there
is a wealth of audio-visual material for both fields on the market, requests for audiovisual items made up only 2% percent of the requests from business faculty and only 2% of the requests from social science faculty (Table 7).

Table 9

Requests for Audiovisual (AV) Items by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number of requests</th>
<th>Percentage of all AV requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filmstrip</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videocassette</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiocassette</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A look at the kinds of audiovisual items that were requested was also revealing (Table 9). While the lack of requests for phonograph records was understandable in view of the extensive record collections of the base libraries and in view of the relative inconvenience of records as an instructional medium, the small number of requests for audiocassettes (only three) was disturbing (Table 9). Audiocassettes would seem to be a particularly appropriate educational medium for students in the Saint Leo College Military Educational Program (MEP). Most of these students are military service members who must carefully balance their study time with their military duties and family responsibilities. Time is at an even greater premium for these students due to the brevity and intensity of the nine-week academic term. Audiocassettes would allow these students to study while commuting to work or while doing housework. While some MEP faculty might not use audiocassettes in teaching, many MEP students would certainly find audiocassettes useful in learning. Again, this situation strengthened the case for including students in the data collection process.

Another medium that seems particularly appropriate for MEP students is the computer-assisted tutorial, yet there were only two requests for this medium (Table 10): one from an English professor and one from a math professor. The English professor specified a tutorial by title, but the math professor did not. In his comments, the math professor stated that he would be sending suggestions, but a follow-up letter to him produced no reply.

The possibilities of the computer-assisted tutorial definitely deserve further study. MEP students are no strangers to the computer. In performing their military duties, many work with computers daily, and many have personal computers in their homes. The Eglin base library has also made a computer available for student use. Computer-assisted tutorials in English and math would enable students to work at their own pace and to strengthen their understanding of concepts in which they are weak. The discrepancy between the great educational potential of the computer-assisted tutorial and the small number of requests for this medium underscored the need to increase faculty awareness and to include students in the data collection process.
Table 10

Distribution of Audiovisual (AV) Requests in the "Other" Subcategory by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number of requests</th>
<th>Percentage of all requests in the &quot;Other&quot; subcategory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer-assisted tutorial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map series</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency series</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide series</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art print series</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations

In view of the results and their implications, the following recommendations were submitted to the Dean of the Saint Leo College Military Education Program (MEP):

Recommendation 1. In response to the library resource needs identified through the survey, take the following actions:

1. Have the professional staff of the Hurlburt and Eglin base libraries check the list of requests against the holdings of these two libraries.

2. Purchase any requested materials that are absent from both libraries.

3. Distribute two thirds of the purchases to the Eglin base library and one third of the purchases to the Hurlburt base library. This distribution is based on the relative distribution of Saint Leo College course offerings at the two bases.

Recommendation 2. In developing a uniform method of identifying library resources for the off-campus centers, observe the following principles:

1. Ensure that data collection receives full administrative emphasis and support, including involvement of the center directors and a special appeal to math/science faculty and to multidisciplinary faculty.

2. Integrate data collection as smoothly as possible into the normal activities of the academic term by (a) synchronizing data collection with the academic schedule, (b) surveying only faculty who are teaching during data collection, and (c) asking faculty to recommend purchases only for those courses that they are teaching during data collection.

3. Include students in the data collection process, and ask students to recommend purchases only for those courses in which they are currently enrolled.

4. Increase faculty and student awareness of library resources by the following means:
a. Require all new faculty members to receive an orientation to the base libraries as a precondition of employment.

b. Encourage faculty members to schedule library orientations for their classes and include this point on the student course evaluation form.

c. As standard operating procedure, maintain a full array of selection aids (i.e., book catalogs, periodicals lists, and audio-visual catalogs) in all offices of all MEP centers and use the existing publications of the college to direct attention to these selection aids.

5. Include the base librarians in the data collection process as described in point 1 of Recommendation 1, and firmly establish the role of the base librarians before data collection begins.

Summary

While the recommendations presented here are couched in institution-specific terms, the needs assessment principles that they embody may prove useful in similar educational settings. Moreover, all aspects of Recommendation 2 can be implemented without the cost of a mailed survey if the needs assessment instrument (Appendix) is incorporated into two forms that educational organizations already use: (a) the form by which faculty evaluate support for the courses that they teach and (b) the form by which students evaluate teaching and learning in the courses that they take.
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Appendix

Survey Instrument

COURSE NUMBER: __________________________________________
COURSE TITLE: ____________________________________________
PROFESSOR: _____________________________________________

NOTE: If you need more space, please use additional sheets.

1. Please indicate the books you would like the base libraries to acquire in support of this course. (Please provide as much of the information requested as possible.)

   a. Author(s): ___________________________________________
      Title: _______________________________________________
      Place of Publication: ____________________________ Year: __________
      Publisher: ___________________________ Price: ______________

   b. Author(s): __________________________________________
      Title: ______________________________________________
      Place of Publication: ____________________________ Year: __________
      Publisher: ___________________________ Price: ______________

   c. Author(s): __________________________________________
      Title: ______________________________________________
      Place of Publication: ____________________________ Year: __________
      Publisher: ___________________________ Price: ______________

   d. Author(s): __________________________________________
      Title: ______________________________________________
      Place of Publication: ____________________________ Year: __________
      Publisher: ___________________________ Price: ______________

2. Please indicate the periodicals you would like the base libraries to acquire in support of this course. (Please provide as much of the information requested as possible.)

   a. Title: ______________________________________________
      Address: ___________________________________________
      Annual subscription price: ____________________________

   b. Title: ______________________________________________
      Address: ___________________________________________
      Annual subscription price: ____________________________
3. Please indicate the audiovisual materials you would like the base libraries to acquire in support of this course. (Please provide as much of the information as possible.)

a. Title: ____________________________________________________________

Format: [ ] Filmstrip [ ] Videocassette
[ ] Record [ ] Audiocassette
[ ] Other (specify): ________________________________________________

Purchase address:____________________________________________________

Price: ______________________________________________________________

b. Title: _____________________________________________________________

Format: [ ] Filmstrip [ ] Videocassette
[ ] Record [ ] Audiocassette
[ ] Other (specify): _________________________________________________

Purchase address:____________________________________________________

Price: ______________________________________________________________

c. Title: _____________________________________________________________

Format: [ ] Filmstrip [ ] Videocassette
[ ] Record [ ] Audiocassette
[ ] Other (specify): _________________________________________________

Purchase address:____________________________________________________

Price: ______________________________________________________________

d. Title: _____________________________________________________________

Format: [ ] Filmstrip [ ] Videocassette
[ ] Record [ ] Audiocassette
[ ] Other (specify): _________________________________________________

Purchase address:____________________________________________________

Price: ______________________________________________________________
Impact of CD-ROM in Providing Library Services to Rural Utah

Rob Morrison
Utah State University

Background

Utah State University and Distance Education

Utah State University, as a land-grant institution, has a mission to teach, research, and serve. Distance Education for state residents is a major role the university fulfills through University Extension, comprising Cooperative Extension and Life Span Learning Programs (LSPL). Within LSPL is Class Division, responsible for providing credit programs to off-campus and non-traditional students through state-wide centers, Evening School, and Independent Studies. LSPL offers 25 degree programs and nine certificate programs.

LSPL operates 15 education centers in Utah where faculty teach on-site or visit from campus. Centers were established beginning in 1967 when the Utah State Legislature required USU to establish and operate two sites in eastern and southeastern Utah. These centers received line-item funding. The Board of Regents mandated 11 additional centers in 1969 but without this funding. Most USU education centers are self-sustaining and do not receive major funding from the University or the State (Life Span Learning, 1991).

In response to increasing growth at these centers between 1979 and 1984, LSPL developed COM-NET, a telecommunications delivery system. Over the COM-NET system, courses are taught on-campus and delivered directly to 37 classrooms in Utah and Colorado. COM-NET currently offers eight degree programs, enrolling over 13,000 students since its inception (Life Span Learning, 1991).

Library Services

The Merrill Library and Learning Resources Program (MLLRP) is responsible for providing library and information services for all USU courses and programs. Administratively, MLLRP covers the Merrill Library, Telecommunications, and a Publications/Design department. Historically, library services to off-campus students and programs have not been available on a regular or organized basis due to a lack of funding and support.

Merrill Library provided services direct from campus on an ad hoc basis, as resources did not exist to support on-site collections and staff. Many off-campus centers are located in remote rural areas of the state that lack even basic library resources for undergraduates. As a result, many faculty either designed courses without making use of library services or supplied materials directly to students.

Library services have also been hindered by additional factors. Faculty teach over COM-NET in addition to on-campus classes; although financially compensated, the workload provides little incentive to teach off-campus. COM-NET classes are cancelled if enrollment is insufficient after the first week; faculty can end up preparing for a class that will not be taught. The inability to
accurately predict the exact sites where COM-NET courses will be offered also impedes planning library services. These factors have made planning standard services difficult to develop with on-campus faculty. Two projects, ICLIS and I-NET, developed in the 1980's, helped deliver library services to selected rural areas and USU education centers.

ICLIS

ICLIS, the Intermountain Community Learning and Information Services project, linked the resources of land-grant institutions to state and rural public libraries in four intermountain states (Utah, Colorado, Montana, Wyoming). It provided educational and informational services to rural residents utilizing the public library as a delivery system. IBM equipment was utilized to access library holdings and deliver courses and other programs designed for adult and community education. An information specialist was hired and trained to support services in the public libraries. ICLIS operated under a grant provided by the W. K. Kellog Foundation from 1985 to 1990. Dr. Glenn Wilde, Associate Dean for Extension and Life Span Learning at USU and acting executive MLLRP Director, was the guiding force behind ICLIS and chiefly responsible for obtaining the grant (Marks, Nielsen, Spykerman, and Wilde, 1988).

Merrill Library played an active role in the ICLIS projects' development and services. The ICLIS Multistate Office was located at USU, and Merrill Library housed the main hardware system. Steve Nielsen, the library's fiscal officer, helped install ICLIS equipment at every site and established FIDO, an electronic bulletin board to receive materials and information requests. MERLIN, Merrill Library's online catalog was available to every site, although actual services were limited to Utah.

Library services began in 1988 in cooperation with the public libraries in Price and Vernal, Utah. The information specialist assisted patrons searching MERLIN and then submitted requests electronically over FIDO. Interlibrary loans were handled by the public library. Although limited to education centers in eastern Utah, ICLIS provided Merrill Library with the resources to offer comprehensive library services off-campus for the first time.

ICLIS depended upon community acceptance and support. When funding ran out in the summer of 1990, the communities had the responsibility to continue supporting services. Today the level of service is contingent upon the community's ability and willingness to provide them. Merrill Library continues to work with the public library in Vernal but with vastly reduced resources. ICLIS today is still a successful and viable model to provide information and education services to rural areas through established information resources (the public library).

I-NET

In 1987, COM-NET implemented "I-NET," an extension of the ICLIS model to provide library services to off-campus education centers throughout the state. I-NET accessed the resources of Merrill Library through the ICLIS system using separate equipment, telephone lines, and funding. COM-NET originally planned to place I-NET in public libraries but ultimately installed the system in four education centers, two public libraries, and one school media center. Unlike ICLIS, I-NET was funded entirely by COM-NET and did not have the benefit of an information specialist to provide assistance. These problems plus technical difficulties prevented I-NET from achieving ICLIS' success.

Technical problems plagued I-NET from the start. Computer disks containing programs enabling dial-in access to Merrill Library often failed to work. While ICLIS had multiple telecommunications lines, I-NET operated over a separate line also utilized on-campus, resulting in
frequent busy signals. At one public library the system did not operate, necessitating its removal to
the local education center.

Lack of complete and standardized training also hampered services. The I-NET system was not
user friendly and specialized training was essential for operation. Center staff did not receive
adequate training necessary to handle I-NET's complexities, greatly contributing to the system's
ineffectiveness. FIDO messages were not transmitted under uniform filenames, preventing library
staff from locating and responding to requests. I-NET was most successfully operated in public
libraries.

I-NET effectively ended in the fall of 1988. That September, the projects' technical and
administrative personnel left COM-NET and the system was discontinued. ICLIS remained as the
only organized source of library services for USU off-campus programs from Fall 1988 to the
Summer of 1990.

CD-ROM: Alternative Access

This lengthy historical background is necessary to understand the context of CD-ROM's role in
current library services. Merrill Library and LSPL have not received separate funding to adequately
provide services, eliminating the ability to maintain large-scale operations for all off-campus centers.
I-NET's problems demonstrated some of the difficulties in providing library services at non-library
sites. CD-ROM provided an alternative solution to technical and staffing problems by allowing
Merrill Library to offer catalog access at remote centers deficient in library resources.

Merrill Library began using a compact-disk catalog in 1989 as a back up to the online catalog.
The card catalog was closed in December 1987, leaving no reliable alternative to the online system.
The vendor also offered additional features which made it attractive for off-campus use. CD-ROM
had many advantages over telecommunication systems which Merrill Library envisioned as more
conducive to working in the off-campus centers.

Fixed Costs

CD-ROM technology eliminated unpredictable costs inherent in any telecommunications system
by operating on a stand-alone workstation. It comprised an IBM-compatible 286 computer with one
floppy drive, 20 megabyte hard drive, CD player, monitor, keyboard, and printer. The library
charged an annual lease for the CD to cover production and licensing costs. Aside from standard
maintenance, this system offered LSPL known and controlled costs. Purchasing multiple
workstations further reduced initial expenses. This advantage was important for off-campus centers
operating with limited budgets and staff.

Manageable Support

Providing technical and staff support for the workstation was less problematic than I-NET.
Specialized library and center staff would not be available to work exclusively with the workstation
and patrons. The search software was simple enough for patrons to execute basic searches without
detailed instructions. Overall, operating this equipment was more manageable than a complex
telecommunications system.
Transportability

The equipment is easier to install, remove, and transport than telecommunications lines. Education centers have moved to different locations and relocated to larger facilities where the catalog could go into operation before completion.

Special Features

The vendor offered several options for the compact disk that Merrill Library viewed as advantageous for current and future library operations. The software supports boolean operators which the library's online catalog did not, providing more flexible searching. Additional features the library viewed as future enhancements were: a library news section, an interlibrary loan and a blank request form. Another option would allow requests to be downloaded and sent through electronic mail.

CD workstations were installed in four off-campus centers in the spring of 1990. This represented the first stage to provide uniform catalog access; the sites were divided between remote rural centers and those with high demand/enrollment. The two ICLIS sites also picked up the CD disk.

Standardizing Services

A librarian was hired in June 1990 in the Reference Department to work directly with off-campus programs for the first time. At this point, uncertainty surrounded the continuation of ICLIS, and dial-in access to Merrill Library had been discontinued at the off-campus centers.

Establishing standard library services viable at all off-campus centers and students for the upcoming Fall Quarter was the immediate task. Basic and uncomplicated services were essential for effective provision at sites lacking library facilities and staff. These services also had to be provided directly from Merrill Library without the benefit of funding or full-time staff and were restricted to a basic document delivery service. Bibliographic instruction, interlibrary services, and on-site collections were not possible with existing resources.

The first phase consisted of organizing, designing, and publicizing services. The first written policies concerning off-campus library services were produced and the program named Distance Education Library Services (DELS). Visits to all off-campus centers to meet with staff and coordinate services were made that September. Copies of the Library of Congress Subject Headings were sent to the four education centers housing the CD catalog to facilitate use.

Merrill Library produces a serial listing of holdings called the Catalog of Serials that were sent to every off-campus center. This source supplemented the CD catalog by listing journal, government document, and conference proceedings titles not included on the database. The main challenge in providing new and uniform services was to utilize existing resources in which the CD catalog played a major role.

Request Forms

Material request forms were designed to accommodate the printing capability of the CD workstation that could also be used at any off-campus center. Rather than creating manual forms with pre-printed bibliographic information, a blank space fitting printed records from the CD workstation was provided with brief instructions. The printed request could be attached to the form
and faxed/mailed to Merrill Library. Patrons at centers lacking the workstation had sufficient room
and instructions to write in individual requests.

**New Electronic Request/Access System**

Telefascimile was a standard means of communication for the off-campus centers, forming the
basis of a new electronic request/communications system. The request form was designed for faxing
by fitting two on one page to minimize costs for the centers. This system did not require specialized
training for library or center staff and was implemented immediately. Telefascimile contributed a
quick means to submit requests, which in turn, facilitated timely processing and delivery of materials.

The second part of this new electronic system consisted of a toll-free number installed at the
same time as the CD workstations. Messages were recorded 24 hours a day, giving students the
flexibility to call Merrill Library at any time. Since most students did not have access to the CD
catalog or any other library resources, this number provided the only direct link to Merrill Library.
Initially named DELS Information Line, this was later changed to DELS Library Access Line in
order to more clearly identify with library services. Combined with telefascimile access, this
represented an effective system to provide basic services.

**Library Services & CD Search Guides**

Several library guides were created to help patrons use the CD catalog. The only manual
provided by the vendor was highly technical and mainly covered installation procedures and
troubleshooting. A simple, nontechnical search guide would assist patrons in place of staff. The
guide was limited to covering only the very basics in order to avoid overloading users with
information.

During the preparation of the search guide, it became clear that a separate section was necessary
to expand upon available services. An informational flyer in every course syllabi briefly outlined
services but did not contain detailed explanations. Most off-campus students do not have the
opportunity to visit Merrill Library and many do not have access to any academic libraries; the
supplementary guide provided a source to fully explain available services and resources. This part
of the guide was also valuable for all off-campus centers. The section essentially became an outgrowth
of the search guide and was entitled "Available Services."

The guide was completed in time for Spring Quarter 1991 but was delayed with the release of
the updated disk. The revised edition is expected for the following Fall Quarter but the "Available
Services" section was distributed that Spring. The next off-campus site visits are scheduled for
September 1991 when the new CD and guide will be demonstrated to center faculty and staff.

**CD Limitations/Disadvantages**

Despite the overall benefits CD-ROM contributed towards establishing standardized library
services, the system has some important limitations. The sole function of the CD workstation is to
supply library catalog access to off-campus students and centers; there are many other aspects of
library services it does not support.

**Currency**

The disks are not updated as currently as an online system. Updates were originally scheduled
quarterly but have been annual due to problems involving the conversion of computer tapes. Users
do not have access to current library acquisitions or the circulation and reserve status of materials. Many older materials have not been converted to electronic format and are only located in the on-campus card catalog.

No Journal/Research Articles Access

The CD catalog provides access to a small portion of library materials, primarily books and government documents. Journal and research articles are key sources of information students must have access to which the CD catalog does not supply. The Catalog of Serials supplements by providing additional serials holdings not available on the online and CD databases, but is not a periodical indexing tool. The logistics and expense of maintaining subject-specific CD databases or print equivalents at all off-campus centers is not currently possible. Merrill Library has been performing literature searches and supplying articles for students due to lack of journal access.

Workstations at Limited Centers

Currently only a quarter of all off-campus centers (four out of fifteen) have the CD available. Workstations for four additional centers are on order and expected for Fall Quarter 1991. This still leaves nearly one-half of all centers lacking catalog access. The priority for which centers receive the CD catalog depend upon greatest demand/enrollment and those centers whose budgets can afford it.

CD & The Future: Developments and Factors

Many different factors will determine the future of off-campus library services at Utah State University and CD-ROM's role in their provision. The pivotal issues that will affect future services are: funding, support, changes in technology, and directions in service.

Directions in Service

Merrill Library will pursue arrangements with local libraries or other established information centers wherever possible in order to provide full services. The resources required to duplicate on-site collections and staff for every off-campus center are prohibitive. Working with local communities has been successful in the past (ICLIS) and is in line with USU's Extension mission. This direction could eventually eliminate the need to maintain CD workstations at the off-campus centers.

Funding & Staffing

Future support for off-campus library services will determine the extent Merrill Library can continue providing basic and expanded services. The Library's Reference and Interlibrary Services Department currently support all off-campus services. Staff, supplies, photocopying, material delivery, and telefacsimile costs are taken directly out of budgets designated for on-campus services. There is a limit to the amount of resources these departments can allocate to off-campus programs.

Distance Education at USU is a full-time program run by part-time staff. Regular visits to off-campus centers and providing bibliographic instruction or interlibrary services is not possible with existing staff and resources. LSPL absorbs the costs of the CD workstations and determines their number and location; Merrill Library has little control over services off-campus due to inability to staff these remote sites.

Utah State University has recognized deficiencies in Merrill Library's resources and is providing additional funding and support for new staff and PCs to bolster on-campus services. Installation of
a new automation system is underway and a separate Science and Technology Library received initial state funding to provide space for a collection that has outgrown the original facility. Private and University funding will be sought to support off-campus services.

Enrollment

Off-campus enrollment has increased steadily for years. Last Fall, in reverse of national trends, Utah's institutions of higher education experienced an unexpected influx of on-campus students. Fall Quarter 1990 saw 1,200 additional students enroll at USU, representing a 7.7% increase in on-campus and 5.8% increase in off-campus FTE's. The following quarter experienced a 10.6% increase; successive quarters also had higher than normal enrollments. Over 6,000 new students are anticipated for Fall 1991.

Utah's large families and Brigham Young University's decision to limit enrollment were major factors for the increase in students. The impact on budgets has been severe, resulting in increasing demands on fixed resources; funds may have to be diverted for additional classrooms and housing. If this trend continues, it will negatively impact on future resources for off-campus programs.

Diversity of Distance Education Programs

Distance Education is provided through multiple systems at USU, complicating efforts to support uniform library services. While LSPL is responsible for all Distance Education programs, multiple and separately administered delivery systems exist. COM-NET established its own telecommunications lines but courses can also be taught over the ED-NET system, run by the state of Utah to provide tele-conferencing, courses, and many other educational programs via microwave.

ED-NET is not only operated independently of COM-NET but students receive these courses at different sites throughout the state. AGSAT, a new cooperative venture between land-grant institutions, delivers courses by satellite around the country. Cooperative Extension has over sixty agents in nearly every county in Utah that need library access and services. Overall, there are far too many off-campus programs and courses operating independently and in different locations for Merrill Library to serve, resulting in current services focusing only on students and faculty.

USU designated a Blue Ribbon Committee to study the operations of Telecommunications, Computer Services, Merrill Library, and Electronic Distance Education services, all administered separately but often working towards the same goal. The committees' charge is to make recommendations that will increase the effectiveness of these units. Plans currently under consideration would lump most of these services under one Dean of Learning Resources. Daily operations would remain separate but a central Dean or administrator would greatly assist the coordination of activities. Whatever the final recommendations, any plan that helps coordinate and integrate library services into the rest of campus will be a positive development for off-campus services.

Prison Sites

COM-NET currently delivers courses to three separate correctional facilities in Utah. Library access of any kind must be provided directly on-site as students are prohibited from using computers with the ability to communicate outside the prison. CD-ROM will continue to provide catalog access to these sites since dial-in access is not possible.
Automation & Technology Developments

Technology has rapidly advanced since the days of ICLIS and I-NET. CD-ROM enabled Merrill Library to utilize new technology at that time to provide effective catalog access to off-campus centers. Today, technology offers more effective dial-in access than in the past to remote sites. Changes in technology at Merrill Library will shape off-campus services and CD-ROM's role by allowing dial-in access to additional databases.

Merrill Library is in the process of providing dial-in access to on-campus databases. MERLIN, the online catalog, has been available through a modem for several years but access will eventually be expanded to include periodical databases. The Library began operating an in-house CD network in November 1990, running off towers containing 11 disk drives, housing four periodical databases plus the CD catalog. The following summer, this system was expanded to a total of 32 disk drives accessible from eight in-house workstations. Dial-in access will be made available first on-campus and then eventually off-campus, once the library is wired to the campus fiber-optic network.

A new automation vendor to handle circulation, OPAC, and technical services will also enhance access. Merrill Library is switching from GEAC to NOTIS to provide all library automation. Dial-in access to MERLIN, the CD network, and additional databases loaded on the mainframe computer should be available by 1992.

The workstations could be modified to permit dial-in access. This would replace the current stand-alone system except in the correctional facilities. Hypercard technology would provide bibliographic instruction to students at these sites. Merrill Library developed a hypercard library skills program on Macintosh which can be networked. Hypercard can be also be utilized as an online interface containing instructions for using the workstation. This would address off-campus staffing problems by allowing the library to provide all necessary instructions from campus.

Summary

CD-ROM provided library catalog access to off-campus centers in Utah as an alternative to problematic telecommunications systems. The CD catalog was an uncomplicated tool for non-library sites and assisted in planning and implementing new and standardized services. Fixed costs for purchasing and operating the CD catalog have been essential for library services that receive no funding. Dial-in access will eventually replace the stand-alone CD in order to provide greater access to materials, but until that time, CD-ROM is a necessary and viable tool for library services.
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Creating an Off-Campus Library Services Program with the Aid of a Compressed Video Network

Gary M. Pitkin
University of Northern Colorado

During the 1988 Off-campus Library Services Conference held in Charleston, I presented a paper describing a telecommunications initiative aimed at incorporating telecommunications into off-campus course delivery. The paper described a pilot project that utilizes telecommunications in the form of compressed video to deliver a course from the University of Northern Colorado in Greeley to off-campus students in Grand Junction, Colorado, a distance of several hundred miles. The project also involved audio conferencing, videotapes, electronic mail, faculty site-visits, and support from the University Libraries in the form of collections and services, graphics and television facilities, and the databases of the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries (CARL) (Pitkin, 1988).

The success of this project, which was conducted through telecommunications equipment and lines provided by US West Communications, led to the vision of the University of Northern Colorado providing teacher education courses via a compressed video network to off-campus students throughout the state. The vision included the ability to combine compressed video with an audio-bridge to allow a professor to teach a class on campus in Greeley but to be simultaneously broadcast to several off-campus sites. Monitors with speakers would also be placed in the off-campus classrooms so students could see and hear the professor and the students in Greeley.

The vision was discussed in many meetings among University and US West representatives during the Fall of 1988 and the Winter and Spring of 1989. In early summer, the University's College of Continuing Education formally proposed a cooperative telecommunications initiative. The initiative would establish "Telecommunications System Centers" at the UNC off-campus locations. Figure 1 lists the goals and objectives of the Centers and Figure 2 indicates their location (University of Northern Colorado, 1989). The goals and objectives would be met through the combined resources of the University of Northern Colorado and US West, which would establish the Western Institute for Distance Education (WIDE) as shown in Figure 3 (University of Northern Colorado, 1989).

The proposal received approval from the appropriate governing bodies and a one-year (1990) partnership was initiated. During that year, WIDE was formally established. Space was renovated, staff were hired, and an ambitious budget was supported by the University's administration with the majority of the funds coming from off-campus tuition. US West provided technical expertise and the equipment needed to begin the development of the Telecommunications Systems Centers based on compressed video technology. A WIDE Steering Committee was created with decision-making authority to control the implementation and growth of the initiative. The Committee was composed of deans, faculty, WIDE staff, US West representatives, and was chaired by the Director of University Libraries.

It was obvious from the beginning that this initiative could not succeed without proper support from the University of Northern Colorado Libraries. Indeed, off-campus programs in place prior to the initiative had been criticized by students, faculty, and librarians at those sites because of the lack of necessary library services and collections.
In the summer of 1989, at the same time the UNC/US West initiative was being finalized, the Director of University Libraries presented the Central Administration with a lengthy proposal to establish a new department, Off-campus Library Services, to be managed by an Off-campus Programs Librarian. The proposal closed with the following statement:

The University of Northern Colorado Libraries needs to take a proactive role in the provision of library services to our off-campus students. We need to take the steps necessary to provide library services to those students at the same level those services are provided to on-campus students. Not only is this necessary in providing distance learning comparable to the quality of residential learning, it is necessary in maintaining the life of the statewide program. By doing so, we meet the expectations of the North Central Association, and we can demonstrate to the Colorado Commission on Higher Education our commitment to a quality off-campus program.

I propose that we accomplish this task by formally adopting, as an institution, the revised "Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Services" when they are finalized by the Association of College and Research Libraries.

I further propose that we:

1. expand the mission statement of the University of Northern Colorado Libraries to include a strong commitment to serving off-campus students in the same manner on-campus students are served;

2. incorporate access to the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries databases into the off-campus program;

3. establish a working relationship between the University of Northern Colorado Libraries, the University of Northern Colorado College of Continuing Education, and the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries through cooperative use of technology and telecommunications capabilities;

4. develop protocols for providing direct reference/research services to off-campus students from UNC library/faculty through the use of compressed video work stations based on the cooperative relationship now being established between the University and US West;

5. develop a budget and staffing requirements based on the accomplishment of the above tasks and work closely with the University administration to analyze and implement options.

The University Administration enthusiastically approved the proposal and authorized the development of appropriate positions and budgets. The Director of University Libraries and the Dean of the College of Continuing Education began working together to develop protocols for the new Off-Campus Library Services Office and to establish criteria for joint support of this effort. By serving on the WIDE Steering Committee, both individuals kept that body informed of the progress being made in the establishment and implications of the Off-Campus Library Services Offices. Also, through this mechanism, the program received enthusiastic support from many sectors of the University.

During the 1989-90 fiscal year, the University Libraries and the College of Continuing Education established the following cooperative protocols for jointly supporting the Off-Campus Library Services Program:
Off-Campus Programs Librarian and Associate Professor:

- the job description (see Figure 4) was written by Library personnel and reviewed by Continuing Education personnel; revisions were made jointly and approved;
- advertisements and interview costs were borne by the University Libraries;
- salary and fringe benefits were paid by the College of Continuing Education.

Support Personnel:

- a full-time, high-level classified position was established to provide necessary support to the Off-Campus Programs Librarian; salary and benefits are paid by the University Libraries.

Off-Campus Library Services Office:

- space is provided by the University Libraries;
- a WIDE-supported compressed video workstation telecommunicated to all off-campus sites is being installed with all costs borne by the College of Continuing Education;
- office furniture, telefaximile equipment, a personal computer and CD-ROM equipment are provided by the University Libraries.

Collections and Services:

- core collections needed at the off-campus sites will be funded by the College of Continuing Education;
- toll-free telephone access to the Off-Campus Library Services Office by off-campus students is provided by the College of Continuing Education;
- postage, photocopying, document delivery, travel and similar expenses are provided by the University Libraries.

Based on the initial initiative of the University's College of Continuing Education and US West to create the Western Institute for Distance Education and the subsequent initiative of the University Libraries and the college of Continuing Education, a scenario has been created to allow the WIDE compressed video network to serve as the conduit for personalized library services to off-campus students. Now that the planning has been completed, and the Off-campus Programs Librarian hired, we will begin the implementation of off-campus library services.
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Exercising Educational Leadership

Telecommunications System Centers

Goals and Objectives

UNC will deliver programs/degrees statewide through a system of centers:
- located at other post-secondary institutions.
- geographically dispersed to blanket the state population, eliminating the need for students to travel more than 60 miles.

Each of the Statewide Centers will provide:
- on-site coordination.
- opportunities for joint appointments.
- access to library, AV, computer facilities.
- collegiate amenities and ambience.
- a capability to create a telecommunications link to the UNC main campus.

The Statewide Center System enables a number of partnership opportunities:
- Colorado Department of Education (BOCES, BOCS).
- Other post-secondary institutions.
- US WEST
- Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries (CARL)
- COLONET
Figure 2.

Initial Center Locations

Population Key
- < 0.5%
- 0.5 - 1%
- 1 - 5%
- 5 - 10%
- > 10%
Exercising Educational Leadership

Potential Partnership

UNC
- Statewide Mandate
- National Prominence in Distance Education
- Instructional Design Expertise
- Telecommunications Commitment
- Viable Application Areas
- Diverse Funding Potential
- Committed to Faculty

US WEST
- Commitment to Solving Educational Needs for Advanced Delivery Systems
- Technological Expertise
- Audiographic/Compression Technology
- Transmission Capabilities
- Software
- Strategic/Planning and Marketing Expertise

Western Institute for Distance Education
- Training, Research and Development Centers
- Instructional Design and Assessment
- Research and Practice in Learning/Instructional Systems
- Technology Proficiency Training
- Information/Educational Product Demonstration and Dissemination
- Demonstration of Technology Application to Current Educational/Training Issues
Figure 4. Off Campus Programs Librarian

The Off-Campus Programs Librarian is a faculty position and reports directly to the Director of Public Services and Personnel. The Off-Campus Programs Librarian is responsible for planning, implementing, coordinating, and evaluating library resources and services addressing the information needs of off-campus students and faculty.

Job responsibilities for the position include the following:

a. Formulates, establishes, and administers appropriate guidelines for the purpose of maintaining off-campus services.

b. Responsible for the supervision and evaluation of one classified staff member.

c. Incorporate and encourage new technology in the everyday delivery of off-campus services.

d. Work closely with all university administrative areas responsible for off-campus services.

e. Provides support for students' needs in fulfilling course assignments, including required and assigned readings and research papers.

f. Provides support for teaching needs of faculty.

g. Travel to off-campus sites when necessary.

h. Determines department equipment and supply needs, preparing justifications and requests as needed.

i. Monitors department performance and provides annual and special reports.

j. Accommodates other information needs of the off-campus programs as appropriate.
A Survey of Extended Campus Library Services and Funding at American Academic Institutions

Colleen Power
California State University, Chico

Introduction

In 1973, Frank MacDougall published his first survey of library services to extended campus services (MacDougall, 1973, p.1). Essentially a directory of such programs across the United States, MacDougall later expanded his directory to include 180 such institutions.

R.K. Fisher studied extension library services in his 1978 survey, noting numerous inadequacies in delivery of these services (Fisher, 1978, p.3). In 1980, George Hodowanec, as part of the assessment of the ACRL Guidelines for extended campus library services, sent questionnaires to 144 libraries, with 42 responses received (Hodowanec, 1982, p. 201). One of the few recently published attempts to survey libraries of United States libraries was conducted to ascertain how the Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Services have been utilized (Sheridan and Martin, 1984, p. 165).

In Canada, Alexander Slade (Slade, 1988) conducted a major survey of 199 Canadian libraries involved in the distance education program. His survey has summarized the characteristics and the scope of the extended campus library services program in Canadian libraries. This study should serve as a model for any similar future surveys, regardless of the country studied.

Gloria Lebowitz and Kim Schultz, librarians at Central Michigan University, in April 1989 began a survey of extended campus programs at institutions in the United States and Canada (Lebowitz and Schultz, 1990). Their extremely useful and descriptive 1990 directory details 68 programs. Like MacDougall, this directory is aimed at providing an information resource, with a minimum intent to analyze the information in tabular form, and will hopefully be followed by a more comprehensive directory.

During a 1987 sabbatical study of extended campus library programs across the United States, the author conducted initial interviews with librarians and continuing education administrators. The librarians interviewed expressed considerable interest in other libraries' services and funding for extended campus library programs. An outcome of the initial survey of these 30 libraries was the preparation and distribution of a three page questionnaire to 149 libraries involved in extended campus programs. This paper focuses on the responses made by these 114 American academic libraries, attempts to quantify the responses to develop a profile of extended campus library programs, and outlines the implications for other libraries considering establishment of such programs.

Methodology

Mailing lists were developed from six lists of attendees at the Association of College and Research Libraries Extended Campus Libraries Discussion Group as well as the attendee list of the three national Off Campus Library Services Conferences. Duplicate names and individuals with the same institutional address were eliminated. The survey with a cover letter was sent out in October
of 1988 to the 149 names remaining in the database. Self addressed stamped envelopes were
inclosed to encourage response, and may account for the higher than usual response, although the
remarkably high degree of interest in the subject may be an equal or greater factor. By January
1989, 124 responses from American institutions had been received. The survey was regarded as
complete and the information tabulated. No responses have been received since that date.

The questionnaire consisted of 19 multiple choice responses with room for comments at the end,
and optional name title and address. Most questions were answered without modification, but in
some cases the librarian would expand their answers to more accurately reflect their particular
library situation, and those are noted in Appendix A.

Results and Discussion

Q1. Does your university offer classes to students at off-campus locations?

Total number = 124

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the attendance lists were used for mailings, some attendees are at the meetings because
their institutions are being impacted by the extended campus students of other campuses. The initial
sort was to limit the responses to the institutions that do offer off-campus programs. Future
program committees may want to consider that at least 8% of attendees may be present because of
such concerns.

Q2. How are classes taught?

n = 114

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor travels to location</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable TV</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITFS (microwave)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (correspondence, etc.)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 167

Many institutions offer several options to extended campus students. For instance, California
State University Chico offers four options. Clearly the most commonly offered option is travel to
the location by the professor. This action alone can strongly influence library services, such as
delivery of materials, library instruction, etc.

Q3. May a student earn a degree through the off-campus program?

n = 114  

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The types of library services offered can very much depend upon the nature of the off-campus classes. Some campuses offer continuing education for teachers or other professionals that may be for credit, but do not lead to degrees. Surprisingly, this study indicates that fully 91.2% of the institutions responding do offer a degree through off-campus study.

Q4. If "yes", what degree levels are offered?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Level</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate or Certificate</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors Degree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once again, multiple responses are to be expected, since many institutions offer more than one degree. At least 50.9% of the respondents offer a Bachelors Degree, or higher, through the extended campus program.

Q5. Does the university provide library services to its students enrolled in off-campus classes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While it may appear startling that not all institutions offer library services, some classes, such as beginning conversational language, computer courses or stain glass art, are not library dependent. One degree-granting institution offered no library services, but in response to question 16, regarding agreements with other institutions, this library responded affirmatively.

Q6. If "yes," what special services are offered?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document delivery</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toll-free reference help</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated librarians</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-line searching</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-Rom searching</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-line catalog</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference collection on-site</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microform catalog on-site</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve collection on-site</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom orientations</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written guides</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If these were put in order from most often to least often provided services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document delivery</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online searching</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms orientations</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written guides</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-Rom searching</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve collection on-site</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated librarians</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online catalog</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference collection on-site</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microform catalog on-site</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toll-free reference help</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since only 61% of the respondents provided document delivery, the logical conclusion is that the institutions either required the students to come to the main campus to do their research, offered classes without research paper assignments, or had alternative access. In fact, of the 51 institutions that did not provide the service, 12 (23.5%) had indicated on question 16 that they signed contracts with other institutions, another two (3.9%) had their furthest site 1-10 miles away, five (9.8%) did not offer degrees, and 21 (41.1%) had onsite collections. Eleven (21.6%) did not conform to any of these parameters.

Institutions that do not provide document delivery:

n = 51

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answered &quot;yes&quot; to Q 16 (signed agreements)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered &quot;no&quot; to Q3 (degree offered)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furthest site 1-10 miles away</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onsite collections</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar correlations can certainly be made for other library services offered, such as how many CD Rom searching respondents also have onsite collections, or if the searching is done at the home campus.

If the respondents answered "yes" to any of the services offered above, they were asked to answer the appropriate questions 7-14, while "no" responses were asked to skip to item 15, regarding policies. Since funding and costs are often a major deterrent to providing these services, several of these questions were aimed at obtaining that data.


n = 63

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Method</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US Mail</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery van</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telefax</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (professor, etc.)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Once again, most institutions offered a variety of services. A surprisingly large number, 10 of the 63, utilized the lecturers to carry the material with them to the classes.

As a related subquestion, the respondents were further asked "Do patrons pay charges for any of these services?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay for charges</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't pay charges</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>85.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial subsidy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overwhelmingly, the universities do not charge for services, or at the very least, partially fund the service. Two respondents checked more than one box.

Q8. Toll-Free Reference Help

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call goes into a special center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call goes to regular reference</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A minority of respondents offer toll-free reference; however, one other respondent indicated that their sites include a hard-wired phone line to any place on the main campus, including the library.

Q9. Designated librarians: How many librarians are assigned to deal with your off campus students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.51-1.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01-2.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strangely, 65 respondents answered this question, while in Q6, only 38 responded affirmatively. One can hypothesize that the respondents to Q6 assumed that "designated librarians" referred to librarians assigned entirely to extended campus. Indeed, looking at the figures, only 18 of the 65 utilize 1.01+ professional staff. Most libraries make do with very minimal professional help.

Q10. On-line searching is handled:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-site</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a special center</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same as for other patrons</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some multiple checking occurred on this question as well. A large portion of libraries treat on-line searching the same, whether the patron is on campus or off. This response leads immediately to the next question, regarding funding.

Q11. Do you charge for on-line searching for off-campus students?

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{n} & \# & \% \\
\text{charge} & 26 & 43.3 \\
\text{don’t charge} & 23 & 38.3 \\
\text{partial subsidy} & 11 & 18.3 \\
\end{array}
\]

Once again, more responses were made (60), than responded under Q6 (51). And again, the implication is that some of the respondents probably interpreted Q6 to mean free “online searching.”

If there were any two questions to be re-written or formulated in another fashion, it would be this one and the preceding. While the information gathered is valid, one intent of this question was to see if the funding was handled differently than with on-campus students.

Q12. On-site reference and reserve collection is staffed by:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{n} & \# & \% \\
\text{Librarian} & 26 & 66.7 \\
\text{Assistant} & 14 & 35.9 \\
\text{Other (office staff or site monitors, etc.)} & 17 & 43.6 \\
\end{array}
\]

Of the 26 institutions with on-site librarians all but one had additional staff, either an assistant or other. Three libraries had all three categories, librarians, assistants and office staff. Two respondents added the information that, while the collection was by office staff, librarians from the main campus visited regularly to provide some bibliographic instruction or staff training.

The second part of this question was to identify what unit most often provided financial support for the staffing:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{n} & \# & \% \\
\text{Library budget} & 36 & 92.3 \\
\text{Non-library funding source} & 7 & 17.9 \\
\text{Exclusively non-library} & 4 & 10.3 \\
\text{Joint expenditures} & 3 & 7.7 \\
\end{array}
\]

Four institutions used exclusively non-library funding. In two cases, the respondents had indicated staffing only by the office personnel. In three universities, funding is shared by both the library and the parent institution.
Q13. On-line catalog:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dial-in from anywhere</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial-in from center</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-wired to center</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very impressive were the number of libraries making dial-in access available from any location. Two other libraries noted that they were using CD Rom catalogs rather than on-line. The introduction of such specialized library tools led to the next question regarding classroom orientations.

Q14. Classroom orientations are conducted in what manner?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Librarian travels to site</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian televised during classes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taped presentation on air between classes</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taped presentation during classes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (on-site librarians, etc.)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most interesting category here was "other" with many libraries requiring their students to go to the main campus for orientation, instruction by the lecturer or utilization of a workbook, administered by the staff or lecturer.

Q15. Does your library have written policies specifically addressing the services offered to your off-campus students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Astonishing perhaps were the number of campuses operating without any library policy for these students. While none of the respondents made comments here, one might hypothesize that the services offered off-campus are identical to those offered to the on-campus community.
Q16. Does your library sign contracts with other institutions to provide library services for your students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For their students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The large number of written contracts was generally reflective of those institutions which did not have on-site collections. Positive responses were far more common with those institutions offering classes at multiple sites (Question 17) and distant sites (Question 18).

Q17. How many separate off-campus sites does your library serve?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bulk of respondents had five or fewer sites, and tended to be those campuses on which the professor traveled to the site to teach the class. For those with twenty-plus sites, correlations with Q2, regarding how the classes are delivered, shows that most are offering satellite or cable delivery. Since some of the respondents were working at the sites, they apparently chose not to answer this question, or the one following.

Q18. How far is your furthest site served?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10 miles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-100 miles</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-500 miles</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 miles +</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The principle indications are that most sites are within 100 miles of the parent institution (70.2%) and that there is a high correlation between those institutions that indicate more than 20 sites (Q17) and those more than 500 miles.

Q19. Comments

At least 30 percent of the respondents added comments, most often quite extensive and genuinely enlightening. None were outright hostile or even particularly critical, which one might have expected from someone who just had to spend 20 minutes filling out an intricate questionnaire.
Conclusions

The 1989 Guidelines for Off Campus Library Services established seven distinct points covering library services to off campus students. These points address the measurement and analysis of need, and all aspects of planning principles (ACRL, 1989, p. 404). The bottom line in any of these considerations has always been financial—who will pay, how to pay or even, should we pay. The results of this survey demonstrates that many of those libraries that offer services to the extended campus community have elected to bear the costs. Some have even found innovative methods of assisting in these costs (Cookingham, 1983, p. 44).

"No extension courses should be approved or accredited without previous evidence of adequate library support" (Fisher, 1978, p. 3). The most astonishing responses on the survey are probably those libraries which provided extended campus programs with no special services offered to these students.

Equally disturbing are the libraries which do provide services to off campus students but do not give orientations or provide written guides. In this fully half of the respondents are in this category. Whether this task is going undone, or is being done by signatory libraries or informally by the professors, can only be speculated upon. Perhaps these programs do not require library usage.

Yet a profile of the average American extended campus library program begins to emerge. Most offer degrees through the Bachelors level, though nearly as many also offer Masters Programs. An overwhelming number do offer special services to off campus students. Most often offered services are free document delivery, designated librarians, free online searching, CD Rom searching, classroom orientations and written guides. Less than half have written policies, contracts or agreements dealing with services to off campus programs. The majority have from 1-5 sites, 11-100 miles distant from the parent institution.

Many correlations can be done within the various elements of this survey, comparing one set responses to another. Such a document would be sixty to one hundred pages in length. Also this information could be prepared in directory format. Gloria Lebowitz and Kim Schultz have managed this quite nicely in their 1990 Off-Campus Library Services Directory, which describes 68 such programs. However the intent of this study was to give an overview, to provide some grounds for comparison, exclusive of identification of the institutions involved, and provide a framework for future studies by other researchers.

The continuing education program across the United States serves more than 21 million adults, according to a Census Bureau summary report (Chronicle, 1982, p. 10). The opportunity to provide substantial services to this group has been exploited by various providers, with less than 45% of the programs being offered by colleges and other academic institutions. The library services offered to these individuals are extremely variable, ranging from reading collections at host libraries to a library users card. One writer states "Academic libraries have a responsibility toward their students no matter what their distance from the main campus. Our attitude has been lax and our effort minimal. We have moaned about budget problems and our difficulties in meeting even the demands of on-campus students instead of realizing our own role in providing services to what is essentially our own community" (Soules, 1978, p. 569).

The research described here will hopefully provide those institutions planning on beginning or expanding campus programs with some road signs that say: "Here is where we have been." At its best some will read this document and say "No one has thought to go this way before!"
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An Investigation of Student Use of the Supplementary Materials List

Steve Schafer
Athabasca University Library

This paper is based on thesis research conducted to complete the degree Masters of Library and Information Studies at the School of Library and Information Studies, University of Alberta. The purpose is to investigate student use of the supplementary materials list that is included in the home-study package for most Athabasca University courses.

Athabasca University

Athabasca University is an open university and is one of three institutions in Canada devoted exclusively to distance education (Sweet, 1986, p. 199). Athabasca University specializes in course delivery through the mode of distance education. Unlike a dual-mode open university, which is "a regular campus-based institution with a distance education component," Athabasca University is a single-mode open university, "devoted exclusively to distance education" (Konrad and Small, 1989, in Sweet, p. 197). Distance education offered by Athabasca University is distinct from the types of distance education that are offered by a traditional university, i.e. correspondence studies or extension courses.

Athabasca University adopted its mission statement and long-term plan in May 1985. The mission statement describes the purpose of Athabasca University and provides a context for the University's activities.

Athabasca University is dedicated to the removal of barriers that traditionally restrict access to and success in university-level studies and to increasing equality of educational opportunity for all adult Canadians regardless of their geographical location and prior academic credentials. (Athabasca University, 1985, p. 1)

There are two requirements which a person must meet before being accepted for studies at Athabasca University. Individuals must be at least 18 years of age and be residents of Canada. Students who are admitted to Athabasca University may take courses available through one of the three faculties: Administrative Studies, Arts, or Science. Courses may be taken for general interest or for the accumulation of credits leading to one of five degree programs: Administration, Arts, Commerce, General Studies, or Nursing (post-R.N.). In addition to the degree programmes, students may take courses leading to one of six university certificate programs: Accounting, Administration, French Language Proficiency, Information Systems, Labour Relations, or Public Administration. In addition, a selection of non-credit courses is offered.

The home-study package is the primary mode of course delivery at Athabasca University. However, courses may also be supported by tele-conference, seminar, laboratory, or field work. Upon registration, each student receives a complete course package that consists of all required texts, a student manual, a forms package, and a study guide which usually includes a supplementary materials list. Occasionally a book of readings, consisting of required, selected articles from various sources that are reproduced by Athabasca University, is included in the course package. Upon registration, each student is assigned a telephone tutor and has access to library services.
Library Services Provided by Athabasca University

It is believed that appropriate planning and organization for the use of various media must occur and that library services are essential to the delivery of a university-level education. Library service, therefore, is one of the essential supporting mechanisms in place since the inception of Athabasca University. The provision of library services to students of Athabasca University is both unique and complex. Students who reside "at a distance" from the institution at various locations across Canada must be served by the Library in radically different ways from those provided by traditional university libraries.

Each student, upon enrolment in a course with Athabasca University, has access to library services from Athabasca University Library. Athabasca University students can submit their requests for library materials by mail, FAX, telephone, or in-person. The Library Annual Report, 1989/90 reveals that 8,138 requests were received at the library information desk during the fiscal year.

Of all requests, almost half (4,116) were from students. On average, students made 343 requests for library materials per month to Athabasca University Library. During this report year, 9,559 items were circulated to students in response to their inquiries. Library materials are sent to the student either by postal service to the student's address, by inter-office courier to one of three regional offices in Alberta, or by government courier to other government office locations within Alberta.

One of the difficulties of providing library service to Athabasca University students is that of making students aware of materials in the library collection that would be helpful for completing a course assignment or project. While an on-line library catalog, AUCAT, was installed in 1989 and is operational at all Athabasca University locations, provision is not yet in place for remote access by students other than from the regional offices which are located in Calgary, Edmonton, and Fort McMurray. However, even if remote access were available, only those students with computer hardware and communication packages would be able to use the on-line catalog. Nonetheless, the Library plans to eventually provide remote access to AUCAT at some point in the future.

One useful instrument for informing all students of what library materials in the Athabasca University Library are available for a specific course is the supplementary materials list that is a part of each course package. The term "supplementary materials" refers to materials suggested by Athabasca University instructors for extra reading, listening, or viewing that would be helpful to understand the course materials. The purpose of the supplementary materials list is to provide a student of a particular course with a list of materials in Athabasca University Library's collection that would be useful, but not essential, for completing a course assignment or project. Supplementary materials are additional to the required materials that are included in the complete home-study package for each course.

This supplementary materials list is compiled by a course team that is primarily comprised of a subject matter expert (author), a production manager, an editor, and a visual designer. However, it is usually the subject matter expert and the editor who compile the supplementary materials list, and library reference staff are often called upon to participate as well.

Statement of the Problem

The primary objective of this study is to investigate student use of the supplementary materials list that forms a part of the package for most Athabasca University courses. The overall research question is: Do Athabasca University students use the supplementary materials list? Data
were also gathered to determine: (a) selected characteristics of Athabasca University students; (b) student awareness and use of library resources; (c) among students who are library users, their awareness and use of the supplementary materials list; and (d), among all students, their awareness and use of computers.

Research Methodology

The study was carried out by means of a questionnaire survey of a random sample of all Athabasca University students enrolled in one or more courses.

Approvals and Ethics Review Requirements

Approvals from the following committees or departments were required and secured prior to proceeding with the research:

The Graduate Research Committee, School of Library and Information Studies, University of Alberta.

The Library, Athabasca University.

The Academic Research Committee, Athabasca University.

The Centre for Distance Education, Athabasca University.

The Registrar, Athabasca University, to obtain mailing labels with the name and address for each student selected through random sampling.

Population and Sample

Athabasca University has an enrolment of approximately 18,000 registered students; registered students are those who have been admitted to Athabasca University. Registered students are not necessarily enrolled in a course at any given time, and therefore they are not all "active" students. The number of active students—that is, those taking at least one Athabasca University course—at the time the random sample was drawn in March, 1991 was 7,308. This figure was generated from the Institutional Student Information System (ISIS), the student records system maintained by Athabasca University. For purposes of this research, all students registered in an Athabasca University course were included in the population of active students.

From the population of active students identified by ISIS, a simple random sample of 800 students was drawn. The required sample size from a population of 7,000 is 261 cases, based on a 90% confidence level and allowing for a permissible error of ±0.05. The sample size was inflated to 800 cases to allow for slightly less than a 50% response rate. The inflation figure was based on data from the Centre for Distance Education at Athabasca University that revealed that recent mail surveys have resulted in response rates of approximately 50%.

The population of active students was divided into two categories: new and continuing students. The original random sample of 800 students consisted of 363 new students and 437 continuing students. New students were those, who at the time of the study, were enrolled in their first Athabasca University course and had not completed it. Continuing students were those who, at the time of the study, had successfully completed at least one course prior to the course or courses in which they were enrolled.
The distribution of new and continuing students in the random sample was found to be identical to the distribution in the original population of active Athabasca University students. The random sample was generated from ISIS, producing only a mailing label. Student identification numbers were not used; no names were used, other than for the purpose of mailing. When the mailing labels were generated, however, four labels did not have complete addresses and an attempt to obtain complete addresses through the Registry at Athabasca University was not successful. The questionnaire was sent out to 796 students; of these, three were returned undelivered. Therefore, the final sample consisted of 793 active students of Athabasca University.

Survey Instrument

Dividing the sample of students into these two categories facilitated the design of the mail survey questionnaire. A single version of the survey instrument would have meant extensive branching within questions to allow for appropriate responses by both new and continuing students. Such an instrument would have been cumbersome and students would have had difficulty working through the questionnaire in an expedient manner. Two versions of the survey instrument were therefore created. While the substance of the questions was identical for both, one version was worded appropriately for students who had previously completed a course, and the other for students who were enrolled in their first Athabasca University course. The questionnaire provided for both quantitative and qualitative responses and it was organized to facilitate the later coding of quantitative responses for analysis using SPSSx.

A covering letter with the questionnaire provided students with a brief description of the research project. Participants were provided with a pre-addressed, postage paid envelope in which to return the completed questionnaire.

Anonymity and confidentiality were assured each student. Assurance was given to each student that participation, or not, in the research study would not affect the library services provided to them.

Pretest of the Survey Instrument

The survey instrument was pretested by seven individuals at Athabasca University. Six of the seven pretest participants had taken an Athabasca University course. They pretested both versions of the questionnaire. A covering letter to the pretest respondents asked them to work through the questionnaire as if they had received it in the mail. They were asked to note any difficulties in following the instructions, ambiguities in wording, problem areas that were unclear, and to make suggestions that would improve the overall quality and effectiveness of the questionnaire. As a result of the pretest, a few minor changes were made to the questionnaire. For the most part, however, the pretesting was favourable and confirmed that the survey instrument was well organized and easy to work through.

The Survey

The questionnaires were mailed on March 11, 1991. Students were asked to complete the questionnaire and return it within a two-week period from the time of mailing, March 25, 1991, or as soon as possible. Three weeks following the mailing of the questionnaires, 236 had been received. The last questionnaire was received on May 8, 1991.

A total of 269 questionnaires were returned, for an overall response rate of 34%. The response rate for new students was 25% and for continuing students was 44%. Although the response rate of 34% was less than anticipated and attempts could have been made to solicit more
responses, the decision was made to compile the results of the questionnaires returned from the one-time mailing. This was done because follow-up was impractical, given the fact that student identification records were not kept. Therefore, there was no way to identify and track the respondents and follow up with non-respondents. In addition, follow-up was not conducted because of the extra time and expense that would have been required. Finally, as was pointed out, the sample size required for a population of 7,000 cases to attain a confidence level of 90% and a permissible error of +0.05 is 261 cases.

Analysis of the Data

The 269 questionnaires were coded and entered into a data file for analysis on SPSSx. Frequency distributions were generated for all coded variables. Cross-tabulations of selected variables were also generated. For the variable of "course enrolled in," the specific courses reported by respondents were recoded and grouped into disciplines, i.e., Biology, English, Psychology, etc. The disciplines were then grouped according to faculty of study, that is, Faculty of Administrative Studies, Faculty of Arts, and Faculty of Science.

Written comments provided by respondents on several questions were entered into a flat ascii text file, and compiled into separate files using an AWK program on the UNIX system. The written comments by respondents provided descriptive and illustrative information that otherwise would not have been available.

Findings

The findings are presented as follows:

1. characteristics of active Athabasca University students,

2. student awareness and use of library materials,

3. student awareness and use of the supplementary materials list, and

4. student awareness and use of computers.

1. Characteristics of Active Athabasca University Students

Students were asked to provide information on the questionnaire that would help determine typical characteristics of Athabasca university students in the survey sample. Specifically, students were asked to identify their age, gender, level of previous education, number of Athabasca University courses enrolled in, number of courses completed, and the faculty in which they were enrolled.

Age: Almost half of 268 respondents were 30 to 39 years of age. The next largest age group represented was 20 to 29 years of age. There were more respondents 50 years of age and over than there were under 20. This is unlike a traditional university, in which the majority of students enter following graduation from high school. The student body of Athabasca University is typically older and comprised of students who are already in the work force, perhaps married and with families, settled in their communities but who for various reasons want to take university courses.

Gender: Female respondents outnumbered male respondents by a ratio of 2 to 1. There were 185 females and 82 males who responded to the survey.
Previous education attained: Responses ranged from elementary education to post-secondary degree. Only 1% of 266 respondents had attained less than a secondary level of education, while most students had taken some post-secondary courses and earned a diploma, degree, or another credential. This is noteworthy because there is no academic requirement to meet for admission to Athabasca University. Almost all students (99%), however, have attained at least a secondary level of education.

Athabasca University course enrolments: At the time of the survey, three-quarters of the respondents were enroled in a single one Athabasca University course. At the other extreme, one student was enroled in six courses. Twenty percent of the respondents were taking either two or three courses at the same time.

Athabasca University courses completed: A question was asked to verify student status at Athabasca University, that is, whether respondents were new students or were continuing students (having completed at least one Athabasca University course prior to this survey). Out of 266 respondents, 108 students, or 40% indicated that they were taking their first Athabasca University course. Almost one-quarter of the respondents had completed either 1 or 2 courses while 8% had completed 10 or more courses. The 40/60 split of student respondents is in direct proportion to the split of students in the original random sample and to the population of active Athabasca University students. In both the random sample and the population of active students the division of new and continuing students was 45% and 55%, respectively.

Faculty enrolment at Athabasca University: Respondents were asked to identify the faculty of study in which they were enroled. Students are not required to declare a faculty upon registration, but those intending to earn a certificate or degree must enrol in a faculty. Out of 268 respondents, about 40% of the students were undeclared, that is, they were taking a course but had not identified a program of study. Students in this category are enroled in their first course and this course may be taken for the sake of interest. On the other hand, 60% had declared a faculty at the time of this study and it may therefore be assumed that they intend to earn a certificate or degree. In descending order, faculties having the most students were: Administrative Studies (32%), Arts (18%), and Science (9%).

Students were asked to identify the course that they had most recently completed, or the course that they were currently enroled in if they were new students. A total of 84 Athabasca University courses were identified by 240 respondents. The most popular courses among respondents were as follows:

**MATH 215: Introduction to Statistics (13 respondents)**

**ADMN 232: Introduction to Administrative Principles (12 respondents)**

**BIOL 230: Human Physiology (11 respondents)**

**ACCT 253: Introduction to Accounting (10 respondents)**

**PHIL 252: Critical Thinking (10 respondents)**

**PSYC 289: Introduction to Psychology (10 respondents)**

The most popular disciplines were Psychology (almost 13% of the respondents), English (almost 8%), Administration (just over 7%), and Mathematics and Biology (about 6% each).
Just over half of the respondents, 133 students, were enrolled in a Faculty of Arts course. Another 27% of the respondents were enrolled in a Faculty of Administrative Studies course and 20% in a Faculty of Science course. It must be pointed out that students in one faculty must take courses offered by another faculty, not only for interest sake, but to fulfill program requirements.

A composite of the typical Athabasca University student, gathered from respondents, is as follows. The typical student is female, between the ages of 30 and 39, and has taken some post-secondary courses prior to enrolling in studies at Athabasca University. The typical student is a continuing student, that is, she has already completed at least one Athabasca University course, and she is enrolled in only one Athabasca University course at a time. This composite corresponds with previous ones.

Smyrniew reported that for the year 1981/82, there were 62% females and 38% males admitted to Athabasca University. Over two-thirds of the students were 25 to 44 years of age (Smyrniew, 1983, p. 6).

The pattern had not changed five years later. Appavoo and Hansen reported, on the basis of data gathered by the Centre for Distance Education at Athabasca University, that two-thirds of all students were between the ages of 25 and 44, and women represented two-thirds of all registered students (Appavoo and Hansen, 1988, p. 13).

Smyrniew (1983) reported also that high school education had been attained by 89% of newly admitted students, while 67% also had some post-secondary education (p. 6). The profile of the typical student has improved dramatically since 1983 in the area of education attained prior to being admitted to Athabasca University. In the current study, 95% of the respondents have some education beyond the secondary level.

2. Student Awareness and Use of Library Materials

Students were asked to provide information on the questionnaire that would help to determine their awareness of Athabasca University Library and use of library materials to complete their courses.

Almost all respondents said that they were aware that Athabasca University provides library services to registered students. A total of 233 respondents, 87%, reported awareness of Athabasca University Library. Moreover, 148 students (55%) reported that they knew the procedures for requesting materials from Athabasca University Library. A total of 90 respondents (36%) indicated that it is essential to use library materials to complete an Athabasca University course.

Relatively low library use by students was reported overall; only 21% of 265 respondents borrowed library materials for the course that they had just completed or in which they were enrolled at the time of the survey. Of the 21%, it is noteworthy that the largest proportion of library users were continuing students.

Looking at library use according to academic discipline, the highest proportion of respondents who reported library use were in Political Science (83%). The disciplines of French, Humanities, Nursing, Sociology/Anthropology, Taxation, and Women's Studies each had percentages of 50% who reported that they borrowed library materials. Psychology, English, and French are the disciplines in which the highest absolute number of respondents said they borrowed library materials (9, 7, 7 respectively).
Students who were taking a Faculty of Arts course at the time of the study reported the highest percentage of library use, 30%, followed by students who were taking a Faculty of Science course and a Faculty of Administrative Studies course. Similarly, the highest absolute number of students (39) who borrowed library materials were taking a Faculty of Arts course. It is noteworthy that students taking a Faculty of Arts course were above the overall average of students who borrowed library materials while students who were taking a Faculty of Administrative Studies or a Faculty of Science course were substantially below the overall percentage of all respondents who reported that they borrowed library materials.

Several comments made by non-library users suggested that the course materials package contained sufficient materials to complete most courses. Some students commented that they had their own reference works on various subjects that they used to help complete their course work. Selected comments made by non-library users with respect to why they did not borrow library materials are provided.

"I did not feel the need to read any other materials for this course. There was more than enough reading involved with the course as it was."

"My course was very self-contained and did not need any other materials."

"The course did not require any research."

"In the past, I found the books were not what I needed. I am NOT paying long distance charges to add to the cost of an already expensive course. The mail is too slow to depend on it."

Respondents who reported that they borrowed library materials for their courses were asked to identify the types of library material they used. Of all library users, 35 reported that they used monograph materials. Examples of materials in the "other" category are the model brain, molecular kit, computer software, and kits of physical examination instruments.

Library users were asked to identify whether they used Athabasca University Library or other libraries. Of the 56 respondents who used library materials, 44 reported that they used Athabasca University Library, 21 students used other libraries, and 9 students used both Athabasca University Library and a library in the student's community.

Students who borrowed library materials were asked to indicate how they selected them, for example, on the basis of topic, on the basis of specific items, or a combination of both topic and specific items. While most Athabasca University courses include a supplementary materials list, students may select specific materials from this list or they may select materials on the basis of the subject of the assignment. Of all library users, 34 students selected materials on the basis of specific item or on the basis of a subject. A total of 17 students reported that they selected library materials on the basis of both specific item and subject.

The advantage of selecting specific materials on the basis of topic or subject matter is that while students may have a preference for specific titles, not all titles may be available at the time the student borrows them. Other items, then, may be substituted for the materials specifically selected if the students identify their subject. It is believed that students would prefer to borrow materials on their subject rather than no material (if, for example, a student selects specific items and the items are not available for loan). Students who borrow materials on the basis of the subject of their query can proceed with their coursework rather than waiting for materials to be returned.
Students who borrowed materials from Athabasca University Library were asked how they made their requests for library materials. Requests for materials can be made by telephone, by mail, by FAX, or in person. The telephone and mail request, at the time of this study, were used most frequently by Athabasca University Library users, 70% and 30% respectively.

Students who used Athabasca University Library were asked the number of requests that were made. Most students made only one or two requests for library materials. One student reported making ten requests for library materials from Athabasca University Library.

Respondents who were Athabasca University Library users were asked if they were satisfied with the materials they received from Athabasca University Library and if they were satisfied with the time it took for the materials to arrive following the request. Almost all of the respondents were satisfied or partially satisfied with both the materials they received and the time taken for delivery.

While most respondents who used Athabasca University Library indicated that they were pleased or partially pleased with the materials they received, a few students commented that some photocopied materials arrived with pages missing. Another commented that the quality of audio/visual materials was poor. Another student commented that the book requested was out on loan and consequently a long wait for the materials was necessary. However, favourable comments outnumbered unfavourable, as the following excerpts from the questionnaires show:

"I was pleased that not only was I sent the books I requested specifically, I was sent several related books and a wonderful book with a feminist theme written by men."

"Materials were varied and fairly comprehensive."

"The reason that I am taking time to respond is because I felt that they did a good job in helping me."

"Materials were received quickly and in excellent condition."

"Materials received very promptly. Usually received materials 2 days after I have sent my FAX."

"Yes, most material was here within a week."

One student reported that the books did not arrive as anticipated, and another student reported that it took months for the books to arrive. Generally, however, students expressed satisfaction.

Students who had indicated that they used Athabasca University Library and were enrolled in two or more courses or had completed two or more courses were asked if the experience they were describing on the questionnaire was typical of their other courses. Seventy-five percent said yes. This suggests that the materials in the Athabasca University Library collection meet the study needs of students and that the level of service provided to students is consistent.

In summary, almost all respondents to the survey were aware that Athabasca University provides library services to its students. While just over 35% of the respondents believed that library materials are essential to complete an Athabasca University course, only 21% of the respondents reported that they actually used library materials.

Of the respondents who were library users, almost 80% used Athabasca University Library and 30% used other libraries. Monograph material was the most frequent type of material borrowed.
Most students who used Athabasca University Library reported that they placed their requests by telephone or mail.

Most students made only one or two requests for material from Athabasca University Library and were satisfied with both the materials they received and the time it took for the materials to be delivered.

3. Student Awareness of the Supplementary Materials List

The 56 students who indicated that they used library materials were asked specific questions about course supplementary materials lists. These questions concerned whether their course had a supplementary materials list, whether titles on the supplementary materials list were relevant to the course, whether they borrowed titles on the supplementary materials list from a library other than Athabasca University Library, and whether they considered the supplementary materials list to be an essential component of the course package.

Two-thirds of all library users (37) indicated that their course had a supplementary materials list. This proportion was corroborated through a manual check of the Athabasca University Library documentation for all courses identified by respondents. It was found that, of the 84 courses identified by respondent library users in this study, 59 had a supplementary materials list. In only 10 courses did all the students recognize that a supplementary materials list was included.

When grouped by faculty offering courses, it is interesting to note, 96% of the Arts courses had a supplementary materials list, followed by half of the Science courses. Of Administrative Studies courses, only 32% had a supplementary materials list.

A question was asked of library users to determine whether they borrowed titles identified on the supplementary materials list from a library other than Athabasca University Library. Of the total of 13 students who responded, 10 reported that they were successful in borrowing supplementary materials from another library. This indicates that some students, although library services are available to them, also use libraries in their local communities. It is interesting to know that items on the supplementary materials list may be available from sources other than Athabasca University Library and that students try to obtain them elsewhere.

The three students who were not successful in obtaining items on the supplementary materials lists from another library were asked why. The reasons were that the materials were all out or that the materials were not available from the particular library.

Respondents who were library users were asked if they thought that the supplementary materials list was an essential component of the Athabasca University course package. Most of the respondents (29 out of 37) said yes.

Comments gathered from the survey questionnaire indicated that most students believe that the supplementary materials list is essential to the course package. A comment made by one student was that the supplementary materials list "can enable a student to seek clarification of the subject." Another student commented that the supplementary materials list is "helpful for completing assignments as it gives direction for research or it provides a chance to broaden perspectives regarding the course." Other selected comments echoed the same ideas. One student said that material "can be used throughout a lifetime for learning." Another said that the supplementary materials list "helps a person look for materials needed for the course without spending a lot of time." The supplementary materials list, as one student commented, "is very handy and very time-saving."
While students who were library users believe that the supplementary materials list is essential and the use of supplementary materials is important, the reality is that most students do not use supplementary materials. For example, one student said, "I suppose I never really had need to examine the list." Other students similarly commented that they had no time to follow up on them. One student said "I found myself rushed to get through this course due to other pressures in my life."

Library users who used the supplementary materials list provided comments that indicated it is essential to the course and the materials listed were relevant to the course. Some selected comments were as follows.

"The materials mentioned would help a person understand the material better."

"The supplementary materials gave me a start when looking for books in my local libraries--even if I didn't find them."

"I would have had some difficulty in writing the necessary essays without the resource material."

"I find it somewhat difficult to study alone at home rather than sharing ideas, etc. in the classroom. The supplemental materials are a real bonus for me."

"If you need materials for the assignment this list is very helpful to get books or articles about topics which were only partially covered in the course."

"Most materials can be found at your local public library (at least in the city)."

"Questions in the workbook often have answers only found in the supplementary material."

"The choice of texts and the elaborate materials in the guides is first rate."

In summary, of the 84 courses identified by library users, a supplementary materials list was found to actually be included in 59 of them. When grouped by faculty offering the course, almost all Faculty of Arts courses had a supplementary materials list (96%). Faculty of Science courses had the next highest proportion, followed by Faculty of Administrative Studies, 47% and 32% respectively.

Library users were asked if their course had a supplementary materials list. A total of 54 student library users identified their course and 35 of those said their course had a supplementary materials list. Grouped by faculty, library users taking an Arts course had the highest percentage, 74%, of students reporting their course had a supplementary materials list. Students taking a Science course had the next highest percentage, 71%, while only 13% of students in an Administrative Studies course reported that their course had a supplementary materials list.

Library users were asked whether the supplementary materials list was an essential component of the course package. Of 37 respondents, 29 said yes. The majority of comments made by respondents were favourable and most respondents, although not necessarily having time to use supplementary materials, realize the value of the use of supplementary materials list to their course.

4. Student Awareness and Use of Computers

With respect to the use of computers, all students were asked to indicate whether they owned or had access to a computer. Two-thirds of the students said that they own or have access to a
computer. One-quarter of those students who owned or had access to a computer also had use of a modem which would be required for remote access to AUCAT, the online public access catalog of Athabasca University Library. Among students who own or have access to a computer, the highest proportion was among the continuing students. While fewer students had a modem with their computer, continuing students still had a higher proportion than did new students.

Almost half of all student respondents indicated that they had used a computerized library catalog. However, only sixteen students indicated that they knew AUCAT, the Athabasca University Library Catalog, was on computer. This figure is not surprising as AUCAT has not been advertised. It must be pointed out, however, that students are informed that AUCAT is available for their use at the Regional Offices. Comments provided on the questionnaire affirmed, however, the students are eager to access the Library catalog on a remote basis if it was possible.

Many students made comments about how remote access to the Library catalog might affect their studies at Athabasca University. Of the 193 comments, 107 (55%) were positive and suggested that remote access to AUCAT would enhance or improve studies at Athabasca University. The remaining comments were neutral, indicating that remote access would make no difference in studies at Athabasca University. The following selection of comments represents student views in general.

"It would be grand. I would get a modem for sure."

"In a word: ENHANCE."

"Information at your fingertip (how great!)."

"Would make me more aware of pertinent data."

"It would make selection of appropriate material easier and faster."

"Access to the library catalog will definitely be an asset as I proceed to higher levels of study where extra materials will be necessary to understand more complex ideas."

"Access through remote would tell me quickly what the Athabasca Library contains. I would likely borrow more materials from Athabasca with remote access."

"With remote access to the Athabasca University Library Catalog I would probably be able to find out how much additional information was available on a particular topic."

"Excellent idea!! I would purchase a modem specifically for AU courses."

"I can't afford a computer. I wish I could. It would greatly increase my academic efficiency."

"I don't think this type of access would affect my studies at all. The suggested lists of supplementary reading are probably sufficient. I don't feel a need to peruse the library catalogues, at this point, anyway."

"In my situation it wouldn't make a difference."

"I'd have to investigate it."

"It would be great for those with access, but may give an advantage to only a few."
"No effect at this time."

"I'm not sure how this system works."

On the basis of the number of students who own or have access to computers and on the basis of student comments supporting remote access to the library catalog, it would seem timely to implement remote access to AUCAT by students. However, when remote access is in place and evaluation of the effectiveness of the online library catalog is conducted, it will be interesting to determine whether the actual use of the library catalog follows the apparent anticipation of access to AUCAT that is evident in this study. The present study indicates that while 87% of the respondents to the survey indicated that they were aware of library services available to Athabasca University students, only 21% actually used library materials and only 16% used materials from Athabasca University Library. Similarly, while 41% of the respondents to the survey indicated that library materials are essential for success in Athabasca University courses, only 21% actually used library materials.

Unlike the supplementary materials list which is static upon production (until the next course revision), AUCAT is dynamic, as materials are continually added to the library holdings. AUCAT would be comprehensive while the supplementary materials list is selective. Furthermore, students, upon accessing AUCAT, could verify the circulation status of specific items of interest to them.

It is not expected that the supplementary materials list would be eliminated or replaced in the near future, as there are students, who do not, for various reasons, own or have access to computers and modems. It would not be in the Library's best interests to suggest elimination of the supplementary materials list and possibly create a barrier to a student's use of the library. Rather the Library should promote awareness and use of the supplementary materials list. It is anticipated that remote access to AUCAT will facilitate access to the library catalog, and enhance the provision of library services to Athabasca University students.

**Summary of Findings**

The typical student is 30 to 39 years of age, is female, and is taking her first Athabasca University course. She is most likely enrolled in a Faculty of Arts course.

Almost all students are aware that library services are provided by Athabasca University to Athabasca University students, and more than half know the request procedure for obtaining materials from Athabasca University Library. One-third of the students indicated that the use of library material is essential to courses taken at Athabasca University. At the same time, however, most students do not use library materials for their courses. Among those who do, most of them used Athabasca University Library, while a few used local libraries. Most students who borrowed materials from Athabasca University Library were satisfied with both the material and the short time it took for the material to arrive.

The majority of students own or have access to a computer and modem, and according to their comments, would make use of remote access to AUCAT, the online public access catalog of Athabasca University Library so they can search the holdings of the library and then request material.

It was found that library users made use of the supplementary materials list that accompanies most Athabasca University course packages. At the same time, however, over half of the library users indicated that the supplementary materials list is an essential component of the course materials package and that it contained items that were relevant to their courses.
Discussion

It was anticipated, at the outset of this study, that the findings would be of benefit to Athabasca University Library, to course development teams at Athabasca University, and to individuals working in the specialization of distance education librarianship. Some assessment of the study's implications is presented below for each of these areas.

Athabasca University Library

The findings presented in this thesis indicate that 21% of active Athabasca University students have used library materials and most of them used Athabasca University Library. At the same time, 87% of the students are aware that library services are available to them and 55% know the procedures to request materials from Athabasca University Library.

While positive comments were made by students about the library services provided to them, it is important that efficient, expedient, and prompt service be maintained. It is important that at least a minimal reference interview be conducted by the library staff member with the student when possible. By doing so, the library staff member who takes the student's request will have a better understanding of the student's request; if the student then requests specific material and the materials are available, the request can be filled; if on the other hand, the materials are not available, a selection of substitute materials can be sent to the student. This is only possible when the subject of the student's request is known.

It is essential that a student complete his or her first Athabasca University course if there is to be any chance of the student taking further studies towards a certificate or degree through Athabasca University. Most students are currently enrolled in a single course. This suggests that students may want to take an Athabasca University course for a variety of reasons. This "first" experience, therefore, must be positive; success in the first course must be cultivated. Only when there are returning students, when there are increases in the number of students taking more than one course, or have completed more than one course, and when students indicate that they are taking certificate and degree programs will Athabasca University be able to meet the objective identified in the Athabasca University Mission Statement, namely success in university-level studies.

On the basis of student comments, Athabasca University and the Library should proceed to initiate and establish the necessary protocols, procedures, and technical requirements for remote access by students to the library catalog. That well over half of all students in the sample indicated they own or have access to a computer suggests that students are only waiting for remote access to the catalog to be made available to them.

With respect to the supplementary materials list, it is suggested that it be maintained as an integral component of the course package and that more awareness and use of it be promoted. The Library must be more active in the selection process of materials to be included on the supplementary materials list so the collection will support all Athabasca University courses and library staff will be familiar with titles in the collection. Furthermore, the Library should maintain and improve the selection process for materials added to the collection. It is important that, for each course offered by Athabasca University, there be sufficient supplementary materials to support that course.

It is important that the Library work closely with course development teams, improve dialogue with them, and endeavour to have a more complete understanding of the course development process, and the objectives of each course. At the same time, it is important that course development teams understand more fully how the Library functions and the significance of library
research to a university-level education, to ensure that appropriate and sufficient materials are in the collection when the course is developed. While it is essential that library staff have at least a minimal level of understanding of the objectives and the assignments for each course if they are to select library materials to send to students to help them complete assignments, it is also essential that the course coordinator and appropriate team members have at least a minimal understanding of how the library can support the course for which they are responsible. The result of more proactive input by the Library at the preliminary stages of course development will mean the Library will not have to "catch up" when the course is open and there are requests by students for materials. Rather, the Library will be ready to meet the information needs of students in Athabasca University courses.

Course Development Teams at Athabasca University

While the findings indicate that 21% of the students used library materials, and well over half of the courses identified had a supplementary materials list in the course package, not all students knew the course had a supplementary materials list. It may be overly simplistic to state that more students should be made aware of the supplementary materials list. It is, nonetheless, important that all courses at Athabasca University include a requirement that each student develop a basic level of library research skill.

Students, as evidenced in their responses to the survey, indicate that they receive sufficient materials in the course package to complete the course. The complete course package is a positive aspect of courses offered by Athabasca University. However, the complete course package must not, nor can it be, a substitute for the development of independent research skills. Course development teams must reevaluate the concept of the complete course package and if the complete course package remains fundamental to the way Athabasca University delivers its courses, then fine. However, each course package could also include a more elaborate introduction to Athabasca University Library and library use in general. Should remote access to AUCAT be extended to students, it will be required that more comprehensive information be included in each course package, introducing students to the Library, providing instruction for searching the catalog and for borrowing materials.

More attention must be given to the supplementary materials list. Through the preliminary pages of each course, the student should be introduced to all services available to him or her that would contribute to and/or enhance the educational experience. In so doing, success in studies will be cultivated and most likely promoted.

It is necessary that any information the Library would want to make available to students be incorporated into the course package. This would require close cooperation between the Library and the course development team.

Distance Education Librarianship

The findings of this study indicate that almost all students of Athabasca University are aware of library services provided to them. While the course materials package may be sufficient, students do avail themselves of library materials as needed.

This study suggests that distance education students have computers and are prepared to access library catalogues and increase their awareness and use of library materials.

The provision of library service to distance education students is complex. While students are aware of library services, the coursework may not require them to actually use library materials.
While students may believe that the use of library materials is essential to complete a course, relatively few students actually use library materials to complete their course. While a large proportion of students believes the supplementary materials list is essential to the Athabasca University course package, few students use library materials. It is clear that there is much to do with respect to meeting the challenge of removing barriers that would traditionally restrict access to and success in university level studies.

Distance education librarianship is a particularly unique specialty. One of the requirements to successfully provide library services to students is to first of all educate and inform them that library services are available. Students then must be informed not only of the library services of the institution in which they are enrolled, but of additional services that may be available to the student in their communities. There is a need, in general, for library and/or bibliographic instruction in all educational settings.

There are opportunities for institutions to cooperate in the provision of library services to students. Perhaps it is time to dismantle the territorial barriers that encompass institutions and engage in collective, more universal or cooperative approach to education. It is hoped that this thesis* will contribute to that and other goals in the distance education movement.

*Note: A copy of the complete text of the thesis, including tables and appendices may be obtained from the author: Steve Schafer, Athabasca University, Box 10,000, Athabasca, Alberta, Canada T0G 2R0.
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Don't Ask Unless You Really Want to Know! Tapping Branch Campus Library Users' Perceptions With Focus Group Interviews

R. Neil Scott, J. Gordon Long, and E. Lorene Flanders
Georgia College

Introduction

Initial interest in utilizing focus group interviews to gauge students' perceptions of Russell Library services and collections began during the Summer of 1990. R. Neil Scott, Coordinator of Information Services approached the Georgia College Marketing Department, and asked if they would be interested in developing a qualitative research project to provide library faculty and staff with input regarding students' perceptions of the quality of library services and collections. Although the Library already had a user survey in place and had useful quantitative data from that survey's results, the Coordinator was interested in what students thought about the library. An unbiased, fresh point of view was sought, with student opinions expressed openly in their own words.

Dr. Gordon Long, who was scheduled to teach the senior-level Marketing Research class the following term, agreed to take on the cooperative project using the consultant-research team-client model. Following a review of the literature it was decided that the most appropriate methodology for the project would be to gather information using focus group interviews, followed by a statistically valid telephone survey of the student body. Long served as the market research firm's principal. Scott, and E. Lorene Flanders, Information Services/Instruction Librarian served as the client, and five teams of students served as firm consultants.

Findings of this quarter-long project, conducted in the fall of 1990, were enormously helpful in meeting the Coordinator's objective of helping Library faculty and staff to see and understand the library from the perspective of students. Virtually all of the trends brought up by more than one focus group proved to be statistically valid. This encouraged the Coordinator to urge his colleagues to try a focus group-only follow-up study of student perceptions of off-campus library services at the College's three off-campus centers. The results of this follow-up study, conducted in the spring of 1991, are presented to the Off-Campus Services Conference.

Review of the Literature

Developed during World War II (Merton, 1987), the focus group technique matured during the 1980's to become one of the corporate world's most widely used method of market research. The word is out that focus groups can be an extremely effective and inexpensive way to obtain in-depth feedback on a wide variety of subjects. Figure 1 describes a typical focus group study in a corporate setting.
Please Mom!—Preteens' Wishes Are Focus of New Research
Skenazy, Lenore
Advertising Age Vol: 59 Iss: 9 Date: Feb 29, 1988 pp: 33, 84

Abstract: Children's Market Research (CMR) is planning a national survey of 1,000 kids and 500 moms. Selina Guber of CMR (New York) recently conducted a focus group of 9-to 12-year-old girls in order to determine some preteen trends before finalizing survey questions. Asked to list 3 wishes, typical responses were luxury sports cars and money—for buying clothes and stereos. The girls demonstrated begging techniques for use on reluctant parents and expressed an interest in going to college as well as an interest in sports. Television idols and movie personality favorites included Tom Cruise, Kirk Cameron, Billy Joel, and Joan Collins. The girls also expressed an interest in soap operas and commercials in which inanimate objects "came alive." Fantasy grocery lists included frozen pizza, ice cream, cookies, candy, and sour cream-and-onion potato chips. Even at their young age, the girls exhibited a fixation on food, a substantial knowledge of brand names, and a concern over calories. (copyright ABI/Inform)

Greenbaum ("Focus Groups," 1989) indicates that one of the fields in which focus groups have found the most support is the banking and financial services industry where they have become the one of the most widely used research techniques. Focus groups have been used to study the image and market segments of credit unions and savings institutions so that marketers could focus their efforts on preferred segments not traditionally served (Lanphear, 1990; Metzger, 1987), and to assess the strengths and weaknesses of a CPA firms' practice to reduce client turnover and increase referrals (Karns, Roehm, Castellano, & Moore, 1988). Wolff (1988) found one bank which trained its employees to conduct focus groups to determine customer preferences and dislikes.

Focus groups are equally useful in the health care industry. Cunningham and Frontczak (1987/88) and DeWolf (1985) describe studies conducted to determine key elements of patient satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Researchers have also noted studies done to determine the image that the public has of psychiatric hospitals (Elbeck, 1988), of obstetric services (Danko and Boucher, 1985), and of ambulatory care services (Festervand, 1984/85). Cahill and Mathis (1990) found that focus groups were useful in the pretesting of a childbirth handbook. Focus groups in other areas have examined such diverse topics as shoppers' perceptions of crowding and its consequences in retail situations (Eroglu and Harrell, 1986), how to best attract students to community colleges (Danko, 1986), or to determine customers' perceptions of marketing efforts by transportation companies (Betz, 1986).

Even though sensitive topics such as income, social status, sexual behavior, bodily functions, religion, political and social attitudes, and physical or psychological afflictions present special challenges, they too have been topics of discussion by focus groups. Marriampolski (1989) details how discussion moderators who deal with sensitive topics must be especially adept, as questioning strategies must include reducing ego threat, chronological reconstruction of events, and projective questioning techniques.

**Representative Focus Group Interviews With Library Research Applications:**

Libraries have used focus groups to identify information about their user community. Baker (1991) describes a series of Iowa City Public Library focus groups designed to provide information on how the Library could improve services to the business community. Denver Public Library used focus group results to better serve the needs of its growing minority population (Detweiler, 1988).
Scharf and Ward (1986) successfully used the technique to obtain student perceptions of the University of Central Florida Library and determined that focus group interviews are a useful technique for evaluating a number of library services. The Council on Library Resources funded a project to use focus group interviews for the evaluation use of online catalogs in several libraries (Markey, 1983). Moneta (1989) reported on the use of focus group interviews of three different user groups to determine perceptions of their need for on-line search assistance. Neal and Smith (1983) used focus groups to explore library support of faculty research at the branch campuses of the Pennsylvania State University System.

Library vendors have used focus groups made up of librarians to develop or improve their products and services. Burroughs (1989) described how several publishing groups (Bantam, Oryx, Doubleday, Dell, Simon & Schuster, ABC-Clio, Gale) use focus groups interviews with librarians as participants to develop customer-driven marketing strategies. Focus groups have been used at conferences to supplement lectures, with moderators encouraging discussions of the hands-on experiences of Library Directors (Upchurch, 1990). The Copyright Clearance Center used focus groups of corporate attorneys to explore the impact of licensing, enforcement actions, and copyright issues related to the electronic storage and transmission of information (Hinds, 1990). Microsoft used focus groups to find out librarians’ views on CD-ROM products for marketing policy (Hogan, Jewell, Reese, and Starr, 1989).

Other library-related uses include: To develop a casebook to characterize the status of library support staff issues (Bulletin Board, 1990); to strengthen the development of a library building program (Leather, 1990); to publicize library services and get community feedback ("Focus groups," 1986); and to determine how a news library contributes to news production for a large metropolitan daily newspaper (Ward, Hanson and McLeod, 1988). Research utilizing focus groups interviews continues, as an article entitled "The Focus Group Interview: Assessing Users' Evaluation" is scheduled to be published by Richard Widdows, Tia A. Hensler and Marlaya H. Wyncott in a future issue of College & Research Libraries.

**Strengths of Focus Group Research**

Because focus groups elicit responses from participants that other research techniques often miss, this interactive evaluation method is especially useful in providing in-depth answers to complex problems such as those librarians face in providing effective library service. If an organization commissions a focus group and takes action on participants' comments, then the chances are higher that a proposed service will be enthusiastically sought out and used (Greenbaum and Zeller, 1988). O'Donnell (1988) indicates that information obtained from focus groups is qualitatively different than that obtained in individual interviews as they provide a wider range of information, greater insight, more candor and greater anonymity. Because the process often encourages participants to motivate each other to discuss the issue or product through a freewheeling and interactive discussion, Welch (1985) and Erkut and Fields (1987) believe that these groups prove especially effective for generating fresh ideas and hypotheses. Focus groups can show how different target groups of users vary in their perceptions of a service or collection.

In contrast to quantitative studies, focus groups depend upon the quality, rather than the quantity of participant responses for their effectiveness. Karns, Roehm, Castellano, and Moore (1988) found that it is only because the groups are usually too small to accurately represent the larger population from which they are drawn that researchers generally encourage clients to have results verified by market surveys. The optimal group size ranges from eight to twelve participants. Tynan and Drayton (1988) believe that smaller groups generate fewer ideas, while larger groups become difficult to moderate.
While quantitative research provides hard, projectionable data, qualitative research methods like focus groups provide an opportunity for study participants to tell librarians first-hand, and in great detail, exactly how they perceive a collection or service. In the corporate world, Warner-Lambert uses focus groups to understand consumer and professional vocabularies and to pinpoint critical issues related to their products. Berlamino (1989/90) describes how Warner-Lambert gathered background information, uncovered consumer needs and attitudes, stimulated new ideas, and interpreted results obtained from other quantitative studies. For these same reasons focus groups are an ideal technique for use in the library environment.

A growing number of organizations now have focus group studies conducted and use the findings as key input for decisions related to advertising, developing and marketing new products, and renaming or redesigning a product. Obviously, their usefulness for librarians lies in the fact that session results provide a sense of direction about the goals they wish to implement. Abelson (1989) found that even groups led by an inexperienced moderator generate a lot of useful information.

Another major reason for the growing popularity of focus groups in the corporate world can be traced to one of the most basic rules that marketing professionals adhere to: "Do not presume you know all there is to know about your marketplace." The assumption that librarians know what is best for their library's users often prevents studies such as the one completed at Georgia College from even taking place. The impetus for qualitative research studies should be the librarian's desire to learn more about his or her library's target group.

One of the major attractions of a qualitative research study in a library environment is the immediacy of the experience and how it give librarians and administrators a gut level grasp of users' perceptions. The enormous emotional impact that results of these studies have is probably due to the fact that, like many corporate executives, library administrators are often misinformed regarding users' needs because they rely too heavily on their librarians for user feedback. The best competitor and customer intelligence usually comes directly from customers the client serves, and the employees who work directly with these customers such as secretaries, repair technicians, and so forth. Tapping results from additional focus groups composed of librarians and staff involved in public services would be another excellent method for administrators to gain even more useful information in a relatively quick and efficient manner.

Focus groups are only one of several qualitative research methods. Others include personal interviews, case studies, direct observation, participant observation, word association, sentence or cartoon completion, and role playing. Focus groups are often favored, however, because of their usefulness for tapping group dynamics (Karger, 1987). Librarians find them useful for fishing for new ideas, experimenting with possibilities, generating hypotheses, expanding and strengthening original ideas, or even, as with the original cooperative project at Georgia College, to explore and lay the foundation for more extensive quantitative research. Administrators can use them as a sort of annual checkup to ensure that their library is not misreading users' needs. Focus group studies also provide a holistic framework for subsequent quantitative studies, and serve as an excellent consumer laboratory.

The description of focus groups serving as a consumer laboratory for gathering qualitative information about a collection, issue, or service is particularly appropriate. When librarians believe that no valid measure is available to measure user attitudes toward a collection or service, or when the information sought is so ambiguous or complex that terms need to be explained, they should at least collect as much descriptive information about the topic as possible using qualitative methods rather than a questionable quantitative measure. In this context, focus groups may be seen as diagnostic aid to help librarians make decisions, or as an integral part of the planning and development program for library research projects.
Problems With Using Focus Groups as a Research Method

One of the principal weaknesses of the focus group technique is the extent to which observers are allowed to interpret participants' comments and reactions. Though many clients believe that there is no substitute for hearing what participants have to say, research has demonstrated that their presence as observers influences both the respondents' comments and how the moderator conducts the group. A study conducted by Robson and Wardle (1988) showed that most participants claimed in response to direct questioning that they took no notice of observers, although indirect questioning revealed that those participants who could see the observers kept them under constant surveillance. Moderators felt that the presence of observers sometimes turned a group discussion into a performance, with the observer evaluating how skillfully the moderator orchestrated respondents.

Greenbaum ("Murder at the focus group," 1989) found that "kill the messenger" behavior is not uncommon. This behavior is sometimes exhibited by clients if an idea is not well received by focus group participants. Ignoring the unpleasant results, the client may perceive that the moderator did a poor job of leading the group, and use this as justification to ignore the results of the study. Another client tactic is to argue that the participants selected were not from the correct target group for the concept under discussion, or that they failed to understand the concept well enough to properly evaluate it. Clients should try to be aware of these and other all-too-human tendencies to "kill the messenger" when things do not go as they hoped. For this research technique to be most effective, even negative and critical comments must be viewed constructively.

Another weakness may be exhibited when moderators are pressured to introduce a client as a colleague. Focus group participants usually sense the client's identity and tone down their opinions accordingly. Clients with a vested interest in the outcome of a research study may find it extremely difficult to sit still and watch a pet project being criticized by a group of strangers. Even in sessions where they sit behind a two-way mirror, they have been known to lose control, burst into the discussion room, and harangue participants when their projects were discussed in a manner they found offensive (Bond, 1989).

As in the business world, clients who are library representatives can cause problems in the focus group process. Librarians or administrators who lack experience with the technique may find the experience of observing a focus group exasperating if they fail to understand, or misread the psychological nuances of the discussion. The presence of senior level administrators may make the moderator uncomfortable. Moderators should preempt problems by insisting that administrators and librarians exhibit appropriate restraint during sessions and obey the etiquette of such meetings before the research project begins. Otherwise, these situations may result in a negative influence on the session and the moderator, rendering the responses invalid.

Problems can occur if clients lose perspective of the seriousness of the sessions. Roller (1985) found that viewing rooms sometimes develop a party atmosphere with food and drink flowing. Smith (1986) describes how problems can develop if focus group observers: (a) fail to understand the issue or problem being discussed, (b) have a closed mind to the discussion, (c) do not take the process seriously, or take it too seriously and lose control, (d) are overly concerned about how closely the moderator follows the discussion guide, (e) take what participants say at face value and fail to consider other factors, (f) insist on writing down every detail participants say, or, (g) are unduly influenced by identifying too positively or negatively with an individual participant since this generally interferes with their ability to listen. A moderator is sometimes asked to cover a multitude of topics in too short of a period of time, so that clients can meet deadlines to design goals and objectives or other strategies overnight. In addition, clients may focus only those ideas that confirm preconceived notions.
Inevitably, a focus group moderator will encounter an individual referred to in the literature as the stalwart authoritarian or dominator. This person may first appear to be the moderator's ally, but more often than not, he or she will serve as a disruptive influence on the group. Bean (1988) found that these individuals may be: (a) naturally extroverted, (b) a self-appointed or bona-fide expert, (c) an individual with high status within an employee or social group, (d) under the influence of drugs or alcohol, or (e) angry about the topic under discussion.

A skillful moderator will employ a variety of tactics to neutralize such an individual and still keep the discussion on track. These include: (a) arranging the seating of participants in the group to be in random order, (b) using nonverbal communication to influence the dominator, (c) confronting the individual verbally, (d) structuring the focus group by calling upon specific individuals to answer questions, (e) allowing the individual some control, then deescalating the tirades as necessary, or, (f) removing the individual from the group.

Qualitative research methods with clients who are high status professionals, such as deans, library directors, and vice-presidents, require special techniques. These individuals often must be convinced to share their thoughts and attitudes with those outside their status level. Simon's (1987) focus group research with physicians found that doctors and other individuals with high status may not be accustomed to having their authority questioned. Challenges to their statements should be indirect, and may be handled through points made by other participants within the discussion group rather than from the moderator. Vanderveer (1987) found that thrift institutions have difficulty putting together high status groups, especially those comprised of busy, affluent customers. As a result, they resort to conducting in-depth personal interviews of this market segment. Library focus groups comprised of individuals from high administrative levels may have to be approached in the same manner.

If not carefully conducted, focus group research can produce biased results. Seymour, McQuarrie, and McIntyre (1987) outline a number of the technique's limitations that should be considered. These include: (a) the artificial setting, (b) possible social posturing by respondents, (c) selective listening, (d) forced compliance, (e) the cost of the information obtained, and (f) the inability to generalize from results of focus group discussions that provide only limited results or do not provide statistically valid projectionable estimates representative of the total population.

**Focus Groups vs. Individual Interviews**

Even though focus group studies are one of the most widely-used research methodologies for gathering consumer opinions, there are those in the research community who argue that under some circumstances, results from personal interviews may be more productive than results from a focus group interview. Experts such as Bloom (1989) argue that individual interviews researchers have better control over the selection of respondents, and are able to interview each respondent in greater depth and in a more flexible manner. By focusing on just one person, the interviewer gains a clearer understanding of that person's feelings and their usage and perceptions of the issue or subject under discussion. Under certain circumstances, this may result in responses with greater significance than those of a focus group discussion. Focus group sessions generally bring in a wider variety of suggestions or criticism which in turn, can be followed up with or quantitative studies that will provide an extremely precise picture of the results.

**Focus Group Research Methodology**

Simply put, the purpose of a focus group is to gather a group of people together and discuss a selected topic for a couple of hours, and, in the process, gather a lot of useful information. This section describes basic concepts for conducting effective focus group sessions and describes the
methodology and results of Georgia College's study of students' perceptions of library services and collections at off-campus centers.

Most experts agree that the procedures for conducting a series of focus group interviews include:

1. The realization that an organization has a problem, and developing the problem statement.
2. Setting goals and objectives to enable the client to understand and possibly resolve the issue.
3. Selecting the moderator.
4. Drafting the discussion guide.
5. Planning and setting up the sessions.
6. Screening and recruiting participants.
7. Conducting the focus group interview sessions.
8. Analyzing results.
9. Following up, if necessary, with a quantitative study (telephone or mail questionnaire, etc.)
10. Presenting written and oral reports to the client.

Statement of Purpose and Problem

Georgia College is a senior comprehensive unit of the University System of Georgia. A unique aspect of the College's outreach is the provision of undergraduate and graduate education at a number of locations in the Central Georgia region. From the State's perspective, this is a low-cost method of addressing the demand for college educational programs. For the student, however, costs can and does have several appearances. Most are employed full time and have a major problem finding time to attend college. Getting to a library and spending the time necessary to conduct research is one of the considerations which Georgia College must address in order to be sure the students get a quality education, irrespective of the branch (center) location they attend.

The considerations to be addressed by this study are:

1. What are the students' perceptions of the adequacy of branch (center) campus libraries and,
   a. how do they adjust to perceived inadequacies
   b. how would they solve the inadequacies
   c. is the trade off for more complex library support acceptable in order to have the center nearby?

2. Would focus group methodology be a suitable vehicle to establish qualitative needs for the branch (center) libraries?

3. Would exposure to focus group sessions led by an experienced researcher provide sufficient background to library personnel, and give them sufficient assessment tools to implement their own focus groups or decide under what circumstances the methodology would be advantageous?
Design of the Study

The study design was non-disguised, non-structured, qualitative research using focus group methodology. Four groups were used to give a cross-section of student information from programs at Dublin, Warner Robins, and Macon, Georgia. The primary focus was at the graduate level; only the Warner Robins session was made up of undergraduates. The reasoning for weighing the study so strongly toward graduate students was that their library requirements are more demanding for both research and paper assignments.

Findings and Discussion

This paper will have something of a split personality because the dual purpose demands that findings and discussion of content concerning adequacy of libraries be pursued plus the desire to determine if the focus group approach is a suitable method for libraries to utilize to assess programs. Examples of events which should be guarded against when using focus groups are included. Actual presentation of the paper which will be accompanied by video clips will graphically demonstrate both positive and negative points which may suffer slightly in the written version.

The Focus Group
As a Methodological Tool For Libraries

Dublin Center

Long conducted the first focus group in the series at the Dublin Center, located about fifty miles south of the main campus at Milledgeville. He was supported by Scott and Flanders. The group was assembled on the night of registration, and was composed of graduate students, all employed at full time jobs during the day and driving variable distances for class. A large classroom with movable chairs was used. When the research team arrived, they started rearranging the seats into a circle and the participants joined in to assist. A positive aspect of the group was that the individuals knew each other. A comfort level with each other had already been established and the problem of a strange environment (the special design focus group—behavioral lab) was avoided.

The group was given the "Who, What, Why" about the team, with an unrushed introduction about how focus groups operate. Participation was initially slow. A former student of the moderator was in the group and Long used their prior relationship to push him into getting the group started. At the beginning, comments were from different individuals. As time progressed, a dominator emerged, supported by about two other individuals. Such an occurrence is common to focus groups and may provide a springboard into various areas depending on the ability of the moderator to shift the focus in a timely manner.

Scott discovered that simple questions worked, while complex and precise wording became a disadvantage. In most situations, it is preferable to use short, simple questions and reactions when necessary, and to avoid library terminology. Hanging questions, where it appears the moderator is groping for the ending of the sentence, encourage the participant to help the moderator by completing the thought.

The session was obviously over when interest began to wane. Near the end, fewer and fewer individuals interacted. It appeared the group felt they had poured out all they had to offer. At the end, Long gave information to the group which was incorrect. Scott interjected correct information. This pointed up the value of an expert being available during the session.
Warner Robins Center

Scott served as moderator for the Warner Robins session, held at this Air Force base center about fifty miles southwest of the main campus. He was supported by Flanders. The eleven participants were junior and senior business students, and one graduate student pursuing an MBA. While the arrangement was satisfactory, the class instructor sat behind the moderator, and was elevated over his line of sight. A participant so positioned in a focus group is viewed as an authority figure. In reviewing the tapes of the session, Scott noted that both his voice, and Flanders' voice needed more volume and variable level and pitch. Librarians spend much of their working lives using voices that are neither intrusive nor noticeable. The role as a focus group moderator requires the ability to keep the group's attention, and firm direction when intervention is necessary. Both Scott and Flanders experienced the tendency to give a library explanation which included too much information. In focus groups it is best to impart a minimum of information. The real intent is to get details on what participants know, believe, think, or want.

Macon Center: Nursing Students

Eighteen graduate nursing students enrolled in a research course at the Macon Center, located about thirty-five miles west of the main campus, formed the third group. This session was conducted in a library large conference room on the main campus in Milledgeville. Long served as the moderator, and was supported by Scott and Flanders. Seating was semicircular, all the participants were women, and the distances traveled to attend the class was up to ninety miles one way. This group functioned as the best example of a focus group, although it did not necessarily provide the most information of the four sessions conducted. The moderator was shown in the chair, very relaxed, and friendly, in an "I'm one of you" slouches. The microphone and video recorded significant non-verbal communication taking place through nodding of the head, use of hand motions, turning to more closely attend remarks being made, along with grunts of agreement, surprise, or just recognition that someone had made a contribution. Questions were kept as short as possible, even when it was necessary to make comments to change directions or to get further depth relative to a specific issue.

This session was the shortest of the four, provided sound information, and was a contrast to the length of the Dublin session. While it is desirable to have a maximum length for a session, it is better to have a sense of the appropriate time to close a session.

Macon Center: Education Students

A class of graduate students enrolled in an education research class at the Macon Center formed the fourth focus group, which met on the main campus in the School of Business building. Unfortunately, the room normally used was pre-empted for an accreditation committee, and there was insufficient space to turn the tables into anything resembling an interactive grouping. Participants did not look relaxed, and the room gave a claustrophobic feeling. Even under those circumstances, some usable information was gleaned.

Long served as session moderator, with support from Flanders. A former student of Long's made a personal connection which assisted in the generation of a casual and informal setting. One of the most valuable lessons from this session was the observation that good may still come from less than ideal conditions. Long found the physical setting the most inappropriate he had ever used for a focus group. Given that the opportunity to work with these students would have been lost, the decision was made to continue for comparison purposes.
Focus Group Structure

The four focus groups demonstrated the necessity for providing participants with a clear methodical introduction to the purpose of the meeting, and what a focus group is meant to accomplish. The video tapes showed the relaxed atmosphere generated by the moderator and the ease of moving from one topic to another.

The need for a moderator who has a dynamic, yet non-threatening voice and demeanor was perceived along with the need for succinct questions. It was noted early in the study that group members did not handle lengthy questions well. Another aspect borne out by all sessions was the need for a high level of skill in the use of non-verbal gestures, grunts, and head shaking. Further, it was clearly demonstrated that even with unsuitable physical meeting facilities, usable information could be gathered. Laboratory conditions which are currently available which incorporate one way mirrors, and elaborate support structures are not necessary.

The group participants were advised that the only purpose of the video camera was to record the session for use in a paper which would discuss what a focus group is like. Long expressed a preference for sessions with no recording devices, and just one person acting as a secretary to log important statements. Videotaping had some post-session advantages, as it enabled the researchers to study facial expressions and other non-verbal cues. It was a valuable tool for Scott and Flanders in that it allowed them to better observe the ebb and flow of group dynamics. While the videotapes served as good research and learning tools for the researchers, the presence of the camera unnerved some participants, particularly at the beginning of the sessions, and may have been viewed by some as an authority figure. Flanders, who videotaped the four sessions, noted that some participants watched the camera when she panned it to capture comments. Videotaping allowed replay to members of the library faculty and staff, and to faculty teaching at branch campuses. In this respect, videotaping may help overcome some of the “kill the messenger” behavior often exhibited by clients.

Scott and Flanders agree there is a danger in having the librarian actually conduct the focus group sessions for several reasons. Librarians are likely to have too much information about the topic and be tempted to share it. Secondly, librarians may attempt to correct participants’ misconceptions about the library and its services and collections during the course of the session. A great deal can be learned by studying patrons’ misconceptions and addressing the reasons for them by improving communication with the library’s clientele. Participants may hesitate to open up and speak frankly, fearing that the librarian will be judgmental or defensive. When negative comments are explored, head librarians may have suspicions that the librarian/moderator is grinding a personal interest ax. From the standpoint of bias, either intentional or unintentional, if the primary purpose of the focus group is to enhance the opportunity for positive change, a disinterested party is the best choice for a moderator.

Library employees viewed two of the videotapes on focus groups. Their reactions were defensive and protective of their domain. They felt that the opinions expressed in the focus groups indicated that students neither comprehended the necessity of, nor were willing to do the hard work properly associated with seeking a degree. The library group missed the point of the real purpose of focus groups—to get at what students think could be improved or changed for the better. The library employees wanted a pat on the back. The goal was to uncover problems, not to garner compliments.

The initial focus group which aroused the interest of the library and inspired this particular study with off-campus students, concluded with a quantitative study which addressed the findings of the focus group. A survey of over 300 students substantiated every major aspect of the focus group information. This study with off-campus students provided a wealth of insight into what the Georgia
College library and staff must do to serve the needs of the branch center students. The information was quickly developed and could be easily processed into the decision system.

**Findings Developed From The Focus Groups**

There were similar findings from the various focus groups. Using participants' comments, the library developed a sense of the problems and concerns which students at all the branch locations seemed to have. Most of the students who participated in this study hold responsible positions, and are married, generally with children at varying stages of development. Either the spouse works as a professional, or they are a single parent. Thus, there should be no surprise that time was viewed as the major enemy. One student articulated the students' general feeling for their mixed responsibilities and time constraints by noting that when it came to a choice of an "A" in a course for an excellent paper versus a "B" because he couldn't get to a library when his son was playing in a baseball game, the son would win every time.

Most of the students were technologically aware, and their suggestions and questions frequently centered on using computer and other technology to break down the barriers of time and distance. Among the questions posed were: (a) why does it take so long to get interlibrary loan, (b) why can't we have more use of fax machines, (c) why can't we use modems from various locations, (d) why can't we use more next day mail, (e) why can't main libraries use scanner technology.

Aside from time, the most observable factor of importance to the participants was that of comfort in using a particular library. Students frequently expressed that they used a particular library with which they were familiar. Graduate students were likely to return use the library at the institution at which they received their undergraduate degrees, if it was within a hundred miles. Some expressed a concern that they would be ridiculed, or the staff at an unfamiliar library would think they were dumb for asking for help. Thus, the logical flow concerned how to reduce discomfort when they were a new user in a facility. There was substantial head shaking in agreement in the sessions with the need for a short ten to twenty minute video which would explain the major features of the library's services and collections. User friendly computers which did not require extensive instruction were another request made of the librarians who were on hand for the sessions.

State institutions appear to have an opportunity to serve the citizen student more fully by mandating State wide library card privileges. While the very large library would likely react negatively, the taxpayer would likely benefit as well as the student. The resources of libraries serving institutions within a system such as the University System of Georgia should be available to all of its students. There is a distinct need to resolve copyright and other problems which slow down the interlibrary and intralibrary loan process. Each branch campus should serve as an electronic information center to allow students to identify and obtain materials available on a given topic within the System. Too often, nuances within the structure of the relationship between institutions and their centers creates inequities in the borrowing and loaning of materials.

A number of students were frustrated because they were able to generate wonderful lists of articles by various computer searches, only to find it either impossible to get the entire article, or to get the article so late that it stressed them beyond acceptable levels. Again, for many of the participants, whether or not there was a charge, or the amount of the charge was secondary.

At one center, a student suggested that activity fees which are a standard concept for boarding students, and main campus students, be redirected at the off-campus centers. The point was that absolutely nothing was received by the branch students except cookies and punch during registration. The suggestion was that the money should be used for upgrading the library, something they could use often and which would possibly save extensive travel to more complete libraries.
Further specifics were: (a) more "ask here" signs in convenient locations, (b) information centers in a centralized place, (c) available, identifiable librarians who are not overwhelmed with their own paperwork, (d) brochures available to give thorough information on interlibrary loan and other services, (e) availability of a data search of the collections of various libraries within the University System to save students time by allowing them to investigate the availability of materials before making a long drive to a library.

Summary and Conclusions

The participants made it clear the branch libraries were inadequate but that they also understood the trade off of having the center available. Travel to libraries was expected, and adjusted to as part of the course load. Travel was acceptable provided the course expectations were presented with sufficient lead time to accommodate research and obtaining materials. The participants have adopted a number of problem solving methods which range from visiting parents or relatives who live near a library, to taking annual leave to spend two to three days at a major State University for the purpose of utilizing its library. Availability of the branch location was highly regarded. Participants were willing to do whatever was necessary to avoid driving extensive distances every day or several times a week to get their degree.

In terms of using the focus group as a vehicle to establish qualitative information about the branches, the conclusion is highly positive. Indeed, except for a limited number of particulars, it was practical to merge the output of the four groups into a single outcomes section. Outcomes from the focus groups merged so well that it was decided there was no necessity to conduct a quantitative survey on the branches.

Skillfully orchestrated testing and discussion of controversial opinions is a highly effective way of ascertaining the need for change and adaptation. Libraries which choose to ignore criticism, or which fail to respond to the needs of their clientele, avoid an important component in the concept of service which is central to the definition of a library. Librarians who have the courage to listen to criticism and who remain open to users' suggestions can use this information to develop more effective library programs. The opinion of the researchers concerning librarians' use of focus groups is mixed in that while the methodology is sound, and the outcomes powerful, care must be exercised to avoid having moderators who know too much about the topic, or who may be perceived by the administrative hierarchy to have vested interests. Librarians must bear in mind that training in the use of the focus group technique is necessary. Librarians who choose to use the approach must be prepared to rethink their verbal presentation style, repress their desire to inform participants about the library during the process, and avoid becoming defensive in the face of criticism.

The authors gratefully acknowledge financial support from the Georgia College Faculty Research fund for the 1990 research project, and from the Georgia College Faculty Development fund for assistance with conference expenses.

References


Greenbaum, T. L. (1989). Murder at the focus group, or: Kill the idea, not the messenger. Marketing News, 23(19), 43-44.


Mariampolski, H. (1989). Focus groups on sensitive topics: How to get subjects to open up and feel good about telling the truth. *Applied Marketing Research, 29*(1), 6-11.


**Additional Readings**


The Tie That Binds: The Role and Evolution of Contracts in Interlibrary Cooperation

Andrew D. Scrimgeour and Susan Potter
Regis University (Denver)

Introduction

The "ACRL guidelines for extended campus library services" advocates the use of "written agreements" when the resources and services of unaffiliated local libraries are used to support the information needs of the extended campus community (Association of College and Research Libraries, 1990). In searching the literature of libraries and higher education for models of these contracts, we were not helped. This topic is a major lacunae in the growing field of off-campus library services.

We would like to examine the importance of contracts in formalizing agreements between libraries to provide resources and services to off-campus students. Emphasis will be on the complementary roles of library administrators and lawyers in formulating these agreements, the categories of a sound contract, and an analysis of the evolution of a specific Regis University contract.

The Value of Written Agreements

Agreements take many forms. A verbal agreement with a hand shake is one of the simplest. Some oral arrangements are followed by a memorandum of understanding written by one of the parties. Still others are as nonchalant as a phone call asking for assistance. But our focus is on something much more exacting—a written contract—a formal, legal document that has been negotiated by library administrators, reviewed by attorneys of both parties, authorized by the administration of both parties, and finally signed by the appropriate officials of the two institutions.

The value of written agreements is multiple. First, they formalize the libraries' plans. A library's good intentions are not left to chance, a host of competing interpretations, the personality of one individual, nor the changing priorities of new administrators. Clarity comes when two institutions carefully hone the text of their common plans and thereby unambiguously establish the goals and objectives of the partnership.

A written agreement also establishes the boundaries of mutual responsibility. Without clear statements one library could easily nurse expectations of the other that are not shared by the partner. For example, a statement such as "The Horace Public Library will provide reference services for Hopewell College students" easily gives rise to expectations as diverse as answering basic information questions to providing extensive data base searching. Mismatched expectations are the root of niggling discontent which easily sprout into dissension. Cooperation cannot flourish in such a thicket. Written agreements eradicate the undergrowth of carefree and careless informality.

Another benefit accrues to the library budget. A contract for interlibrary cooperation will not be abrogated when fiscal constraints are grim. A contract is simply a contract and will be honored. It
must be honored. A written contract thus elevates the status of these partnerships to the level of institutional priority and insures it against the vagaries of adverse budget seasons.

When two institutions invest this kind of care in an agreement, they are also saying something powerful about its priority in the hierarchy of the institutions’ missions. The importance of the new arrangement calls for an appropriate level of care. It demands the formality of a contract.

This quartet of values—formalizing the library’s plan, establishing the boundaries of responsibility, protecting the library budget, and signaling the priority of the partnership—coalesces to create a solid foundation on which to build interlibrary cooperation.

The Role of Library Administrators

The leadership role in contract negotiation of necessity falls to the librarians. They are the ones who must respond to new institutional initiatives and sketch the way to library services for geographically dispersed faculty and students. They must look for library partners and assess their potential for the delivery of specified services.

The attentive librarian will take the initiative in exploring options with other libraries, advising his or her administration on the progress of the discussions, and then taking the lead in the actual negotiation of the contract.

The Role of Lawyers

Lawyers need to play a key role in the development of written contracts. Their role is assured in most state institutions and larger universities where administrative policy is formal and exacting. However, in smaller private colleges and universities contracts are frequently forged without the assistance of legal counsel. Contracts which bypass the scrutiny of the attorneys for both parties should be avoided at all costs. The litigious bent of today’s society casts a shadow of pure folly on any institution that would bind itself to another institution without legal review.

The contribution of the lawyer is twofold. First, is content. Are the goals of the two parties truly accomplished in the document? Are these goals understandable to persons other than the principals? In times of disagreement or even renewal, the original parties are often no longer at the institution. It is essential that the intent of the partners is clear and unambiguous. If the contract is in any way inaccurate or ambiguous in its content, it is the obligation of the attorney to insist on precision and clarity.

The second major focus of the attorney is process or the technical formalities of a contract. It is important to be reminded that a lawyer’s task is not to remake a deal but to insure that it is well constructed. Are the elements that comprise a formal contract present in the document? An attorney will make sure that the proper legal names of the parties are used, that the principals are in fact legal representatives of their respective institutions, and that the prospective partner is of sufficient substance to perform the obligations of the contract.

Common questions to be answered include: Why are the parties entering into this agreement? What is the benefit and detriment for each? What provisions are included to coerce behavior when something goes wrong? And if things do go wrong, in what legal jurisdiction will court proceedings take place?

The language of contracts is often criticized as archaic, wooden, difficult to comprehend, and even when understandable, seemingly offensive or combative in tone. This is the acidic land of
"wherefore's" and "heretofore's" but no petit fours! The terminology is indeed of considerable ancestry and comprises the essential tools of the trade known as "terms of art." These words and phrases are not simply irrelevant "legalese" bent on frustrating the layperson. They have well defined denotations that are readily understood by attorneys and the court system. If these terms are avoided in favor of the vernacular, the range of interpretation broadens considerably and the risk of confusion and alternate interpretations grows exponentially.

On the other hand, these documents do not have to be written in stifling argot (See Appendixes A and B). There is a balance to be achieved between the essential terms of legal exactitude and the natural language of the contracting parties.

The seemingly abrasive character of some of the language arises in part from one of the critical purposes of a contract. It must address what is to happen if the parties do not live up to their responsibilities or the partnership dissolves. In a very real way, it functions as a prenuptial agreement. Lawyers pour cold water on the ardor and goodwill of the would-be couple and force them to decide up front what will happen if a divorce is necessary. The contract thus states in advance of any difficulty what the penalties and procedures for default are to be.

Contracts do not need to be complex documents. This fact is especially the case in certain areas of higher education which operate under the rubrics of accreditation and professional organization guidelines. These documents create a context of established norms for standard academic practice. For example, the articulation agreements between Regis University and the community colleges of Colorado are not legal mazes because they build on the formal guidelines of the North Central Accreditation Association and the Colorado Community College and Occupational Education System.

Similarly, the memoranda of understanding between Regis University and other cooperating libraries are not complicated because they are guided by the "ACRL Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Services" (ACRL, 1990).

Attorneys not only insure that the intent of the parties is faithfully expressed in "terms of art," they protect the interests of their institutions. Lawyers for a college will not allow their library to take inappropriate risks or incur unanticipated liability.

As librarians increasingly negotiate contracts for new library ventures, they should insist that their institutions insure the success of these sui generis documents and provide legal assistance. Brokering a contract without the counsel of an attorney is as misguided as venturing to a tree limb during a mid-western electrical storm.

The Evolution of a Contract

Regis University Libraries currently provide services to extended campus students in fifteen different locations within the states of Colorado and Wyoming. Our first written contract for cooperative services with a community library was in Loveland located approximately sixty miles from Denver.

The evolution of the written contract at Regis was both deliberate and thorough. The literature was searched for models of legal documents outlining cooperative agreements in educational settings. Articulation agreements and their history at this institution and at others were reviewed. Drafts of the written contract were circulated to the campus attorney, vice president for academic affairs, deans, assistant library directors and library department heads for critique. Meetings were held with the principals of the cooperative venture to determine whether expectations on both sides were
properly outlined in the document. After several re-writes, a final document was presented to the Regis attorney for review and then to the director of the cooperating library for review by the Loveland attorney and then final signature.

It became evident very quickly in searching for models of written contracts between academic and public libraries that these were few and far between. The literature presented numerous examples of cooperative education, particularly between public schools and public libraries or public schools and colleges, but only a few examples about formal agreements between public and academic libraries. None of these examples offered the complete text of the written contracts, but excerpts from these assisted us in outlining the potential categories for our agreement.

One of the earliest models was the St. Joseph’s College (New York) agreement with the Levittown Public Library (Travis, 1982). In summary, it provided for orientation, reference services and borrowing privileges at the public library for the college’s extended campus students in exchange for the college’s purchasing and processing books and serial subscriptions to be added to the public library collection. A two-year term of agreement and procedures for renewal or termination were laid out in this document. An interesting facet of the agreement was the section determining ownership of materials. It was made clear from the beginning that, should the partnership dissolve, all materials except for journals would remain the property of the college library. In addition, the college library would reimburse the public library for the cost of processing all materials.

These two points were a major divergence from Regis’ developing philosophy. At Regis, a fundamental of goodwill was the premise that all materials would become the property of the public library immediately upon purchase. The public library would absorb the cost of processing the materials. It was obvious to us that the content of the Regis-Loveland contract would differ significantly from these models on the issues of ownership of materials and the costs for processing those materials.

Another example of the St. Joseph option is the agreement between the University of South Alabama and both the Fairhope Public Library and the Faulkner State Junior College Library (Bush and Damico, 1988). It spells out the intent for all library materials to remain the property of the university should the cooperative venture dissolve.

The history of articulation agreements nationwide and within our own institution gave us a little better starting point. Articulation is not a new concept. The term was commonly used in the 1960's and early 1970's to refer to arrangements between the newly popular junior colleges (also referred to as two-year or community colleges) and the more traditional four-year colleges. Articulation agreements laid out the responsibilities of both institutions in facilitating a student's progress toward a college degree. More specifically, they outlined the requirements and procedures necessary for transfer from the junior college to the four-year college. Articulation agreements developed at the grass roots level because people who had a serious interest in the plight of the transfer student decided to meet and search for a solution (Coughlin, 1974). In much the same way, our cooperative agreements were initiated at the grass roots level by people who had a serious interest in meeting the library needs of extended campus students.

There are a number of contrasting models in use for improving articulation. Most, however, focus on several recurring themes. The first of these is the building of a "foundation of mutual respect and acceptance" between the two institutions entering the agreement (Hertig, 1973, p.40). It is essential to success that an equal partnership of the two institutions is acknowledged from the very beginning (Darnes, 1974). In the case of Regis, this foundation was nurtured by a series of meetings with library administration and community leaders in Loveland to discuss mutual needs and areas in which contributions could be made by each institution. Trust was built by attendance at
local meetings and fund raisers and enhanced by the knowledge that our institution was already providing quality education to Loveland residents.

Second is a local focus on the problems to be addressed (Hertig, 1973). Applied to our situation, specifically what library materials and services were needed by Regis students and the community of Loveland?

A third area of the model is the "establishment of a mechanism which permits effective and efficient communication between the two kinds of institutions" (Hertig, 1973, p. 42). Who would the principals be in negotiating the contract and what steps would be taken in these negotiations?

A fourth and very important aspect of the models is the emphasis on student and/or community follow-up (Hertig, 1973). How would the effectiveness of the cooperative agreement be evaluated?

Finally, a rationale is needed for how to provide the materials and services identified as needed (Hertig, 1973, p. 42). A major part of our rationale evolved and became entwined with two Library Services and Construction Act grant proposals that were submitted and approved to provide access to the on-line catalog CARL and monies for cooperative collection development at the Loveland Public Library (LPL).

In looking at Regis University's articulation agreements with a number of junior colleges, there were several aspects that were of interest to us in writing our own cooperative library agreement. How was the purpose of the agreement stated? How were the responsibilities of each institution outlined? To what legal issues should we be alerted? Was there a method of evaluation integrated into the process? Was the term of the contract specified and the procedure for terminating the contract outlined? It is interesting to note that when we drafted our first cooperative library agreement, the University's articulation agreements with extended campuses were extremely lengthy and detailed, yet we chose to keep ours fairly short and simple. Since that time, the University has moved to a much more streamlined version of articulation modelled by the University of Colorado - Denver. In 1990, the Articulation Agreement Committee at Regis recommended the adoption of an agreement that was greater in scope (one agreement would apply to at least 15 junior/community colleges in the state of Colorado), easier to maintain, more attractive to students and competitive with other four-year colleges (Regis College, 1990).

Using Regis' standard articulation agreement as a model, a checklist of contract categories was established that facilitated the writing of the cooperative library agreement. These categories were:

1. The preamble.
   (What is the background to the agreement? Who are the parties? What is the general purpose of the contract?).

2. Responsibilities of the college or university.
   (What are the obligations of the initiating institution?).

3. Responsibilities of the partner.
   (What are the obligations of the partner?).

4. Term of the contract.
   (What is the timeframe for the agreement?).
5. Renewal of contract.
   (What are the steps for negotiating the contract?)

   (What steps does either party take to end the agreement?).

7. Signers and date.
   (Who are the authorized, legal representatives for the institutions? What is the date of
   the signing?).

In addition, we added another category:

8. Review of the contract.
   (How is the contract to be evaluated? May changes to the contract be made while the
   contract is in force? And if so, how? Should evaluation be on a regular schedule or
   simply reviewed immediately prior to renewal?).

Our first draft of a "Memorandum of Understanding Between The Loveland Public Library and
Regis College Libraries" incorporated all eight of these categories. Although this document went
through a series of critiques, the eight categories remain today.

Comments about the first draft ranged from a "bravo" from the media services librarian,
questions about educational programs being served and photocopy charges by the assistant director
of libraries, to a series of questions from the technical services librarian. Included in these were
questions of identity: Which Regis libraries are included in this agreement? How will a Regis
student be identified at the LPL? Another area encompassed questions of responsibility: Who
would have the primary responsibility for selection of materials? Who would catalog and process
these materials? Would LPL librarians be responsible for any bibliographic instruction? Would the
Regis branch libraries still have right of first refusal on gift books? Technological questions
followed: Would a WATS line be installed to facilitate reference and interlibrary loan services?
Would the on-line catalog be dial-up or dedicated lines? Would the catalog include LPL's holdings?
Only one of the critiques questioned the two-year length of contract.

The second draft of the "Memorandum of Understanding Between The Loveland Public Library
and Regis College" incorporated many of the changes suggested after the first draft, and provided
further clarification of additional areas. A re-writing of the preamble section was much more
effective at emphasizing the positive aspects of the cooperative agreement. Services, such as the
Business Index and CARL, were described in greater detail and issues of time and charges for these
services were addressed. Provisions were made for future technological improvements.
Responsibility for the selection, cataloging and processing of materials was more specifically
outlined.

The area of the second draft that subsequently came under fire was the section on LPL
responsibilities: Would a proof of address be required in addition to a current Regis I.D. card?
Would priority be given by LPL to the processing of resources purchased by Regis? Would LPL be
asked to provide the facilities for bibliographic instruction by Regis librarians? Should the
responsibility for instructing Regis students and faculty about LPL procedures and regulations belong
to the Regis Libraries or LPL? The issue of the length of contract was still unclear.

Once again, many of the changes suggested after the second draft were adopted in draft #3.
This draft was then sent to the dean of career programs, the vice president of academic affairs and
the assistant director of the Colorado Springs branch library to undergo their scrutiny. It was felt
that the contract between the two libraries should be something that was known and supported by the college as a whole.

Comments from the dean took issue with the open-endedness of some of the statements in the section on Regis' fiscal responsibilities: Would we really spend $5,000 or more per year to add to the LPL collection? Would the statement about bringing up CARL be better if amended to say it would be brought to LPL as soon as Regis deemed it fiscally feasible? Exactly what would the patrons be charged for copying costs? How could we guarantee that we would reimburse the LPL for resources lost or mutilated by any non-Loveland Regis student? The only suggestion about the LPL section was to ask them to place a bookplate identifying the Regis partnership in materials purchased under the agreement. The assistant director of the branch library reiterated concerns about priority of processing and responsibilities for bibliographic instruction.

The final document was reviewed by the Regis attorney, then submitted to the director of the LPL. After review by the city attorney, it was signed by both parties (see Appendix A). The entire process from first draft of the agreement to the signing of the final document was six months.

After the initial contract had been in effect for two and a half years, we began the process of renegotiating a second contract. Our first step was to schedule a meeting with the LPL director, assistant director and reference librarian. At this meeting, we read through the original contract together, discussed things that had worked well and others that hadn't, made suggestions for areas that needed changes or clarification and talked about new areas to emphasize in the next three years. The meeting was extremely positive on both sides and we adjourned with the promise to provide LPL with a draft of the new contract in several weeks. We then drew up the new draft incorporating items from our discussion and submitted it to our campus attorney for review.

The document was returned to us a week later with two pages of comments and suggestions. These were, without exception, all changes in the process or formalities of the document. The content of the contract was accepted without question. The suggested changes were made and the contract was then sent to the director of the LPL for review by their staff and attorney.

The LPL staff studied the draft and recommended that no further changes be made. It was then reviewed by one of the city attorneys. That lawyer had two concerns. First, that the renewal clause be stated more clearly. He proposed a revised text. And second, that the signatory for the LPL be changed. Inasmuch as Colorado State law mandates that only the chairperson of the Library Board may obligate the library through a contract, it was incorrect to have the director of the LPL signing the contract.

These changes were acceptable to Regis. However, LPL's attention to the legal absolutes governing signatures to contracts occasioned an internal review of Regis protocols for the signing of contracts. It was discovered that by-law changes since 1988 now restricted signing authority to the president and a number of the vice presidents. Thus the draft was further amended to have the president of Regis University as the signing party to the contract. It seemed appropriate to have Regis' highest ranking officer sign the document rather than a vice president, as a reciprocal to LPL's chairperson of the Library Board. It also enabled the institution to give the agreement a level of recognition that lifted it above the routine. It deserved the president's attention.

The second contract with the Loveland Public Library is now ready for the signatures. The renegotiation of the second contract took four months.
Conclusion

The Director of the Loveland Public Library recently stated at a meeting of the Colorado Library Association that the relationship with the Regis Libraries was "a marriage made in heaven." We concur. Certainly, the care that went into the creation and refinement of the contract carried a matchmaking quality with it. A formal document has become a "tie that binds" in word as well as in spirit.
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Appendix A

A Memorandum of Understanding Between

The Loveland Public Library and Regis College Libraries

22 August 1988

The inauguration of Regis College degree programs in Loveland in July 1986 closely coincided with the opening of the Loveland Public Library's new facility. It is four blocks away from the Regis-Aims Center.

Given the proximity of the new Loveland Public Library (LPL) to the Regis building, the strength of its collections, and the skills of its staff, it seemed unwise for Regis to launch an independent Regis branch library in Loveland. Rather, it explored a unique partnership with the LPL so that the total community resources could be strengthened.

Regis College is appreciative of the quality of the LPL collections and services. However, it acknowledges that it has the primary responsibility for identifying, developing, and providing resources and services which address the information needs of its students and faculty in the Loveland programs. It recognizes that responsibility in initiating this document.

In acknowledgement of the mutual value of the cooperative library ventures already informally in place and in the belief that a formal agreement will enlarge and clarify this cooperation,

The Regis College Libraries agree to:

1. Extend full borrowing privileges to any Loveland citizen in all of its libraries.

2. Give priority processing to all inter-library loan originating from the Loveland Public Library. These requests may be on the standard ALA form, but telephone requests will be honored as well as encouraged. Through the CCLS and HPRL courier systems, in which Regis and LPL are members, most requested items should arrive at the LPL within two (2) days.

3. Engage in joint fund raising efforts, especially grant proposal development, to the mutual benefit of Loveland citizens and Regis students in the Loveland area.

4. Provide a subscription to the Business Index—a monthly business periodical indexing service accessed through a microfilm reader. The full costs of the subscription, hardware, and hardware maintenance will be borne by Regis. This Index provides information on the articles of over 800 business periodicals, such as Fortune, Harvard Business Review, and many others.

Over 600 of these journals are in the Regis collections. They will be copied upon request and sent via courier to Loveland. The turn-around time is 48 hours on the average. Copying costs will be charged back to the patron.

Regis will replace this microfilm service by an InfoTrac, CD-Rom service when demand on the Business Index no longer makes that service effective for Regis students.
5. Provide collection development funds in areas pertinent to its RECEP II Program. In 1988-89 such funds will be no less than $5,000.

Regis librarians will be responsible for selecting and ordering these materials in consultation and coordination with the Loveland librarians.

Ownership of these volumes will be retained by the Loveland Public Library.

6. Bring the CARL on-line catalog to the LPL as soon as Regis deems it fiscally feasible. The CARL catalog is the gateway to the Regis libraries. It will not only offer Loveland residents a comprehensive catalog to the Regis libraries but to many of the major academic libraries along the Front Range, including the University of Northern Colorado (Greeley), the University of Colorado (Boulder), the University of Denver, the School of Mines, the Auraria Library, and the Denver Public Library. Over 4.5 million titles are now on this growing system.

7. Place special densities of resources from its libraries on reserve in the Loveland Public Library when course requirements demand such special augmentation of the LPL collection.

8. Provide in-service orientation sessions for the LPL reference librarians for the subject areas of its curriculum.

9. Provide bibliographic instruction lectures for Regis students in coordination with the LPL reference staff.

10. Make available to LPL portions of the resources that Regis receives through gifts or withdrawals from its collections.

11. Advise LPL on its collection development work when appropriate and upon invitation from LPL staff.

12. Regis students will be subject to all the rules and regulations of the Loveland Public Library. Regis will reimburse the LPL for any resources that are lost or mutilated by any non-Loveland Regis student.

13. Regis College will instruct its students, faculty, and administration in the procedures and regulations in force at the LPL as well as the appropriate specifics of this agreement.

The Loveland Public Library agrees to:

1. Grant library privileges to all Regis students presenting a current Regis ID card and proof of address.

2. Catalog and/or process the resources purchased by Regis College for the Loveland Public Library and assume those processing and cataloging costs. Priority will be given to the processing of these materials.

3. Intershelve the resources purchased by Regis College with its own collections and make them available to all patrons according to established LPL procedures.

4. Place a bookplate in the volumes purchased under this agreement which identifies them as provided by the Regis College Libraries.
5. Provide reference assistance and inter-library loan service to all Regis students.

6. Provide a "temporary reference" service (reserve service) for the Regis faculty.

7. Provide facilities for bibliographic lectures for Regis classes, subject to the availability of the LPL meeting rooms.

Regis College librarians and LPL librarians agree to assess the progress and effectiveness of these arrangements on a quarterly basis and revise and refine them as mutually agreed upon.

This agreement will be in force for three (3) years with automatic, annual, one-year renewals, subject to the option of either party's notifying the other in writing of the intention to terminate the agreement ninety (90) days prior to the annual renewal date.

Elaine Puls, Director, LPL

Date

Andrew D. Scrimgeour, Director of Libraries, Regis College

Date
Appendix B

A Memorandum of Understanding Between
The Loveland Public Library
and
Regis University Libraries

August 1991

[Proposed Text as of 1 July 1991]

The inauguration of Regis University degree programs in Loveland in July 1986 closely coincided with the opening of the Loveland Public Library's new facility. It is four blocks away from the Regis-Aims Center.

Given the proximity of the new Loveland Public Library (LPL) to the Regis building, the strength of its collections, and the skills of its staff, it seemed unwise for Regis to launch an independent Regis branch library in Loveland. Rather, it explored a unique partnership with the LPL so that the total community resources could be strengthened. An extremely successful cooperative relationship between the Loveland Public Library and Regis University Libraries has been in effect for the last three years.

Regis University is appreciative of the quality of the LPL collections and services. However, it acknowledges that it has the primary responsibility for identifying, developing, and providing resources and services which address the information needs of its students and faculty in the Loveland programs. It recognizes that responsibility in initiating this document.

In acknowledgement of the mutual value of the cooperative library ventures already formally in place and in the belief that this agreement will continue to enlarge and clarify this cooperation,

The Regis University, through the University Libraries, agrees to:

1. Extend full borrowing privileges for any Loveland citizen to all of the general usage libraries of the University, subject to the rules and regulations which pertain to usage of those libraries.

2. Give priority processing to all inter-library loan requests originating from the Loveland Public Library. These requests should be on the standard Regis Interlibrary/Intercampus Loan form, but telephone requests will be honored as well as encouraged. Through the CCLS and HPRL courier systems, in which Regis and LPL are members, most requested items should arrive at the LPL within two (2) days.

3. Engage in joint fund raising efforts, especially grant proposal development and submission, which both parties believe to be mututally beneficial to their service of the citizens of the City of Loveland, and Regis University students and programs.

Note: Regis changed its name from Regis College to Regis University in 1990.
4. Obtain and provide to LPL a subscription to, and the related hardware and hardware maintenance for the Business Index, and provide, upon request from LPL, copies of journal articles indexed in the Business Index which are maintained in the Regis University collections. Those articles will be transmitted by a courier or other available means with the intent of attempting to provide those copies no later than 48 hours, during normal operating periods, after receipt of the request.

5. Expend not less than $5,100 during fiscal year 1991-92, and equivalent amount inflated by any increase in the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Cost of Living Index, All Items, Denver, Colorado, for each succeeding fiscal year that this Memorandum of Understanding is in effect. Such funds shall be expended by the Regis University Libraries in support of the RECEP II Program collection at LPL as it in its discretion deems appropriate. Priority areas of collection development for the term of this contract will be religion and philosophy. All items acquired and delivered to the LPL shall become the property of the Loveland Public Library, subject to such usage, conditions and restrictions that are contained herein and/or as established from time to time by the Regis Libraries.

6. Provide the annual operating fee for maintenance of the CARL on-line catalogue at the LPL. Such fee may be paid directly to CARL by Regis. It is understood and agreed that all of the CARL hardware, software, and related materials provided by, paid for directly or indirectly (e.g., through grant funding) by Regis shall be the property of Regis, and upon termination of this Memorandum, shall be subject to disposition at the direction of Regis.

7. Place special densities of resources from its libraries on reserve under conditions established on a case by case basis through discussions between Regis and the LPL librarians in the Loveland Public Library when course requirements demand such special augmentation of the LPL collection.

8. Provide in-service orientation sessions as reasonably necessary for the LPL reference librarians for the subject areas of its curriculum.

9. Provide bibliographic instruction lectures for Regis students in coordination with the LPL reference staff.

10. Make available in the discretion of Regis to LPL portions of the resources that Regis receives through gifts or withdrawals from its collections.

11. Advise LPL on its collection development work when appropriate and upon invitation from LPL staff.

12. Regis students will be subject to all the rules and regulations of the Loveland Public Library. In Virginia Boucher's Interlibrary Loan Practices Handbook, it is suggested that "all costs of repair or replacement must be met by the borrowing library." In accordance with the spirit of this document, Regis will reimburse the LPL for any resources that are lost or mutilated by any non-Loveland Regis student provided that LPL has first exhausted its reasonable efforts to recover the replacement cost of the resources from the patron, and that LPL does in fact replace the resource.

13. Regis University will instruct its students, faculty, and administration in the procedures and regulations in force at the LPL as well as the appropriate specifics of this agreement.
The Loveland Public Library agrees to:

1. Grant library privileges in accordance with LPL rules and regulations to all Regis students presenting a current Regis ID card and proof of address as long as they adhere to the rules and regulations in force at the LPL.

2. Catalog and/or process the resources purchased by Regis University for the Loveland Public Library and assume those processing and cataloging costs. Priority will be given to the processing of these materials.

3. Intershelve the resources purchased by Regis University with its own collections and make them available to all patrons according to established LPL procedures.

4. Place a bookplate in the volumes purchased under this agreement which identifies them as provided by the Regis University Libraries. A new bookplate will be provided by Regis incorporating the name change to University.

5. Provide reference assistance and inter-library loan service to all Regis students.

6. Provide a "temporary reference" service (reserve service) for the Regis faculty.

7. Provide facilities for bibliographic lectures for Regis classes, subject to the availability of the LPL meeting rooms.

8. Maintain reasonably appropriate collections security procedures and insurance coverage on all resource materials provided by Regis under the provisions of the Memorandum.

9. Replace all lost, damaged, or stolen resources or materials provided by Regis under the provisions of this Memorandum unless otherwise agreed by Regis.

10. Provide services in accordance with applicable Federal, State and local non-discrimination laws, ordinances and regulations.

Regis University librarians and LPL librarians agree to assess the progress and effectiveness of these arrangements on a quarterly basis and revise and refine them as mutually agreed upon.

This agreement will be in force for three (3) years with automatic, annual, one-year renewals, during this three (3) year period, subject to the option of either party's notifying the other in writing of the intention to terminate the agreement ninety (90) days prior to the annual renewal date.

Juanita Cisneros, Chairperson, 
Loveland Public Library Board

David M. Clarke, S.J., President

Date

Date
A Librarian-Centered Model for Developing and Implementing an Off-Campus Library Support System: Establishing a Proactive Process

Alexander L. Slade
University of Victoria

Introduction

The issue of library support for off-campus and distance education programs has received considerable attention in recent library literature. In response to a demand for information in this area from librarians and administrators in postsecondary education, a growing number of authors have published case studies, research reports, and review articles on "off-campus" or "extended campus" library services. As an indication of the breadth of the existing literature, a recent bibliography lists over 500 international publications in the area of library services for off-campus and distance education (Latham, Slade, & Budnick, 1991).

From several of these publications, especially from the descriptions and reports of specific services, composite models can be created for the provision of library support for distant learners. However, as the authors of one study indicate, "there is a dearth of models which adequately integrate all the procedural and conceptual components needed for innovative contemporary practice" (Burge, Snow, & Howard, 1989, p. 333). The authors of that study offer a conceptual model, based on original research, to respond to the needs of distance education programs in northern Ontario. While this model has wider implications beyond Ontario, it only addresses a limited area of off-campus library services and does not take into account the broader range of settings and variables which comprise the field of off-campus education. This paper will present a model designed to encompass the variables of this wider context and to integrate a conceptual framework with procedural suggestions for establishing library support for off-campus populations.

The Context of Off-Campus Education

There are basically three forms of off-campus education which may be classified as follows:

1. Distance education courses in which students work independently with prepackaged learning materials.

2. Distance education courses which involve a combination of group meetings and independent study.

3. Off-campus classroom courses which involve direct interaction between the students and the instructor.

The term "distance education" is sometimes used synonymously with "off-campus education," but in Canada, it is employed in a more restrictive sense. Canadian usage tends to correspond to Borje Holmberg's definition of distance education: "Those teaching methods in which, because of the physical separateness of learners and teachers, the interactive as well as the preparatory phase of teaching is conducted through print, mechanical or electronic devices" (Holmberg, 1981, p.11). The distinctive feature of this first form of off-campus education is that it does not have a fixed geographic location. Students work at home and receive instruction through print materials,
audio-video materials, educational broadcast television, computer conferencing, or a combination of these and other methods. These students rarely, if ever, assemble as a group and contact with the parent institution is normally by mail and telephone.

In contrast, students taking courses through the second and third forms of off-campus education meet periodically in a group setting. When group meetings are integrated into distance education courses, they are often conducted through teleconferencing or closed-circuit television with the instructor being located several miles away from the students. Frequently these types of meetings are on a regional basis, with "pods" of students located at different sites. These "pods" normally do not meet together to form an entire class, rather they function as a convenient way to group students who reside in the same geographic area. Sometimes an institution will establish a regional study center where students in that area can receive some face-to-face instruction or tutoring to supplement their independent study.

Off-campus classroom courses are conducted in essentially the same way as on-campus courses, the primary differences being that the location is some distance from the main campus and classes tend to meet less frequently than they would on campus. While most courses offered in this manner are conducted with face-to-face interaction between students and the instructor, a few institutions employ a type of distance education model where lectures are transmitted to students from campus using an interactive video-audio system. Some colleges and universities vary their off-campus course sites according to local interest. In other cases, fixed centers are used for off-campus classroom instruction. These centers may be the property of other institutions (e.g. a local school) or remote branches of the main campus. Partly due to the geographic dispersion of the Canadian population, this latter concept of "extended campus" is not as common or widespread in Canada as it is in the United States.

Constructing a Model for Library Support

The model proposed in this paper encompasses all three forms of off-campus education. The objective is to provide a conceptual framework which can be applied to any type of off-campus situation, especially since several universities and colleges utilize more than one form of off-campus education (Slade, 1988, p.9).

A number of recent publications provide valuable information for the establishment of a conceptual model for off-campus library services. Affleck (1987) proposes a model comprised of thirteen components to support distance education programs in Saskatchewan. Slade (1988) discusses the results of a national survey of off-campus library services provided by Canadian universities and colleges. Kacsus & Aguilar (1988) outline a three-part working model for off-campus library services involving use of the home library, a designated off-campus librarian, and agreements with nonaffiliated libraries. Burge, Snow, & Howard (1988, 1989) describe their study in northern Ontario and offer a model oriented towards developing partnerships for the provision of library support to distance education programs. The Association of College and Research Libraries in its third revision of the Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Services (Association of College and Research Libraries [ACRL], 1990) presents a general framework for supporting "non-traditional study." This paper will attempt to synthesize the findings and recommendations of these and selected other publications to form a composite model to assist in the development of library support for off-campus populations.

In order to construct this type of model, a number of basic assumptions must be employed. The first basic assumption is that the administration of the institution sponsoring the off-campus programs recognizes the value of library support for these programs and is willing to assume full responsibility for ensuring that the library needs of off-campus students are met. This assumption is
stressed in the "Philosophy" section of the ACRL Guidelines (ACRL, 1990, p. 354). At many institutions, administration of off-campus programs is conducted through a division of continuing education. Depending upon the funding structure of the particular institution, the continuing education division, acting as the delegate of the parent institution, may be the most appropriate body to assume the type of responsibility outlined above.

The second basic assumption is that adequate funding will be made available for the development and maintenance of an off-campus library support system. This financial aid is a manifestation of the sense of responsibility assumed by either the parent institution or by the continuing education division.

The third assumption is that the responsibility and the funding will be passed on from either of the above mentioned bodies to the library administration, giving them a mandate to develop the appropriate means to support the off-campus programs. The ACRL Guidelines indicate that the library has the primary responsibility in this area but, in reality, the library is normally dependent upon external funding to develop this type of service and often must prepare a case to convince the institutional administration of the need to assume and delegate responsibility.

Factors such as these add to the complexity of developing models of off-campus services. On-campus, the existence of certain library services is taken for granted (e.g. circulation of materials, reference assistance) and the degree to which these services are offered depends on the current budget. These organized systems of library support usually do not exist for off-campus programs without special provisions from campus. Local libraries provide some assistance for off-campus students, but the support is usually happenstance and not specifically designed to meet the needs of students from other institutions. Remote teaching centers or branch campuses can provide some services similar to those available at the main campus, but generally there is insufficient budget to address all the library needs of the off-campus student. At the parent institution, off-campus students tend to become an invisible, silent minority. Without some sort of external pressure, it is all too easy for the administration to overlook the library needs of these people in favour of the more visible majority of on-campus students and faculty who are more vocal about their library needs.

In the United States, the impetus for the implementation of off-campus library services is frequently received from regional accrediting bodies and state licensing agencies (Kascus & Aguilar, 1988). These bodies often require institutions to demonstrate some means of library support for their off-campus programs as part of the accreditation process. Since Canadian institutions are not normally scrutinized by these types of bodies, except in specific subject areas like librarianship, the impetus for off-campus library support is less direct and frequently stems from the development of government funded distance education programs (Slade, 1991). As a result, Canadian librarians face a somewhat greater challenge to convince their administrations of the value of off-campus library support and the need to assume responsibility and provide financial support for this area.

**A Librarian-Centered Model**

The proposed model differs somewhat in emphasis from the frameworks established by other authors (e.g. Burge et al., 1988, 1989; Affleck, 1987) in that it is centered around the role of the librarian who is designated to coordinate off-campus library services. Other authors do include this role in their models and stress its importance, but do not use it as the pivotal focus of their frameworks. A fourth basic assumption in the process of responsibility delegation is that the library will appoint one individual to "plan, implement, coordinate, and evaluate library resources and services addressing the information needs of the extended campus community" (ACRL, 1990, p. 355). This person is regarded as the central element in the framework illustrated in Figure 1.
In the model, responsibility for the development and delivery of off-campus library services is delegated from either the institutional administration or the continuing education division to the campus library. The library in turn appoints or designates a librarian to assume the responsibility for coordinating all aspects of the off-campus support system and for acting in a liaison role with all the component offices and people. In addition to the relationships which naturally exist between these
component parts, the librarian acts as a filter through which all aspects of the off-campus library support system must pass. Where there is a regional center or branch campus, the off-campus librarian may either be in charge of the library facilities at this location or act as an intermediary between the center and the students. The model is based on a proactive role for the off-campus librarian. In this role, nothing is left to chance or to the priorities of other personnel. The needs of all relevant parties are assessed, cooperative access arrangements are negotiated, and necessary resources are acquired in advance. The rationale for a proactive approach to services is to encourage the use of library materials in off-campus programs while at the same time controlling that use to ensure that demands are reasonable and realistic in relation to the availability of staff and materials. To date, the trend in off-campus education has been to provide library support on an ad hoc basis or in a reactive manner. Clear evidence of this trend was found in the results of The Second Canadian Off-Campus Library Services Survey (Slade, 1988, p.79). The present model is an attempt to encourage effective planning and coordination in this area of librarianship in order to enhance the quality of off-campus programs.

In the role of proactive coordinator of services, the off-campus librarian is responsible for the following tasks:

1. Analyzing the planning context and the user system;

2. Conducting needs assessments;

3. Translating needs into goals and objectives;

4. Establishing priorities;

5. Requesting funding;

6. Establishing a library support system.

All the component offices and people should be included in this planning process to ensure that the needs of each group are clearly identified and priorities are established to meet those needs. In a reactive model, the library is a passive participant, responding to the demands of faculty and students. Under these conditions, there is minimal interchange of information between the continuing education division, the faculty and the library about courses, assignments, deadlines, and anticipated demand for library resources. Burge et al. (1988, 1989) found in their study that library services were often excluded from distance education courses because course designers saw no need to supplement the information provided to the students in prepackaged form. As these authors point out, this is partly due to the lack of communication between the library and the personnel responsible for designing and delivering the courses.

The planning process illustrated in Figure 2 is an extension of the conceptual framework of relationships presented in Figure 1. It is based on needs assessment, exchange of information, and communication designed to encourage and control the use of library resources in off-campus education. After all the relevant information has been collected through this process, the input can be used to create a support system consisting of appropriate services, library materials, physical facilities, and communication and delivery mechanisms.
Figure 2.

1. Assume Responsibility
2. Designate Librarian
3. Analyze Planning Context
4. Conduct Needs Assessment
5. Set Goals and Objectives
6. Establish Priorities
7. Request Funding
8. Establish Support System

- Contin. Ed. Division
- Faculty
- Students
- Other Libraries
- Branch or Center

- Services
- Materials
- Facilities
- Mechanisms
The Planning Context and User System

The first stage in this model involves the designated off-campus librarian analyzing the planning context and the user system. The planning context focuses upon the forms of off-campus education provided by the institution, the types of programs offered, and the departments or offices responsible for developing and delivering off-campus courses. The user system concentrates on the types of students who participate in off-campus education, their numbers and their locations. The characteristics of faculty and course designers also are significant factors in the user system.

Essentially, the librarian needs to understand why off-campus education is offered by the institution, who finances it, which departments are involved, and for whom it is intended. To effectively initiate a library support system, the librarian must be able to relate it to the context in which off-campus education is offered. This requires collecting information on the following areas:

1. Program responsibilities: Which departments offer off-campus programs? Is coordination centralized or decentralized?

2. Program areas: What disciplines, subjects, and courses are offered?

3. Program types: What forms of off-campus education are utilized? How are the off-campus courses delivered?

4. Program levels: Are there graduate as well as undergraduate programs? Are there certificate or diploma programs?

5. Program size: How many courses are offered? How many students are involved?

6. Program location: Where are courses offered? If there are distance education courses, over what area are students dispersed? What is the urban-rural ratio?

7. Program participants: What types of students are involved?

Needs Assessments

Once the librarian has acquired an overview of the planning context and user system, the next stage is to conduct needs assessments involving all the relevant participants in the off-campus programs. A need is basically a "gap" which exists between a current state of affairs and a desired state of affairs. The role of the librarian in this context is learn what is the current state of affairs with regards to off-campus education, what is the desired state of affairs according to the various participants, and what "gaps" exist. From this process, a list of needs can be created. Needs assessments should ideally be conducted with each of the following groups:

Continuing Education Division

Institutions vary according to whether they utilize a centralized or decentralized system for providing off-campus education. In some institutions, off-campus courses are entirely the responsibility of the faculty departments. In others, a central office such as a continuing education division coordinates the off-campus offerings and works in conjunction with faculty. Specific funding may also stem from this centralized office.

Where such an office or division exists, it is important for the off-campus librarian to discover how programs are planned and delivered and how the division sees the role of the library in this
process. Does the division understand how the library can contribute to course development and delivery? Has the division considered the option of reducing the number of required readings in course packages and allowing the library to provide optional readings on request? Is the administration of the division interested in exploring what needs could be filled by enhanced library support? Are they willing to include a librarian in their planning process? These and other questions are important to determine what role library support is to play in off-campus programs. The librarian may need to conduct this particular needs assessment in a very proactive way to encourage the continuing education division to evaluate its position on library support.

While the focus of this needs assessment is on the needs of the continuing education division with regards to the library, the process can also clarify the needs of the library vis-a-vis the division. As was mentioned earlier, additional funding may often be required to establish an off-campus library support system. Would the division be willing to consider providing a financial contribution to the library to implement this type of support? What effort will be required on the part of the library or the off-campus librarian to develop more effective relations with the division? Does the librarian need to work closely with this division to establish and deliver library support or are faculty departments more appropriate channels for this process? Answers to questions such as these will assist in determining the demands upon the library in this process.

Faculty and Part-Time Instructors

Even when a central office coordinates the off-campus programs, faculty or part-time instructors are usually responsible for course development and delivery. These people determine what readings and assignments are given to the students. There is a tendency in off-campus education to eliminate the need for library support because it is too cumbersome, too time-consuming, or too costly (Slade, 1987a). In conducting a needs assessment, the off-campus librarian should learn what types of readings and assignments are currently provided to students and whether faculty and part-time instructors would be interested in changing these readings and assignments if enhanced library support were available. Basically the librarian needs to determine which individuals would be willing to motivate their students to use library resources. In some cases, a little persuasion may be necessary to encourage certain faculty members and instructors to think of the benefits of enhanced library support.

In addition to the above information, the librarian should determine the level of support required for the different programs. Would a collection of books be sufficient or will the students need access to periodical articles or audio-visual material? Would a literature search be useful for the faculty member to aid with course preparation? Could some student topics be researched in advance so that packages of materials are available for loan to the students when required? If there are graduate programs, what indexing, abstracting, or online sources would the students need to access for their research? The librarian should ideally talk to each faculty member and part-time instructor involved in the off-campus program to determine the potential needs for library support. In cases where distance education courses utilize tutors, these people should be included in the needs assessment process in order to learn what difficulties students have encountered in accessing and using additional resources for their courses.

Students

Assessing the needs of off-campus students is an area which is easily neglected in the planning of off-campus services. This is due largely to the geographic dispersion of the students, their numbers and the distances involved. Surveys are one effective way to include student reactions in the planning process, but they are costly and time-consuming to conduct. The off-campus literature contains a number of examples of student surveys, including two recent Canadian studies (Appavoo
& Hansen, 1989; Burge et al., 1988, 1989). If it is impractical to conduct a thorough student survey, there are a number of ways the off-campus librarian could obtain some information which would assist in determining student needs. One way is through sampling. This could involve selecting a small number of students from a cross-section of locations and contacting these people for informal feedback. If there are off-campus classroom courses or distance education courses with group meetings, the librarian could arrange a visit to two or three of these sessions to talk with the students. Indirect methods can assist in this regard. Information obtained from faculty and part-time instructors, course evaluations, local libraries, and surveys conducted at other institutions can supply some insights into the library needs of off-campus students.

Other Libraries

An important aspect of the needs assessment process is to determine which libraries are available to off-campus students and whether the students are likely to obtain appropriate resources and information through these local facilities. This requires that the librarian be familiar with the locations of students and the libraries situated in those areas. Using information obtained from the continuing education division and/or the faculty, the librarian can match subjects and curriculum topics to the holdings of the local libraries. This can be done by accessing online, CD-ROM, or microfiche catalogs where they exist, as well as through using the telephone, mail, fax, or personal visits. In addition to holdings information, the librarian also needs to learn the policies of these local libraries with regards to serving students from other institutions and whether the libraries would be willing to enter into formal or informal arrangements to provide space and collections as required.

Branch or Center

Where a regional center or branch campus exists, the off-campus librarian should conduct a thorough examination of the facilities to determine what resources and equipment are presently located there, whether there is space to add library materials, and whether there would be staff available to provide service and security for these materials. Students' use of the center should also be examined to determine how frequently these people meet at the center and how far they need to travel to get there. The objective in this context is to determine to what extent the center could be used to effectively provide library information and resources to the off-campus students. For example, if the majority of the students live a considerable distance from the center and only travel there once a week for classes, it may not be practical to develop elaborate library support systems and collections at the center.

Translating Needs Into Goals and Objectives

Once all the information from the needs assessments has been amalgamated and studied, the next step in the planning process is to use this information to establish goals and objectives for off-campus library support. Goals are considered to be broad, general statements which define the purpose of the program while objectives are more specific statements which provide a framework for achievement of the goals. The ACRL Guidelines advocate that immediate and long-range goals and objectives be developed into a written statement which lists the needs to be addressed and the methods by which progress can be measured. Some of the Guidelines themselves serve as examples of goals and objectives which could be incorporated into an institution's written statement. Any goals and objectives established for off-campus library support should be consistent with the broader mission of the main library in relation to the parent institution (ACRL, 1990, p. 354).

The process of translating needs into written goals and objectives aids in focusing and refining the responsibilities of the parent institution, the continuing education division, the library, and the
off-campus librarian with regards to off-campus library support. If endorsed, these goals and objectives commit the library, the continuing education division, and the institution to a plan of action to meet the needs which have been identified in the document. They also provide a rationale for funding to develop and maintain off-campus library support.

Establishing Priorities

Inevitably, the goals and objectives derived from the needs assessment process will be too ambitious for the initial phase of development for off-campus library support. The goals and objectives represent ideals to be worked towards for optimum service. To make the task of support development more realistic and more acceptable to institutional budgets, priorities will have to be established. In proposing a new or enhanced system of off-campus support, the librarian may choose to recommend that it be implemented in stages, with each stage or level being evaluated before another one is implemented. The priority ranking of the different needs and objectives will depend on a number of variables, including the demonstrated interest in or demand for library resources, the existing support systems, the availability of nonaffiliated libraries with appropriate collections, the required use of technology, and the implications for staffing patterns and budget allocation.

Requesting Funding

After the goals and objectives for off-campus library support have been prioritized, the next step is for the librarian to present a funding proposal, based on the first priority needs, to the appropriate administration. In many cases, the library may be the first department to receive this proposal. However, in some institutions, the off-campus librarian may have the autonomy to deal directly with the continuing education division or the faculty departments.

The proposal for funding should include reference to the following items:

- staff (professional and support);
- collection development;
- photocopying and printing;
- communications systems;
- document delivery;
- postage and shipping;
- publicity and user orientation;
- computer support;
- contractual arrangements with other libraries;
- evaluation;
- travel budget for the off-campus librarian.

Where appropriate, the funding proposal should make reference to possible cost-sharing arrangements between campus departments such as the library and the continuing education division. Costs should also be divided according to whether they are "start-up" or ongoing costs. Cost information should take into account support for faculty in course development as well as support for off-campus students.

Establishing an Off-Campus Library Support System

Many of the models for off-campus library support created to date combine the planning process and the support system in one list of component elements (e.g. Slade, 1987b, 1988; Affleck, 1987; Kascus & Aguilar, 1988; Burge et al., 1988, 1989). This approach has been valuable and necessary,
but does not provide a sequential overview of the process required to develop this sort of support system. In this paper, the off-campus library support system is seen as the end product in the process. The key element in this regard is the role of the off-campus librarian who is charged with the responsibility for developing and implementing the system in an organized manner. Once all the necessary steps have been accomplished to this point, a support model can be introduced based on needs, goals and objectives, priorities, and available funding. This support model consists of four broad categories: services, materials, facilities, and mechanisms. The component elements of these categories will be identified in the sections which follow.

**Services**

The term "services" has been used in a very broad manner in the off-campus library literature to encompass many or all of the aspects of the process of support system development, implementation, and maintenance. Even the ACRL Guidelines are labelled "extended campus library services" when "services" are just one component of the framework. The term "support" has been deliberately used in this model to reflect the larger context of a system. "System" is utilized to indicate the concept of a coordinated set of functions grouped together in an orderly manner to form a unified whole. "Services" in this context are activities within the support system designed to assist individuals, groups, and organizations involved with or affected by the forms of off-campus education. The area of "services" may be divided by the type of participants illustrated in Figure 1: students, faculty and course developers, the continuing education division, nonaffiliated libraries, the regional center or branch campus (where it exists), and the campus library itself.

**Services to students.**

This is the most frequently discussed area in off-campus library support and has been well documented in publications such as The Second Canadian Off-Campus Library Services Survey (Slade, 1988). For the purposes of this model, the commonly identified service elements will be listed without commentary. Further discussion of the significance of some of these elements can be found in Affleck (1987) and Slade (1987b). Typical services to off-campus students include:

- depository collections at local sites;
- access arrangements with local libraries;
- telephone, mail, and electronic access to the campus library;
- document delivery;
- reference assistance from campus librarians;
- access to online catalogs;
- computer search services;
- bibliographic instruction;
- publicity and advertising;
- interlibrary loans;
- consultation with campus librarians.

**Services to faculty, instructors, and course developers.**

The off-campus librarian, if allowed, can play a significant role in assisting with the development of off-campus courses. Unfortunately, librarians are all too often excluded from the program and course planning process (Burge et al., 1989; Slade, 1991). This is why a proactive approach is necessary to alert the relevant parties to the fact that the off-campus librarian can make a contribution to the planning process. As discussed in Slade (1987a), the librarian can assist faculty, part-time instructors, and course developers in the following ways:
• providing information about library policies, procedures, and collections;
• advising on the suitability of library resources for specific courses;
• advising on the availability of specific library resources;
• arranging for the acquisition of required material;
• conducting literature searches for course topics;
• preparing bibliographies on course topics;
• arranging access to recommended titles through the library as an alternative to including this material in the course package;
• preparing collections of materials to assist students in the completion of assignments;
• recommending ways in which library resources can be effectively integrated into off-campus courses;
• arranging local access to materials and collections where appropriate.

**Services to the continuing education division.**

Where off-campus courses are coordinated by a continuing education division, the librarian can assist with program planning in ways similar to those outlined for faculty and course developers. The principal means in which the off-campus librarian can serve this type of agency are:

• acting as a liaison between the division and the library;
• providing information about library policies, procedures, and collections;
• conducting literature searches for members of the division as required;
• advising on the role of the library in off-campus education;
• providing input into divisional meetings and committees;
• suggesting ways in which the availability of library resources can reduce the costs associated with course readings and copyright clearance;
• advising on current developments in copyright issues and information transmission technologies.

**Services to other libraries.**

Part of the concept of responsibility discussed earlier in this paper concerns the parent institution and the campus library assuming responsibility for coordinating access to nonaffiliated libraries where appropriate. This concept is reflected in the ACRL Guidelines (ACRL, 1990, p. 354). In this model, local library use is not left to chance. The off-campus librarian should survey the holdings and resources (including technology) of significant libraries accessible to the off-campus students. From this survey, the librarian should compile a list of libraries with resources appropriate to the off-campus curriculum and negotiate access to these resources for the off-campus students. This process can have several advantages for the nonaffiliated libraries:

• notification of impending use by off-campus students;
• notification of which resources or collections may be required;
• loan of appropriate resources to supplement local holdings;
• purchase of materials or resources in exchange for services to students;
• reciprocal arrangements with the campus library;
• fees for services where required;
• reference support from the campus library through communications technologies and online catalogs.
Services to a branch or center.

Where a regional center or branch campus exists, the off-campus librarian can either assume responsibility for the operation of the library facilities at that location or act as a liaison from the main campus. In either case, the librarian can provide a number of benefits to the center by:

- negotiating for space for library collections;
- negotiating for staff to manage those collections and provide library service;
- negotiating for the installation of computer and communications technologies to support library access;
- arranging agreements with local libraries for back-up library support;
- arranging for the acquisition of new library materials or the deposit of core collections from campus.

Services to the campus library.

This section could also be labelled "benefits to the campus library." If the off-campus librarian is given the appropriate responsibility, autonomy, and budget to develop a library support system, that person should be able to provide a number of services and benefits to the campus library by:

- coordinating all aspects of the support system to free other librarians from these tasks;
- anticipating demands for materials and resources and resolving conflicts between on-campus and off-campus needs;
- acquiring additional resources for off-campus use to relieve the pressure on on-campus resources;
- supervising support staff with off-campus responsibilities;
- negotiating formal or informal agreements with nonaffiliated libraries to serve off-campus students;
- obtaining advance information from faculty, part-time instructors, and course developers regarding off-campus course requirements, including assignments, required materials, deadlines, and anticipated demand;
- negotiating for additional funding and increased budgets to support off-campus library requirements.

Materials

In this model of an off-campus library support system, the term "materials" refers to print and audio-visual items normally available through a library or media center. With regard to print items, usually books, documents, and periodical articles, there are several options for making this material available to off-campus students:

- materials in the campus libraries can be made available, on request, to off-campus students on a first-come, first-served basis;
- periodical articles can be copied on demand and sent off-campus by mail, courier, or fax;
- monographs can be loaned to off-campus students for regular or special periods and sent off-campus by mail or courier;
- a separate "extension" library can be created especially for off-campus students;
- access to the collections of nonaffiliated libraries can be negotiated for off-campus students;
- core collections can be deposited at local libraries, regional centers, or other locations close to the off-campus students;
• recommended readings and high demand items can be set aside on a short term basis at the campus library for off-campus use and returned to the main collection when the courses are finished;
• duplicate copies of high demand items can be purchased for off-campus use to supplement the main campus copy;
• packages of materials on course topics can be assembled in advance and loaned to off-campus students on request;
• interlibrary loans can be initiated on behalf of off-campus students;
• a combination of some or all of the above options can be utilized.

The issue of making audio-visual materials available to off-campus students is more controversial and problematic than the issue of loaning print items. Some of the questions associated with this topic are:

• Are there audio-visual materials which would be appropriate to the course content or instructional objectives?
• Are these materials already available on-campus?
• If so, are they in heavy demand on-campus?
• If these materials are not available on-campus or are in heavy demand, can money be made available to purchase copies specifically for the off-campus program?
• Are students likely to have access to the equipment necessary to use these materials?
• Can equipment access be arranged in the local communities?
• Can multiple demands for the same material be met within a reasonable length of time?
• What is the most efficient means to transport A-V materials to off-campus locations?
• What are the risks of damage or loss?
• Should students be charged for this type of service?

In theory, audio-visual materials could be loaned to off-campus students in the same manner as print materials. However, due to problems with availability of playback equipment, turnaround time, and risk of damage, some institutions may be reluctant to make these types of items available to off-campus students. To date, there has been no published literature which addresses this issue. The only reference to the provision of audio-visual materials in this context occurs in The Second Canadian Off-Campus Library Services Survey where 58% of the universities and colleges which supply core collections reported that they include audio-visual materials on a selective basis (Slade, 1988, p.11).

Facilities

"Facilities" refers to physical space available to off-campus students. Since most of these students seldom visit the main campus, any facilities provided would have to be arranged in the local communities. Burge et al. recommend that local public library facilities include the provision of a 35-40 square metre (115-130 square foot) space for use by distance education students (1989, p.333). Formal or informal arrangements with nonaffiliated libraries may be necessary to supply some facilities for off-campus students. Other community institutions such as schools, community colleges, and recreational centers are potential locations which could also be developed for off-campus library purposes. Again, it is the role of the off-campus librarian to investigate these possibilities where appropriate and to negotiate suitable arrangements with the organizations concerned.

Regional centers and branch campuses are often logical locations for off-campus library facilities. However, as was discussed above under "Needs Assessments," there are a number of variables which can influence a decision to use these centers for library purposes. The availability of space and staff
are two significant factors in this regard. A more comprehensive examination of the variables affecting regional centers appears in Slade (1989).

Where facilities other than those of nonaffiliated libraries are used, the space should ideally include provisions for ready reference collections, core collections, computer terminals with access to online catalogs, means of electronic communication with the main campus, and equipment and software for database literature searches (online or CD-ROM). In addition to the above provisions, the ACRL Guidelines recommend space for consultations with librarians or library staff (ACRL, 1990, p. 355).

Mechanisms

The term "mechanisms" refers to the communications, computer, bibliographic, and delivery systems required to provide off-campus students with access to library information and materials. Included in this category are online public access catalogs (OPACs), microfiche catalogs, online or CD-ROM bibliographic databases, printed indexing and abstracting sources, electronic mail, telephone access, telefacsimile transmission, and postal and courier delivery services.

A common goal of an off-campus library support system is equality of access to library information between off-campus and on-campus students (e.g. Affleck, 1987, p.5). As part of its mandate in assuming responsibility for meeting the library needs of its off-campus students, the parent institution must be prepared to finance appropriate mechanisms for students to access and receive information and materials. The ACRL Guidelines support this premise by stating: "The library should provide facilities, equipment, and communications links sufficient in size, number, and scope to attain the objectives of the extended campus programs" (ACRL, 1990, p. 355). Since off-campus students are physically distant from the campus library, it is important that appropriate communications links and bibliographic sources be made available to these people.

Communications systems.

The most common communication mechanism employed in off-campus library support systems is the telephone. Many authors advocate the use of toll-free telephone lines to provide off-campus students with a means to request material and information from the campus library (e.g. Slade, 1987b, Kascus & Aguilar, 1988; Burge et al., 1989). Alternative means of communication are gradually becoming available in this context, the most notable being electronic mail and telefacsimile transmission. Some OPACs also have messaging capabilities which can enable the user to request the loan of an item directly through the online system. These types of communication links to the campus library are vital for the off-campus student who cannot obtain adequate library information in his or her community.

Bibliographic systems.

When possible, it is important to the off-campus student's educational experience to enable this person to select his or her own library materials. The increasing availability of OPACs is greatly facilitating this process. Where OPACs do exist, it is important for the off-campus librarian to attempt to arrange access to the system from nonaffiliated libraries, regional centers, branch campuses, and other appropriate institutions in the communities where off-campus students reside. Burge et al. recommend that public libraries which serve five or more distance education students per term be provided with computer terminals to access the OPACs of academic libraries (1989, p.334). Clear instructions regarding sign-on and access should be prepared and placed in centers where an OPAC is available. These instructions should also be sent to off-campus students who have their own personal computers and modems.
In cases where catalog holdings and serials lists from the campus library are available in microfiche format, these sources could be placed in strategic off-campus locations to serve as substitutes for or supplements to the OPACs. This arrangement would be particularly useful in small communities where the local library does not own the equipment necessary for accessing an OPAC.

As well as OPACs and microfiche catalogs, the off-campus support system should include access to online bibliographic databases and CD-ROM systems. Burr (1988) provides an example of successful application of these systems to an off-campus program. In the needs assessment process, the off-campus librarian should ascertain what systems and resources are presently available in the local communities and make this information known to off-campus students. Where a large number of students are concentrated in an area, the librarian should investigate the feasibility of installing the necessary equipment and software on site for the students to use. Local libraries may be willing to assist in this regard by providing services in return for the installation of systems such as CD-ROM databases. Also, the major database vendors such as Dialog and BRS have menu-driven online search systems which are designed for the untrained user. Information on these systems should be provided to those off-campus students who have access to the necessary equipment.

In addition to online or CD-ROM systems, it may be advisable to provide access to printed indexes and abstracts for off-campus students. Again, a survey of local resources should be part of the needs assessment process and a list should be provided to off-campus students of relevant reference sources available in the local communities. Where there is a sufficient number of students in an area, the off-campus librarian may wish to place sets of appropriate indexes or abstracts at a regional center or local library for student use. Whatever resources are concerned, it is important that their availability be well publicized to off-campus students.

**Delivery systems.**

The issue of document delivery has been examined in a number of American sources (e.g. Gilmer, 1989) and in *The Second Canadian Off-Campus Library Services Survey* (Slade, 1988). The postal service and courier companies remain the primary means for a library to transport monographs and audio-visual materials to off-campus locations. Fax machines are becoming commonly available and provide the campus library with an ideal means to deliver a reasonable number of articles to off-campus students in a very short time. The off-campus librarian, as part of the needs assessment process, should investigate the access to fax facilities in the local communities in order to convey this information to off-campus students. Arrangements with local libraries could also be negotiated in this regard to provide the students with a centralized sending and receiving point for facsimile transmissions.

**Conclusion**

The wide scope of this model inhibits thorough discussion of all the factors and variables which occur in developing and implementing an off-campus library support system. The framework established in this paper is general and not intended to invalidate the models created by other authors. Rather it is intended to enhance them and to provide a broader context which encompasses the major forms of off-campus education.

As a result of this sweeping perspective, some elements in the process have not received as much attention as they have in other publications. Two such components are support staff and evaluation. For any off-campus library support system to be effective, it requires "support personnel sufficient in number and of the quality necessary to attain the goals and objectives of the extended campus program" (ACRL, 1990, p.355). Evaluation ideally should be of two types in the context of
off-campus library support: formative and summative. Formative evaluation occurs as an on-going process during the entire planning stage. It provides information relating to the degree and rate of progress in meeting identified needs and fulfilling goals and objectives. Summative evaluation occurs at the completion of a planning stage or implementation project and provides information for future decision-making and institutional accountability. Summative evaluation of off-campus library support would normally consist of obtaining formal or informal feedback and reactions from all the participants in the support system illustrated in Figure 1.

There are three features which make this model unique in the off-campus library literature. The first is its focus on the role of the off-campus librarian as the central element in planning and implementing the support system. The second involves the concept of "system" to connote an organized, integrated whole. As was mentioned earlier, many institutions tend to provide off-campus library support on an ad hoc basis (Slade, 1988). This model is a deliberate attempt to stress a proactive approach to this area rather than a reactive one. An important aspect of the proactive approach is the emphasis on communication and exchange of information. Marketing and publicity are necessary in an off-campus library support system to ensure that all participants know what to expect from the system. This is especially important for the students involved so that they know what resources they can access in their local communities and what services and materials they can expect to obtain through the main campus library.

The third major feature of this model focuses upon the concept of "process" to both distinguish the planning activities from the end product of a support system and, at the same time, to demonstrate the sequential cause and effect relationship between the two elements. "Process" also indicates an ongoing activity and it must be stressed that aspects of the planning stage, as well as summative evaluations, need to be practiced continually in order to maintain an effective, proactive system which responds to the needs of all the participants in the model.

A model is essentially an analogy to be used for comparison or imitation. Not all the factors of the model proposed in this paper will be applicable to any particular institution. However, this model may serve as a framework for comparison from which institutions and libraries can extract those elements that seem appropriate to their needs and local conditions. The field of off-campus education is so diverse that no one model will ever encompass all the relevant variables in such a way as to function as a definitive blueprint for every university and college. This model expands upon the existing off-campus library literature and blends conceptual and procedural components in such a way as to enable institutions and practitioners to examine the issue of off-campus library support from the broader perspective of a proactive, process-oriented system. The challenge ahead is to further develop a research base to support and substantiate models such as this and to justify the expenditures required to implement and maintain effective library systems that can enhance the quality of all forms of off-campus education.
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CD-ROM Reference Access and Delivery

Steven L. Smith and Sharon M. West
University of Alaska Fairbanks

There is little dispute that Alaska is a large, beautiful, often inhospitable land. Most people experience it in small bits as tourists. Behind the romanticism of life in the north is the reality of living and conducting business there. One of those realities is the delivery of higher education. For many students that means education at a distance. That usually means library service at a distance.

Consider these obstacles. In all of Alaska (586,412 square miles) there are only 5,679 miles of roads and only 2,676 miles of those are paved. Literally hundreds of communities are simply not accessible by ground transportation (unless you consider dog sled or snow machine). The 2,991 rural students (Fiscal Year 1990) enrolled in various courses and degree programs at the University of Alaska Fairbanks have access to a combined collection of all local libraries of around 40,000 volumes. One library holds 25,000 of those volumes. That leaves a combined collection of 15,000 spread throughout communities over several thousand square miles. Many rural degree seeking students, both undergraduate and graduate, don't have any local library (or only a limited public school collection unsuitable for college level work). Yet students are taking courses via audio teleconference based on a semester timetable. They have deadlines for papers, projects and theses just like local campus students. Similarly, faculty and staff for those students are spread throughout the state. They have extensive research and instructional support library needs.

To serve these needs Elmer E. Rasmuson Library at the University of Alaska Fairbanks organized an Extended Campus Services unit in 1989. As it has evolved to meet specific needs a number of strategies and technologies have been employed. Among those is the use of CD-ROM (Compact Disc - Read Only Memory) databases mounted on a network. This paper will detail some of our experiences with CD-ROM and library services to off-campus patrons.

Background

The University of Alaska Fairbanks includes five extended campuses, seven rural education centers, a cross cultural education development program that stretches from the Aleutian Islands to Barrow (the northernmost community in the United States), and a statewide network of research centers, Cooperative Extension Offices and Marine Advisory Program offices. Elmer E. Rasmuson Library is the primary research and academic library for all University of Alaska Fairbanks programs, including the extended programs listed above. Three of the extended campuses have local campus or consortium libraries. One has a collection of 25,000 volumes. The other rural sites have small, informal collections. Rural students may take courses and pursue certain degree programs from their home communities. In those instances, there is no immediate access to even these limited library resources. To facilitate equitable access to library services for all students, faculty and staff regardless of location, the Rasmuson Library Extended Campus Services unit offers a diversity of support. It includes:

- Toll free telephone assistance
- 48 hour turnaround time from receipt of request to mail pickup
- On-line electronic mail and interlibrary loan requests
- Fax service
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Extended campus library services are experiencing a dramatic growth pattern. Unfortunately no staff have been added to deal with this increase. Turnaround in 48 hours becomes difficult to sustain. Lacking additional staff we have looked toward technological innovation to help meet patron demand.

**CD-ROM ala LAN**

About the same time Rasmuson Library made a commitment to delivery of services to rural patrons, there was a realization that better access to multiple CD-ROM databases was needed. The library was sprouting single, dedicated CD-ROM workstations like weeds in a garden. Our local campus users, including librarians, got as much exercise as playing 18 holes of golf moving from workstation to workstation. Our extended campus users had no access to this information except when a librarian could enter the moving queue to conduct a search. Take a number and wait.

In 1990 we mounted most of our CD-ROM databases on a Local Area Network (LAN) dubbed ElmerNet. Immediately multiple databases became available at multiple workstations. Workstations are placed throughout the main library as well as the BioSciences Library located about one-half mile away from Rasmuson. Figure 2 details the databases available on ElmerNet at this writing.
### Figure 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CD-ROM DATABASE</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABI/Inform</td>
<td>Business/Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Sciences &amp; Fisheries</td>
<td>Marine Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compendex</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIC</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government Documents</td>
<td>Federal Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaserCat</td>
<td>Library Catalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>Periodicals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLA</td>
<td>Language/Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Abstracts</td>
<td>Newspapers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PolarPac</td>
<td>Polar Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical Masterfile</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A top level menu provides all users with a uniform interface. For the public this is a menu with five subject headings. Selecting any subject presents a list of available databases. Figure 3 presents the subject heading users see at the top level menu.

### Figure 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Books &amp; Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some databases, such as Federal Government Documents, appear as a selection under several subject headings. All menus can be changed easily by the system administrator without affecting current activity on the network. Thus, if library faculty wish to rearrange the intellectual order of databases appearing under the subject headings, it can be done in a few minutes.

After three minutes of inactivity at a workstation the system automatically exits a database (after an audible and visible warning with an opportunity for a user to stay active in the database) and returns to the top level menu.

Access to various databases is denied or allowed through user profiles controlled by the library. These privileges can be assigned to groups of users, i.e. all public workstations, or to individual network users. For example, new databases on the network for examination are made available only to specific staff users and workstations. As far as the end user is concerned these privileges are expressed by what options appear on the on-screen menu of selections. What you don’t see, you don’t have access to.

A meter function in the software limits the number of simultaneous or concurrent users who can access a database. For example, if the meter is set to ten, only ten people on the network may use that database concurrently. The poor eleventh fellow who wants entry to the database gets a polite message telling him things are presently a bit busy; please try again later. The meter function can be individually tailored to each database. Hence, database A may be set for ten concurrent users while database B may be set for five concurrent users.
The access privileges and meter functions are important for the bottom line: cost of licensing fees. For example, ABI/Inform costs $150.00 for each concurrent user on the network. Metering allows us to keep concurrent users at a constant level while adding additional users and workstations to the network. Pricing for network access to CD-ROM databases varies widely from vendor to vendor.

ElmerNet has recently been connected to a campus wide fiber optic network. As a result, in the fall of 1991 we will provide access to various departments and individuals throughout the campus. We will also implement a connection into the university's computer network which will open up potential access to users of that statewide system.

We also provide dial-up access to ElmerNet. This has been in a test phase since the spring of 1991. It will move to a regular service in the fall of 1991. Presently for dial-up users we have a dedicated workstation on the network running remote telecommunications software. Several commercial packages of this type of software are available. We use PC-Anywhere which runs on any IBM or compatible. The dial-up user needs one portion of the software for remote access.

The dedicated dial-up or host machine at Rasmuson patiently waits for a call. The remote user, via her PC-Anywhere software and modem equipped microcomputer, calls that lonely machine back at the library. Once the connection is made, for all practical purposes, the keyboard and monitor of the remote user are tied to the CPU (Central Processing Unit) of the host machine in the library. As far as the network is concerned it's just another workstation. This system works equally well with either the public phone system or a dedicated telecommunication line.

The dial-up user will be asked for an ID (identification name) and a password. This helps us limit access to "authorized" users (again important for some licensing agreements) and keep track of how the system is being used. The password is the user's private choice. For IDs, we use the individual's University of Alaska Computer Network ID.

This remote access system has drawbacks. Users are limited to the available number of telecommunication lines. For dial-up we will have two phone lines in the fall of 1991. Dedicating one workstation for each remote user is not a good use of equipment. Dial-up access means users outside the local calling area must pay toll charges. Finally, remote users must currently have the appropriate software (PC-Anywhere in this case) to gain access.

Our solutions to these problems are three:

1. We are installing a communications server to route incoming traffic from multiple telecommunication lines, both dedicated and public switched phone lines. This server includes multiple "computers on a board" which are equivalent to individual, dedicated workstations;

2. We will provide access through bridges to existing wide area networks (WANs) which will allow remote users access via a local rather than a toll call;

3. We will include an interface in the communications server for terminal emulation. This will allow remote users to use most common communications software (Procomm, CrossTalk, etc.) for connection rather than special communications software.

These solutions are not without their own set of problems including licensing, how some databases will translate across networks via terminal emulation, user support, and handling local downloading and printing of records. A year from now we'll report on how we resolved these issues.
LAN, WAN, CD-ROM and ECS

Our operation is not nearly so confusing as the acronyms that title this section. Our goal is to give our off-campus users reasonable access (for the price of a local call) to the library's resources.

Currently network availability of CD-ROM databases enhances extended campus services in two distinct ways.

First, it is a timesaver for librarians doing extended campus reference work. A workstation is readily available. You don't waste time waiting to grab an available station or reserving a slot in the near to distant future to use one. The necessity for a timely response to requests demands promptness in conducting a search. The availability of multiple CD-ROM databases at the workstation allows us to search, in a matter of minutes, for references from many sources. We don't have to run around asking, "OK, who's got the ERIC CD today?" The results can be printed out immediately and sent to the patron via post or telefacsimile. Another option is to download the results and send them via electronic mail.

From our point of view, distance delivery of library materials requires us to expedite reference requests. Network access to CD-ROMs to librarians is an essential tool to providing that service.

Secondly, in the long term we want our patrons, particularly our off-campus patrons, to become as self-sufficient as possible in filling their information needs. Direct access to CD-ROM databases is a way to promote that self-sufficiency. It is one thing for a rural patron to send a request for information into a distant black hole called a library. After some time, hopefully sooner rather than later, the black hole emits some information back. Presumably, the information is just the thing that person was looking for. If not, the process is repeated. If so, the patron sifts through the citations and initiates another request to receive the actual materials.

Too many times the reference librarian may have to second guess what someone really needs, basing that decision on a few notes jotted down by another staff member taking the initial request. Our experience has been that many of our rural users may have limited knowledge of libraries. The time lag, no matter how efficient the library staff and the delivery systems, between someone perceiving an information need and getting information in hand tends to distort and confuse. Direct experience is a better teacher and guide. How much more useful for a person to directly interact with sources of information. Try one search approach and see immediately what the results are. That is the rationale behind providing direct access to CD-ROM databases for remote patrons. Let the individual conduct his or her own search. Direct access to the CD-ROM network provides instant feedback, allowing the person to refine and better define information needs in a fashion similar to the way an on-campus person might use the library. This also frees up the librarians to spend more time on difficult searches and working with patrons to improve the patron's own information seeking skills.

Risky Business

This empowerment of the remote user is not without risks. There are three distinct ones we've perceived thus far in our limited foray into this arena.

First, you need constant, reliable, and speedy technical support. Frustration levels can quickly be reached and surpassed dealing with technology. The top priority for our technical people is to keep the network running and assist users, particularly remote users, to use the technology.
Second, you need user training. One of the problems with the myriad of CD-ROM databases is that every vendor (it seems) has a different interface, each with its own commands and nomenclature. Does one use * or ? for truncation? Do you hit the F2 key or the ENTER key to begin a search? How do you do a Boolean search (and where do you find on-screen help to tell you what a Boolean search is in the first place)? Every vendor we've spoken with claims their CD-ROM is user friendly. It is, but in its own unique way. We provide user training and help electronically (e-mail and on-line help screens), by phone (both individually and by audio teleconference), in writing (self-help guides), and through formal class work. We will begin a basic library skills course, taught at a distance, in the fall of 1991.

Third, you need to prepare for the effects of opening access to millions of CD-ROM citations. Specifically, you need to give your interlibrary loan (ILL) staff a big supply of Excedrin. They will need it. Although it is too early to see the effects of dial-up and other direct remote access to our CD-ROM LAN, there does appear to be a relationship between ILL and extended campus service. Figure 3 compares the performance of those two over the 90-91 academic year.

Our ILL borrowing has steadily increased as we've added more CD-ROM databases and expanded LAN access to them. This is one of the "indirect" consequences of network access to CD-ROM. Another we've noted is a substantial increase in the use of microform reader/printers. People are finding citations more easily, for example, to our ERIC microfilm collection.

Figure 4. UAF Rasmuson Library ILL Borrowing & ECS Services
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In short, expanded access to databases on CD-ROM is multiplying the demand for the full document or book.
A Final Word

Because of both an institutional and philosophical commitment, our library serves patrons spread over several hundred thousand miles of mostly empty land. Through a variety of means, including direct access to a CD-ROM network, we are trying to provide equitable service to both local and remote patrons. The technologies we've chosen work. It is the human elements--working with vendors and license agreements, educating users and staff--that keep us both challenged and glad for the end of the week (of course with an on-line system there is no "end of the week"). Our alternative is to provide inferior service to people who, for as many reasons as there are citations on a CD-ROM, are unable to walk through the doors of our library.

Although the conditions in Alaska may seem extreme, what we are doing holds much in common for other libraries. As budgets seem to shrink and more information becomes available in optical and electronic forms, sharing resources across networks appears the most viable option to serving our users, wherever they may live.
Remote Access to the Online Catalog for Off-Campus Clientele

Karl R. Steiner
Saginaw Valley State University

The implementation of the NOTIS online public access catalog (OPAC) at Central Michigan University Libraries presented a unique opportunity to the more than 12,000 CMU students enrolled in the centers and special sites across the country and Canada. The students, faculty and administrators would now have access to the libraries' catalog through dial-up ports on the university's mainframe computer where the OPAC is mounted. This automated access to the catalog supplements the existing CMU Off-Campus Library Services (OCLS) program.

OCLS was formed in 1974 to provide library support to the students, faculty and staff of what was then called the Institute for Career and Personal Development. IPCD was reorganized in 1989 and given its current name, Extended Degree Programs and Credit Courses. Off-campus library services are designed to provide direct access for CMU's off-campus students to the libraries' collection of over 800,000 books, 5,500 periodical titles and 1 million pieces of microform. The library program is composed of two distinct parts, (a) providing access to materials and (b) reference and information services.

The Document Delivery Office (DDO) of OCLS was formed to provide students and faculty with the materials they need for their studies. The DDO's toll-free number is staffed 94 daytime and evening hours during the week. When not staffed the telephones are connected to an answering machine to record peoples' messages. Requests are filled by staff and student workers and mailed out, usually within a 24-hour period. Periodical articles are photocopied free of charge and books are loaned for a four week period.

Reference assistance is provided by six librarians who work exclusively with the off-campus students and faculty. Two librarians are located in Mt. Pleasant, two in the Detroit area and two in the Washington D.C. area. These professional librarians assist the students and faculty in identifying books, periodical articles, government documents and other materials necessary for their studies. The librarians also give in-class bibliographic instruction, prepare course and subject bibliographies, and do database searching. The librarians familiarize themselves with local libraries when they travel to do bibliographic instruction. In this manner they can provide knowledgeable advice to students wishing to do research locally while using OCLS as a supplementary source. In addition to these activities OCLS also provides an instructional resources support collection to help faculty in selecting textbooks for their courses.

So it is from the perspective of these services, already in place, that OCLS became an active participant in planning, with other university library staff, for remote access to the online catalog. The Remote Access Taskforce was created by the Dean of the University Libraries and given the charge to develop "recommendations for providing access to CENTRA [CMU's online public access catalog] from locales outside of the library and to examine the needs of the Off-Campus Library Services program, keeping in mind the costs to be incurred by the remote user, computer services and the Central Michigan University Libraries." With this broad charge in hand the taskforce proceeded to brainstorm further questions that the group should explore. The questions can be divided into three categories: those dealing with the technical aspects of accessing CENTRA, management issues and service concerns.
Technical Questions:

1. What equipment is needed by remote users to access CENTRA?

The off-campus students and faculty need a microcomputer, modem and telecommunications software that will allow the microcomputer to emulate one of many computer terminals (e.g. VT100, ADM3a, etc.) that CMU's mainframe supports.

2. Are CENTRA users able to dial-in directly to the library catalog or do they first have to access the university's mainframe and then select CENTRA from many different user options?

It was deemed too expensive for the library to provide computer services with the equipment necessary to provide direct access to CENTRA. Ideally, access to the OPAC should be direct, thus solving many of the connect/disconnect problems associated with accessing mainframe computers.

3. How do off-campus students and faculty access CENTRA from locations throughout the country and Canada?

Students and faculty who have the necessary equipment, as described earlier, can access CENTRA by dialing directly into the mainframe or first dialing MichNet and then selecting CMU-IBM. MichNet is a taxpayer supported computer network with nodes throughout Michigan. The network is also accessible by dialing into other value-added networks such as SprintNet. MichNet is free to users dialing within Michigan. Off-Campus Library Services is currently experimenting with providing access to MichNet, free of charge, to students and faculty in the Washington D.C. metropolitan area. Monthly charges are being monitored very closely to determine if it is financially feasible to continue this service at no cost to the user. OCLS investigated providing toll-free access to CENTRA for all off-campus students, but could not afford such a service. The taskforce discovered that CENTRA does not automatically log the user out if there has been no activity from a user in a predetermined length of time. This could result in high telecommunication charges by people who log on to CENTRA and forget to log out.

4. How do users exit CENTRA?

Strangely enough, in the early weeks of CENTRA use by remote access there were not many problems with people accessing the system, but there were many questions about how to exit the system. People obviously could just hang-up their phone, but that left a port tied up until the computer realized that that port was not being used and made it available to another user. The solution was to have the NOTIS computer programmer make it possible to exit CENTRA by entering any term, such as quit, logout, logoff, bye, goodbye and including a short message on the CENTRA introductory screen to this effect. Once out of CENTRA, the users were returned to the CMU mainframe introductory screen. At this point the user can either hang-up the phone or use a sequence of key strokes to exit the mainframe. CMU Computer Services was not concerned about users hanging up the phone as a means of exiting the mainframe.

Management Questions:

1. Who provides support to remote users of CENTRA?

The taskforce readily determined that since Computer Services already provided a Help Desk for users of the mainframe, it would make sense to have the Help Desk answer questions concerning the technical aspects of accessing CENTRA. This would include any hardware and software
compatibility problems users might have. The off-campus librarians would be responsible for answering questions concerning how to effectively search the online catalog.

2. Are passwords required to access CENTRA?

The taskforce felt that access to CENTRA should be as easy as possible. As such, no passwords are required for users of CENTRA. Anyone knowing the phone number of the mainframe and having the right equipment can gain access to the online catalog.

Service Questions:

1. How many hours is CENTRA available per day?

CENTRA is available to remote users the same number of hours that it is available to users inside the library, Monday-Friday 7:30 AM to Midnight, Saturday 7:30 AM to 10 PM and Sunday 12 PM to Midnight.

2. What instructions on the use of CENTRA are provided?

The taskforce developed a brochure for remote users. The brochure includes information on when CENTRA is available, technical aspects of configuring microcomputer telecommunications software, phone numbers for the mainframe and MichNet nodes and examples of log-on sequences users might experience when accessing CENTRA. The taskforce did not include instructions on searching the online catalog in the brochure because of the extensive help screen system built into the online catalog. It was decided to keep the brochure limited to instructions on accessing the system and giving the remote user a phone number to call if he/she encountered problems after using the online help screens.

3. How are remote users identified?

At the present time there is no method to identify the remote users of CENTRA through the online system. No passwords are required so the library has no method of knowing who is using the system. Perhaps the primary method of identifying remote users will be when someone requests help in searching CENTRA. At that point OCLS will ask the user his/her name and address in order to start a database of remote users. This database will be useful in soliciting information on how students and faculty are using CENTRA and what ideas they have for improvement of the system. OCLS also has an order form for its publications on which the remote access brochure is included. This will be the start of a database of off-campus students and faculty who are using CENTRA.

In this paper I have outlined some of the major questions that should be addressed by any library wanting to provide remote access to its online public access catalog. At CMU's Off-campus Library Services promotion of the online catalog is in its infancy. OCLS needs to collect statistical information on remote users and their use of the catalog. From anecdotal evidence it appears that use of the online catalog is not widespread. This is probably due to: (a) lack of access to the necessary equipment and more importantly, (b) approximately ninety percent of the Document Delivery Office's requests for materials are for journal articles. CENTRA provides information on books and other materials owned by the library, it does not provide access to indexing of journal articles.

If journal indexing becomes available on the NOTIS system at CMU, it could change OCLS' method of doing business. Students and faculty would then be able to do their own searching for
articles rather than relying exclusively on the librarians. The librarians could concentrate more on teaching database searching skills to the students rather than the traditional bibliographic instruction now being taught. This would mean that the same number of librarians would be able to handle more students because now the students would be doing for themselves what the librarians formerly did. The OCLS librarians would concentrate on being consultants, advising on searching problems, and teaching online searching skills either in person or through video cassettes presented in class.

The above scenario will not take place at OCLS for the following reasons: (a) lack of access to the proper computer equipment for the majority of students, (b) cost of telecommunications for students outside of Michigan, (c) lack of a willingness on the part of the students to learn searching skills necessary to do database searching and most importantly, (d) lack of a willingness on the students' part to take their time to do something that the librarians formerly did.

Adult students working full-time and trying to earn a graduate degree want the type of service that librarians most often associate with special libraries, that is, providing the information the students need already packaged. Thus access to online catalogs and journal indexes will not change the librarians' job significantly until the full text of articles is available online. Once this is available students will have information instantaneously and will not have to wait to receive articles in the mail. While access to CENTRA is a valuable feature for some OCLS students and faculty, it will not affect OCLS' operations significantly in the near future.
Using the Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Services--A Case Study

Sharon Lee Stewart
The University of Alabama

Background

In 1946 the University of Alabama (UA), through its Extension Division, started centers around the state to act as feeder schools to the university. These centers predated the junior college system by twenty years. The impetus for their inception was the need for higher education opportunities for World War II veterans. In the beginning there were seven sites: Huntsville, Birmingham, Mobile, Montgomery (which became respectively, University of Alabama at Huntsville, University of Alabama at Birmingham, University of South Alabama, Auburn University at Montgomery), Selma, Dothan (both closed), and Gadsden (which remains).

The Gadsden Center at first offered basic college courses for the first two of the four years needed to matriculate with a BA degree. After these two years, the students went on to Jacksonville State University (JSU) or UA. The city of Gadsden provided the building for the Center and rented it to the University. A library was established at the Center at the very beginning, complete with a part time librarian. All acquisitions and cataloging for this library were done by the UA library in Tuscaloosa. The same types of courses (undergraduate and occasionally graduate level) and the library services continued from 1946-1969. In 1966 the junior college system began in the state. Gadsden State Community College started at this time and almost obliterated the need for the Center. By 1969 only 47 undergraduate and 60 graduate students were enrolled at the Center. A move was underfoot at the community college to change its charter to become a four year college. Instead, in 1971, Governor George Wallace created the Cooperative University Upper Division so that JSU and UA could offer upper level undergraduate programs in Gadsden. At that time the library was moved over to the community college but the books were given ownership markings. Any books added to the collection to this day also have JSU and UA markings. The cooperative effort remained in effect until 1986, when UA dropped out. JSU still offers the undergraduate degree with classes held at the community college (J.B. Condra, personal communication, May, 1991).

The Gadsden Center then became a graduate program under the direction of UA's College of Continuing Studies, Division of Instructional Programs. The UA College of Education now offers the following programs:

- Administration and Planning
  - M.A. and A Certificate
  - Ed.S. and AA Certificate

- Instructional Leadership
  - M.A. and A Certificate
  - Ed.S. and AA Certificate

- Early Childhood
  - M.A. and A Certificate
  - Ed.S. and AA Certificate
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Elementary Education  M.A. and A Certificate  
               Ed.S. and AA Certificate

Secondary Education  M.A. and A Certificate  
               Ed.S. and AA Certificate

*Courses for the programs at the Gadsden Center are taught by full-time faculty from The
University of Alabama as part of their regular load or by approved adjunct faculty. Full time faculty
also serve as student advisors. Students enrolled at the Gadsden Center are classified as if they were
enrolled on the Tuscaloosa campus and have full access to the Amelia Gayle Gorgas Library on the
Tuscaloosa campus as well as other campus facilities and services. Students often complete part of
the degree or certification course work on the Tuscaloosa campus* (University of Alabama, 1990).
In fact, the doctoral degree cannot be completed at Gadsden because of course offerings and
dissertation committee requirements.

A closer look at the Center was initiated by the UA College of Education in conjunction with its
ten year NCATE accreditation review. Dr. Frances Benham, Associate Dean for Collections and
Information Services, and Sharon Stewart, Head, McLure Education Library, were enlisted as
consultants to evaluate and make recommendations concerning library holdings and service at
Gadsden State Community College LRC, the location for the Center's library. The site visit was
completed on November 27 and the consultation report submitted on December, 12, 1989.

Shortly before this time, the ACRL/Task Force to Review the Guidelines for Extended Campus
Library Services had completed a draft revision that would go through hearings at the American
Library Association Annual Conference on June 25, 1989 (Association of College and Research
Libraries [ACRL], 1989). The revised Guidelines were therefore available at the time of the
consultation visit and were referred to in preparing the report for the College of Education.

Consultation Findings

The findings, as stated in the consultation report (Benham and Steuart, 1989), were as follows.
The Austin R. Meadows Learning Resources Center of the Gadsden State Community College holds
84,854 volumes. Most of these (65,162) are owned by Gadsden State Community College.
Jacksonville State University, which offers upper level undergraduate courses on campus, owns
11,102 volumes, and The University of Alabama, which offers a wide range of courses from A.A.
level to five master's degrees in education, owns 8,590 volumes. Clearly the size of the collection
could not support graduate level research. Upon further investigation it was learned that only the
community college collection showed any recent growth. The UA and JSU collections had not
grown in the past five years.

Periodical holdings, on the other hand, were very good. UA subscribes to sixty journal titles,
with back files of varying lengths; the community college to just under 400 titles. The Education
Index is available from 1946. Current Index to Journal in Education was started in 1981 and
continues. A subscription to Resources in Education had lapsed, perhaps because the fiche
collection is not available locally. A surprisingly good collection of other indexes and abstracting
services are also available.

The reference collection was also surprisingly strong. It includes a wide range of sources in all
subject areas, along with a solid range of social science and humanities sources. The reference
materials in education were evaluated against an in-house publication of UA reference sources. It
too had many strengths.
Staffing at the community college LRC consisted of 2.5 full time librarians, with an extra half time librarian paid by UA. Since the two half time positions were filled by the same person, involvement in the day-to-day activities of the library, including automation of the library, circulation, reserve, ILL, and reference service, benefited the Center. The hours of operation (8:00am-9:00pm Monday through Thursday, 8:00am-4:00pm Friday, 10:00am-1:00pm Saturday, closed Sunday), make it possible for students to do research before their evening classes and during their lunch break for Saturday classes.

To provide resources that the library does not own, interlibrary loan, usually from UA, was used when possible. The librarian would usually call the university to verify citations and request them by telefacsimile. These requests were then filled as any other request would be. It was reported that there were few requests but that each one generated multiple citations. Gadsden students are believed to use the resources of other academic libraries, such as Jacksonville State University (twenty miles away), University of Alabama at Birmingham (sixty-six miles away), and University of Alabama at Huntsville (seventy-three miles away).

Recommendations and Progress

If one begins with the philosophy of providing services to off campus sites as stated in the revised Guidelines (ACRL, 1989), the Gadsden Center should provide library services that are equitable to those at the main campus, even though these services may not be exactly the same. Since the UA library system was not directly involved in the management of the Gadsden Center library, the emphasis of the report focused on the collection and service aspects of the Guidelines. The consultants found that a good base did exist at the Gadsden State Community College. It was, however, not sufficient for graduate level research. Upgrading the collection for graduate on-site research was clearly not practical. Therefore, other means for providing research materials from the main campus were explored by the consultants. Services provided on-site, supplemented by the main campus were also explored. The recommendations, as submitted by the consultants, and progress made by the institution are delineated here.

1. Collection Development
   a. journals—the journal collection was established by the librarians at Gadsden State Community College based on their knowledge of courses provided. **Recommendation:** interaction between library selectors and faculty is imperative. ILL requests should be examined to provide guidance in the selection of new titles. **Update:** faculty in each area of Education that offers courses in Gadsden were asked to submit journal requests. Subsequently, these titles have been ordered.

   b. monographs—since the addition of new monographs halted approximately five years ago, adding money to the monographs budget needed to be instituted. **Recommendation:** money should be set aside for faculty requests. Librarians should also study course syllabi to facilitate the process. **Update:** $10,000 was allocated for this purpose and faculty were instructed to submit requests.

2. Bibliographic Access
   a. ERIC—the paper version of CIJE was available. **Recommendation:** a CD-ROM version of ERIC, which includes both CIJE and RIE, should be added to the library. **Update:** ERIC on CD-ROM has been installed at both the Center and at the Gadsden State Community College LRC by personnel from the UA library Systems Office.
b. AMELIA—the online catalog at UA is a NOTIS system which can be accessed by telephone.

recommendation: the Gadsden State Community College LRC and the Center should purchase appropriate hardware to be able to access UA holdings.
update: UA Library Systems Office and the Computer Center have helped make this recommendation a reality.

3. Document Delivery
ILL was used exclusively at the time of the consultation visit. Telefacsimile of journal articles was already in place.

recommendation: a courier service, perhaps using faculty who drive regularly between the two campuses, should be arranged to provide more rapid delivery of monographs and microfiche.
update: courier service will be instituted when both the CD-ROM and AMELIA hookups are fully utilized.

4. Bibliographic Instruction
Students enrolled at the Center received no bibliographic instruction.

recommendation: course-related bibliographic instruction should be offered to faculty and students at the Center in cooperation with the community college.
update: no progress.

5. Personnel
a. Training
The librarian hired for the Center was undertrained to facilitate the research needs of graduate students and did not know what resources the main campus could offer.

recommendation: the librarian should visit the main campus for training in bibliographic instruction, automated literature searching and reference skills. Familiarity with UA library resources should also be maintained through regular visits, perhaps once a semester. Professional development activities on a regular basis should be required as well.
update: no progress.

b. Size of staff
A half-time librarian for the Center was available at the community college.

recommendation: the half-time status of the librarian should be monitored as student expectations increase.
update: the College of Education and the College of Continuing Studies are aware that a full time librarian will most likely need to be hired in the near future.

Conclusion

Upon studying the ACRL Guidelines once again, this author realizes that a good beginning has been made, but that further strides must be taken to ensure adequate service be provided to off-campus students at the Gadsden Center.

A basic problem is that the main campus library is not actively involved in the operation of library services at the Center on a continuing basis. Management, finances, personnel selection and evaluation, facilities, resources, and services are controlled by the Division of Instructional Services in the College of Continuing Studies on the main campus. The consultation visit and report were done on an ad hoc basis. Support from individuals within the UA library system is unofficial. When approached by the UA education librarian concerning the need for publicizing available library
services, the Center program coordinator encouraged the development of a pamphlet for faculty and students. The personalities in the positions at this time facilitate interaction. Without formal agreements, however, the progress that has been made is extremely tenuous. The establishment of long term goals and provision of an ideal level of service necessitate the continued formal involvement of the main campus.
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Methods of Funding Library Services in Support of Off-Campus Programs: A Research Report

Betty A. Van Blair
Southwest Baptist University

Historically, private, four-year colleges have been primarily residential. However, this research, which was limited to four-year private institutions accredited by the North Central Association, reveals a changing pattern. The study was limited to four-year private institutions, since their funding sources differ from those of state supported institutions. It was also limited to institutions accredited by the North Central Association for two reasons: (a) It was assumed that institutions which have regional proximity have more in common economically and culturally. (b) Since the North Central Association does not spell out specific guidelines or recommendations for off-campus library services, institutions accredited by this agency may not have the same motivations to fund specific library services as do institutions accredited by other regional accrediting agencies.

Using the list of postsecondary institutions published in the North Central Association Quarterly, 350 institutions were identified as meeting the above criteria. The first survey instrument was sent in 1989 to the chief academic officer of these 350 institutions. Responses were received from 271 or 77 percent. Of these, 131 or forty-eight percent indicated involvement in off-campus programming. Table A-1 in the appendix indicates the number of institutions surveyed within each state.

The six sections of the ACRL Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Services were used as the basis to survey the librarians of the 119 institutions agreeing to be a part of the study. Twelve of the institutions were not willing to participate for various reasons. Ninety-three or 78 percent responded to this second survey instrument. However, nine did not feel qualified to complete the form, did not agree that their institution was involved in off-campus programming, or felt their answers would make their institution appear in an unfavorable position. Therefore, 84 usable survey instruments were tabulated. Table A-2 in the appendix indicates the number of institutions in each state which agreed to be part of the study and the number of librarians who completed the second survey instrument.

Although several questions were researched, the two main ones were: (a) What factors may have influenced the on-campus library to become involved in providing library services in support of off-campus programs? (b) What funding methods were used to fund library services to off-campus programs?

Involvement

Thirty-eight, or 45 percent of the total respondents were involved in providing library services at all sites which their institution operated. Another ten, or 12 percent offered services to some of the sites. Therefore, forty-eight of the eighty-four libraries were involved in some way with providing library resources and services away from the main campus library. As is reflected in Table 1, another 42 percent or thirty-five of the librarians knew their institution offered classes off campus, but they were not providing any services or resources for those students or faculty.
Table 1

On-Campus Library Involvement with Off-Campus Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-campus involved at all sites</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus involved at some sites</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus not involved</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. One institution did not answer this question.

Several factors were compared to determine what may have caused these forty-eight libraries to provide off-campus library services. Factors explored were: percentage of the Educational and General Budget which the on-campus library received, the number of professional librarians to share the work load, the distance of the off-campus sites, and the student enrollment off campus as compared to on campus.

Table 2 indicates that although all libraries receiving 6 percent or more of the E & G were involved, so were the institutions receiving the lowest percentages.

Table 2

Analysis of On-Campus Library Involvement Compared to Percentage of E & G Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement</th>
<th>Percentage of E &amp; G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved at all sites</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved at some sites</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not involved</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Nine Institutions did not indicate percentage of Educational & General Budget.

The number of professional librarians employed by the institution to share the work load is shown in Table 3. This table also indicates if someone had been designated responsible for providing off-campus library service. In general, the more librarians an institution employed, the more likely it was that the duty would be shared by all. However, libraries which employed less than a full-time librarian provided off-campus library services as did those libraries which employed several librarians.
Table 3

Number of Professional Librarians Employed by an Institution Compared to Designation of Librarian Responsible for Off-Campus Library Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Professional Librarians Employed</th>
<th>Number of Libraries Designating Librarian Responsible for Off-Campus Library Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Two Institutions did not answer these questions.

Tabulation was then done to determine if the designation of someone responsible for off-campus library services was related to the distance of the off-campus sites. If an institution operated more than one site, the distance to the farthest site was used. Tables 4 and 5 summarize the responses of librarians that indicated involvement at all or at some of the sites.

On Table 1 ten were identified that only provided library services to some of the sites operated by their institution. Of these, none indicated that a person had been charged with the responsibility of off-campus sites. Of the thirty-eight that provided services to all of the sites operated by their institution, seven designated a full-time person with the duty. Nine designated part-time people with the amount of time spent on the task ranging from five percent to fifty percent. Twenty designated no one specifically for the responsibility and many indicated by a written note that the duty was shared by all, while two did not answer.
Table 4

Designation of Librarian Responsible for Off-Campus Library Services in Relation to Distance of the Farthest Off-Campus Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance in Miles</th>
<th>Number of Libraries Designating Librarian Responsible for Off-Campus Library Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-200</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-300</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601-700</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701-800</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801-900</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901-1000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Four Institutions did not answer one or both questions.

Table 5

Designation of Librarian Responsible for Off-Campus Library Services in Relation to Distance of the Closest Off-Campus Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance in Miles</th>
<th>Number of Libraries Designating Librarian Responsible for Off-Campus Library Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(table continues)

| 51-100 | 0    | 0 | 7 |
| 101-200 | 0    | 2 | 1 |
| 201-300 | 0    | 1 | 0 |
| Over 1000 | 0    | 0 | 1 |

Note. Four Institutions did not answer one or both questions.

The off-campus enrollment as indicated on the first survey instrument was compared with the institutional enrollment as listed in the Spring 1988 issue of the *North Central Association Quarterly*. Table 6 indicates that although most institutions had an off-campus enrollment of less than the on-campus enrollment, five institutions had a larger enrollment off-campus than on-campus. Whether the library provided services to off-campus students did not appear to depend upon the number of students enrolled in the off-campus program.

Table 6

Library Involvement Related to Off-Campus Enrollment as a Percentage of Total

Institutional Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Institutional Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Libraries</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Involved</td>
<td>Not Involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-90%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two Institutions did not respond.
Thus, the data collected indicated that neither the percentage of the institutional budget, the number of professional librarians to share in the work load, the distance of off-campus sites nor student enrollment off-campus were statistically significant factors in influencing the on-campus library to become involved in providing library services in support of the off-campus programs. Two factors examined which did have significance statistically were: (a) the involvement of the librarian in the planning process for off-campus programs, and (b) the provision of additional funding for the off-campus services.

The 1982 Guidelines indicated that for the institution to meet the needs of students and faculty in extended campus programs, needs should be assessed, a written profile prepared, and a written statement of objectives developed. This process should involve not only the librarian, but an appropriate off-campus academic representative.

An overview of librarian involvement in planning (Table 7) indicated that 52 percent of the librarians reported institutional planning had been done, at least to a limited extent. However, only 26 percent of the time were librarians involved in the assessment of the needs for library resources, services and facilities and less than 10 percent of the time were they involved in writing a profile of these needs or developing a written statement of objectives.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement in Planning</th>
<th>Percentage of Institutions Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Planning Done</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian Involved in Assessment</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian Involved in Profile</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian Involved in Objectives</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. No response was tallied as a no answer.

Analysis revealed that if librarians were involved in the planning process, the probability of the on-campus library providing services to off-campus sites was greater than if they were not involved in the planning process. As shown in Table 8, the significance level for Chi-square was .0025. Based upon a .05 level of significance, the null hypothesis of no relationship was rejected. The data indicated a relationship between involving the librarian in the planning process for off-campus programs and the on-campus library providing resources and services to the off-campus students and
faculty. Although this involvement in planning was not absolutely essential, when they were involved the chances for provision of these services were greatly increased.

Table 8

Analysis of Librarian Involvement in Planning for Libraries that Provided or Did Not Provide Off-Campus Library Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision of Services</th>
<th>Number of Librarians</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involved in Planning</td>
<td>Not Involved in Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided Services</td>
<td>19 (12.87)</td>
<td>28 (34.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Provide</td>
<td>4 (10.13)</td>
<td>33 (26.87)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square D.F. Significance
9.1311  1.00251544

Note. (Expected frequencies)

Funding

Respondents were asked to indicate how off-campus library facilities, services, resources and personnel were funded. A tally of these statements indicated libraries that received additional funds. The Chi Square Test of Independence was computed to determine if a statistically significant relationship existed between additional funding and providing off-campus library services. As shown in Table 9, the significance level for Chi-square was .00979942. Based upon a .05 level of significance, the null hypothesis of no relationship was rejected. The data indicated a relationship between additional funding and the on-campus library providing resources and services to the off-campus students and faculty.

Telephone interviews were conducted to explore the methods of funding in more depth. Although twenty-eight librarians had indicated on the survey form that additional funding had been provided, when contacted by telephone, twelve either could not remember what they meant, or they had marked the form incorrectly. From the remaining sixteen, two main methods of funding off-campus library services were identified. They were: (a) providing the on-campus library with a larger budget, and/or (b) allocation of funds from the off-campus program to provide library resources and services.

Four librarians interviewed indicated that the on-campus library received a larger percentage of the Educational and General budget to fund library services off-campus. Of these four institutions, two librarians felt that the amount of budget increase had been adequate to cover the additional resources and services they needed to provide. The other two librarians indicated the increase was minimal and did not feel it was adequate. Although each of these librarians indicated the on-campus library had received a larger percentage of the Educational and General budget, the needs and the amount of additional funding received varied greatly.
Table 9

Analysis of Additional Funding for Libraries that Provided and Did Not Provide Off-Campus Library Services

| Provision of Services | Number of Libraries |  |
|-----------------------|---------------------|--|---|
|                       | Funding Received    | No Funding Received | |
| Provided Services     | 17 (12.67)          | 21 (25.33)          | |
| Did Not Provide Services | 2 (6.33)           | 17 (12.67)          | |

Chi-Square 6.671  D.F 7  Significance  .00979942

Note. (Expected frequencies)

Nine of the librarians contacted by telephone indicated that funds from the off-campus program were allocated to provide library services. Three configurations for allocating funds from the off-campus program were identified. One was an assessment of a library fee when students enrolled in the off-campus program. Another was a percentage of the tuition or budget of the off-campus program. A third was consultation or bargaining with the off-campus personnel.

In general, when the method of funding was an assessment of a library fee, it was used to provide database searches, telephone consultation, telefacsimile transmission, and in some cases to pay the librarian a fee for bibliographic instruction sessions off campus. Except in one case, this fee was not the only additional funds which the library received to provide these services.

Two institutions had a percentage of the tuition or budget of the off-campus program allocated to provide library services. One library received one percent of the budget; whereas, the other library received five percent of the off-campus tuition. Although this program had not been in existence long enough to know if the five percent would generate enough funds, the librarian indicated that the faculty had been instrumental in getting this percentage of the tuition designated to the library. They had been able to hire a librarian to provide reference assistance to the off-campus students, and some periodicals and reference materials were being placed at the off-campus sites. Providing access to the on-campus library by means of an automated catalog was also being implemented.

Two librarians who had probably attained more funds overall than any of the others had done so by cultivating a good working relationship with the head of the off-campus program and consulting or bargaining with that person for necessary funding. Neither of these librarians had delegated the responsibility of off-campus library services to any particular librarian. The philosophy of the administration at each school was that the off-campus programs were an integral part of the institution. Therefore, library services to the off-campus student were handled by all staff members
as part of their normal work flow. They felt that this helped prevent a schism from developing between the off-campus program and the on-campus program.

Conclusions and Recommendations

As colleges and universities expand their offerings off-campus, there is concern with providing a quality education. One part of this quality is the provision of library resources and services. This study found two statistically significant relationships when the on-campus library was involved with providing off-campus library services. The first of these was the involvement of the librarian in the planning process for off-campus programs. The second was the provision of additional funding to provide these library services off-campus.

Why the library was not involved in the planning process most of the time was not covered by this study, but a recommendation to all college and university officials planning to expand their course offerings off campus would be to involve the library in the planning process from the beginning. It is especially important for the library to be involved in an assessment of the library resources, services, and facilities in the community in which the off-campus programs will be offered. They should also be involved in the preparation of a written profile of the information needs in the off-campus community as well as a written statement of objectives. Working with the librarian should be appropriate representatives from the off-campus program, including faculty. In this way a relationship will be developed and an understanding of the needs on both sides can be shared.

The study indicated a statistically significant relationship between the involvement of the on-campus library in providing resources and services off-campus and the provision of additional funds. However, no one particular method for providing these funds seemed to be evident. Four funding models were identified in the study: (a) a larger general library budget, with possibly additional line items for off-campus library services, (b) assessment of a library fee when students enroll in the off-campus program, (c) a percentage of the off-campus tuition or budget, and (d) consultation with the off-campus personnel. Depending upon the philosophy of the institution and the accounting procedures employed to incorporate the off-campus programs, any of the first three models are recommended. Although the telephone interviews indicated that the most successful means of obtaining funding was consultation and bargaining with the off-campus personnel, this method is dependent upon the personalities involved. For this reason, a more objective method combined with the consultation is recommended.
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## Appendix

Table A-1

**Private, NCA Accredited, Four-year Institutions, by State**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Institutions</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Number with Off-Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>350</strong></td>
<td><strong>271</strong></td>
<td><strong>131</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-2

Institutions Participating in Study, by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number Which Agreed to Study</th>
<th>Librarian Completed Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Providing Off-campus Library Services to a Branch Library in Europe

Ellen J. Waite
Loyola University of Chicago

Background on the Campus and Library

Loyola University of Chicago has a campus in Rome, Italy called the Rome Center of the Liberal Arts. The promotional literature on the campus describes it as "a small American undergraduate college in a European setting. It offers students a variety of academic courses and the opportunity to live together and form a community in a city with considerable cultural and religious importance to the Western World for over 2000 years. The students are not tourists. Rome is their home for year or a semester." The program is fully accredited and the general academic focus is on the Classical World, the Renaissance, and contemporary Europe. Annually, 300 students are enrolled in the Rome Center.

Loyola is one of the few American universities with campuses or academic programs in Europe which also supports a library. The Rome Center Library has 40,000 volumes and over 50 periodical titles. The Library is staffed with one librarian, an assistant and student assistants. The Rome Center Library operates like a distant branch of the main university library in Chicago with the Rome Center Librarian reporting to the University Librarian. The majority of books are acquired in the U.S. and all technical processing of books is done in Chicago. Supporting information services are referred to Chicago.

In 1989, the Loyola's library administration and the Rome Center administration assessed the Rome Center Library. This assessment led to a number of changes in staffing, collections, and services. These changes are aimed at offering the users of this small library many of the same services as are offered in the libraries in Chicago.

The Rome Center Student

Most of the students at the Rome Center are from medium to large universities with highly automated libraries. The typical student at the Rome Center is 19-21 years old with Junior standing. The Center usually has more females than males. All students must either have studied Italian or they are required to pass an Italian language course while studying at the Center. While the academic program is central, travel is an important part of the experience. Travel throughout Europe and the Mediterranean is expected and encouraged. And, the students expect to travel at the lowest possible rates while achieving the best possible experiences.

While students are immersing themselves in the Italian and European cultures, they intermittently suffer from homesickness. They miss many things that they took for granted. There is one TV and the only available news from the states is the evening news which is televised the next morning in Rome, an 8-9 hour delay. Even students who never cared about sports start caring about who won the World Series and how the Chicago Bears are doing. National news that they took for granted, such as what is happening at the hearings on the appointment of the new Supreme Court Justice, is hard to get. Phone calls to their parents are difficult to make from the three public booths where the students queue up and wait while the porter executes the calls to the states.
On top of this, students often find they do not have the funds that they want or need and they are looking for student employment which will allow them to study and travel. The library is one of the few places on the campus where they can work.

The Rome Center Faculty

The 25 Rome Center faculty come from a variety of backgrounds. While there is a small core of faculty who remain at the Rome Center, most of the faculty rotate and spend one to two years at the Rome Center. Some faculty are from Loyola’s Chicago campuses, a few are from other U.S. universities, some are scholars residing in Rome. The reasons the U.S. faculty are at the Rome Center is as varied as the faculty. Some bring their families to Rome and find that the experience of living in Rome is of primary importance. Some are intent on doing research. Some are as intent on travelling and seeing Europe as their students. All faculty are expected to offer courses which are as academically rigorous as the courses that they offer in the states.

The whole Rome Center serves as a social focus for faculty and their families. It may be the only place where they regularly hear English spoken; it is the place where they get information on living in Rome. Faculty families are users of the Rome Center Library. While much of the use is for recreational purposes, school age children often use the library for studying and homework assignments and faculty spouses are often working on their own research projects.

Many faculty arrive in Rome without thinking about library support for either their classes or their research. Some send in lists of needed materials. The lists arrive in the library offices in Chicago anywhere from two days to six months before classes start.

The Rome Center Library Services

Unlike our branch libraries in the states, the Rome Center Library serves as a center for students’ academic, recreational and social needs. The Rome Center library serves as a library, a study hall, a travel advising agency, a communication/information connection to the states and a social center. We recognized this need on our 1989 assessment of the library and made the conscious decision to address more than just the traditional academic needs of the students.

While the library has the traditional books and journals to support the academic curriculum, the Let’s Go guides, daily Herald Tribune, and the latest editions of Time, Newsweek, and Sports Illustrated may be the highest used journals in the collection. American newspapers are treasured.

We have found that students who are not normally readers, devour books as a recreational outlet that was probably served by the States by watching TV. Students often travel by train at night to avoid hotel costs and a good paperback can turn an unpleasant crowded train ride into a tolerable experience.

After the 1989 assessment, we remodelled the library so that it provides a wide variety of areas for both gathering and studying. The circulation desk with the reserve collection of highly used travel guides and the photocopy machine are at the entry to the library. The front of the library has the magazines, the ready reference area, the catalog, and bulletin boards on current topics. Single user study carrels are sequestered in the stacks room. Study tables for group work are in a back room. In the reference room, multi-user tables serve as the reading and study area. Early in the semester, this room takes on a variety of atmospheres but during finals, the whole library serves as a quiet study hall.
The library employs many students and hires them within the first week of classes. Students rotate weekend hours so that everyone gets a chance to travel. Weekend hours also have a higher pay rate since the students are in charge of the library during this period of time. Though it is unusual, students who do not show up or who do not work get laid off and their hours are immediately picked up by others.

Most faculty are regular visitors to the library. They want to see their favorite journals. They will stop in the library on a daily basis to read the paper and check to see if any new books arrived.

After the 1989 assessment, the library determined we needed to provide better research support for the faculty. To do this we needed to identify how we could get information to Rome fast. The Rome Center had a fax machine and access to Bitnet which served as two basic tools. We engaged a shipping service with offices in New York and Rome for weekly package delivery of letters and journals. We relied on express mail services for two day delivery on materials we needed to get to and from Rome quickly.

Interlibrary loan requests are faxed to Chicago and journal articles are faxed or mailed back to Rome. The fax machine proved to be better than telephone communication—swifter and more reliable than Bitnet. Telephone calls are often garbled by static, echoes and other noise but telefacsimile messages get through 99% of the time. Bitnet messages can get hung up as they cross the ocean and often do not arrive at the Center until 48 hours later. This past year, we experimented with express mailing books; we found the cost to be prohibitive (up to $140 per book) mainly from the cost of shipping from Italy back to the states and have discontinued this service.

The library offers Rome Center faculty the same Table of Contents Service in Rome that we offer in Chicago. In fact, for Rome Center faculty we offer expanded service. The libraries in Chicago photocopy the table of contents of the selected journals as they arrive. The contents pages are mailed to Rome. Rome Center faculty can then determine which articles they want to see, the request is faxed to Chicago and the Chicago library will then mail the articles to the library for pickup by the faculty.

Faculty are asked to send their book requests to the library as soon as they are appointed for the next year. Most do not do this and every year we rush process materials for class reserve. By the spring semester, the library is usually ready to meet the classroom needs of the faculty.

The library has guidelines on family use of the library. All faculty families have library privileges. We have had young students who were disruptive in the library and the faculty parents are asked to provide guidance in these cases. Faculty and their spouses are ready contributors to and users of the growing paperback collection. Visitors to the Rome Center often leave behind the paperbacks they brought on the planes and they then become part of the informal "lending library."

The library has one copy machine and it is the most popular machine in the whole complex. Maps, pages out of guide books, assignments, class notes, articles, newsletters are all copied on this machine. Imagine any of our universities surviving with only one copy machine.

The Collection

For years the major portion of the library's collection was composed of approximately 40,000 volumes that were part of the Milford Collection, a collection the university acquired in 1972 and sent to the Rome Center. At the time of acquisition, the Milford Collection had numerous periodicals and reference works. It was a research collection in theology, the classics and history with holdings of lesser note in other subject areas. After Loyola acquired the collection and sent it
After the books were selected and purchased, they were cataloged by the Blackwell Technical Services division and shipped to our shipper in New York City. The shipper then shipped the books to Rome during the summer of 1991 so that the books were in place for the fall semester.

Originally, we planned to complete this project in six to nine months. This proved difficult. The first profile was flawed and had to be redone. The second profile proved to be right on target. The gathering of the books and the processing, however, took longer than planned. The great out-of-print problems which plague us daily in our libraries plagued us also for this project.

The library also identified and ordered reference materials we could not get through Blackwells.

To keep the collection fresh with travel guides and popular fiction, the Rome Center Librarian during the annual Chicago trip, selects the most up-to-date travel guides, maps, and current paperbacks. These materials are not cataloged and are sent in a shipment which arrives with the students in fall. Updates to the paperback collection are sent from Chicago with the January flight of new students to Rome. We expect that these books will get used, abused and lost and we do not think it is worthwhile to catalog them.

The library also has a budget of $12,000 to spend on new monographs each year. The cost of English language books and magazines in Italy currently is prohibitive to purchase on a wide scale basis but the Rome Center Librarian does purchase some materials as needed. We also purchase Italian art books and Italian language materials in Rome.

**Journals**

Most of the journals in the library are U.S. or British publications. For years the library used two European vendors: one in Oxford who handled all U.S. and British journals, the other in Germany who handled all other European journals. Since the library is small and rather distant from Oxford, we found our British vendor to be rather unconcerned if issues never made it to the library. When contacted, the U.S. publishers were even less concerned. Many journals regularly arrived months after publishing.

These problems have led us to consolidate all of the subscriptions with a U.S. vendor who will then provide check-in services and first class air mail. We will be able to monitor the check-in from our Chicago libraries so that if we find out a journal has not been received, we can easily follow up on the problem. We believe that this method will provide us with better service. If it does not, we will look for other means of getting the journals into the Rome library in a timely manner.

**Technology Issues**

Loyola's U.S. libraries are highly automated. Going to Rome brings a whole new perspective on technology. At this time, the library has one MAC SE which the Rome Center Librarian uses. The administrative computers at the Rome Center are on a local area network with Olivetti PCs which are IBM compatibles. To import IBM or Apple products, the university must pay extraordinary tariffs. The cost of U.S. made products in Italy is, at the minimum, twice the U.S. list price. Loyola sends over Information Technologies staff to set up and maintain the networks and train staff in new software.

We have many years to go before advanced technology will be affordable and possible at the Rome Center. Since the collection is so small, the need for an online catalog is not as necessary as in our Chicago libraries but it would be wonderful to provide access to our Chicago libraries through online access through a network such as Internet or on site CD ROM.
Our technology dream for the Rome Center is to:

1. have the catalog online, perhaps on a CD ROM disk
2. have CD ROM full text products available
3. offer a variety of electronic services from a networked computer system.

Staffing

The library has two permanent positions at the Rome Center Library: the librarian and the assistant. The library needs staff who can work very closely with the students and faculty and who are resourceful in satisfying their information needs. The scholarly demands on the librarian are relatively low; the interpersonal demands are very high. While a permanent librarian had been assigned to Rome for many years, our current plans are to rotate the assignment among the present Loyola librarians. Our goal is to have librarians from different areas of the library go to Rome to run the library and to accomplish a project which is related to their area of specialty.

Wouldn't it be wonderful to live in Rome and work at an American University? Wouldn't it be wonderful to spend hours at the Sistine Chapel and Piazza Navona? Wouldn't it be wonderful to work in Rome and be only an overnight train ride to Paris? Wouldn't it be wonderful to have a job where demands and pressures are almost non-existent?

Visiting and living in Europe are not comparable. Things that visitors find quaint and charming often wear thin when one lives with it for nine to twelve months. Some of the realities of living in Rome are:

1. the U.S. dollar has been weak for a number of years and the bargains of the past no longer exist;
2. Italy is plagued by inflation; the cost of food is very high compared to U.S. prices;
3. the cost of housing, even by Chicago standards is extraordinary;
4. many of the comforts U.S. citizens take for granted are missing (heat, good phone service, good mail delivery, the convenience of grocery stores).
5. Americans in Rome are more vulnerable during times of international unrest; in the past decade, Rome has been the sight of some very serious terrorist activities with Americans as targets.

As wonderful as Rome and the Rome Center are, it is not easy to find the right person for this position. Knowing Italian, while not a requirement, makes the transition easier for the individual. Problems are often not easily or quickly resolved. People who need instant answers find that they cannot live with the ambiguity or the delay in solving problems.

Our initial plans for staff assignments to Rome were for two year stints. It often takes a person about six months to adjust to the library, the university and life in Rome. The second year of the assignment should go easier and the person should be able to accomplish an identified project. The new Italian tax laws now make it impossible to assign a person to Rome for more than one year. This will affect how much we can accomplish at the library in the future.
The problems for the classified staff member are similar to the problems for the librarian. The pay is comparatively low since the pay grade is set by the university using the U.S. pay grades. The assistant maintains the catalog as well as serving as a reference assistant. We found it most useful to train the person in one of our Chicago libraries before sending them on to Rome.

Management Issues

Perhaps the major management issue is maintaining good communication with the staff and avoiding staff isolation. Extra efforts must be made to communicate with staff at branches regularly. Out of sight, out of mind is a phrase that aptly describes branch libraries, no matter where they are.

A difference for staff who are located in Europe is the difference in ease of phone service. Rome is eight time zones ahead of Chicago. Telephone connections are always bad, it is merely a continuum of how bad. It is hard to communicate with a person when you can only hear every third word or when you get cut off during a crucial sentence.

We write letters to staff in Rome to keep them informed of what is happening in the states. We send the library newsletter and ask for contributions from them. We fax news and seemingly simple questions and answers back and forth.

Branch staff, be they 2 blocks away or 5000 miles away, are physically isolated from the main library and they easily can be programmatically isolated as well. It is important that communication flow. That the staff feel that they are valued and that personnel problems be dealt with in a timely manner.

The other major management issue concerns funding and the budget. This issue is unique to branch libraries not in the states. We are never sure how inflation will affect the budget, how the dollar will do against foreign currency, or what new tariff and tax laws will affect the library. Budgetary factors influence personnel decisions, equipment and material purchases. In some years, the strong dollar offers opportunities to advantageously purchase materials abroad; other years, it is to our advantage to purchase materials in the U.S. In either situation, the library must remain flexible in its budgeting policies so that it can take advantage of the constantly changing economy.
Off-Campus Education and Library Service Library -- Experiences and Observations

Herbert S. White
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana

I am honored to have been asked to speak at your conference, and I am fully cognizant of the fact that many of you have far more experience in the distance delivery of library services than I have. My own involvement in this process is limited to library education. I will therefore talk primarily about that topic, and will attempt to generalize from my experiences and observations in this area to look at opportunities as well as potential concerns in the larger area of the delivery of all kinds of information services, certainly including but not limited to documents. Document delivery, as I'm sure we all recognize, is the only last and really the most simple and straightforward of the information flow processes, even as we frequently have difficulty in bringing it to fruition.

I came to Indiana University in 1975, after a 25 year career that encompassed special libraries, corporate and government information systems, including national information delivery systems, and the information industry. Except as a guest speaker I had not really experienced the academic campus. I came to Indiana as a professor and as director of the Research Center for Library and Information Science, and later, from 1980 to 1990, I served as dean of the school. I think I can state without contradiction, because the statistics are there to support the claim, that during this period the Indiana University School of Library and Information Science had the most highly developed system of delivering educational materials to students not located on the main residential campus, through a combination of off-campus teaching by regular faculty members, the use of adjuncts, and the use of the Indiana Higher Education Television System (IHETS).

Much of this of course came from initiative and planning, but it also resulted from fortuitous circumstances. The Indiana University program is the only accredited one in the state of Indiana. Bloomington, as a residential campus, is located at some distance from where many of the citizens live. It is ideal for full time residential attendance, but that does not work for all students, and it was quickly apparent that not only the present reality in 1980 but also developing demographic trends were shifting away from this form of educational delivery. And, of course, what applies to library science education also applies to the use of academic libraries.

Indiana University is fortunate that its structure consists of eight separate campuses which then cover most of the state, and that it is a centralized administration under one president. This is not true of all states, where there may be many small but totally separate institutions that compete with each other. The operating philosophy here "One University With Eight Front Doors" may produce an architectural monstrosity but it is conducive to the development of off-campus delivery mechanisms. In addition, however, to the realities of financial concerns about fostering growth, we also took quite seriously our responsibilities to provide our unique products and services to all of the citizens of the state of Indiana. After all, the name of our school was and is Indiana University, and not the University of Bloomington.

The philosophy we developed included teaching courses on the Bloomington campus, teaching courses on all of the other campuses of the system, including the one in Indianapolis which, with 27,000 students, is almost as large, although other campuses have as few as 4,000 students and
primarily undergraduate programs. We used regular faculty to teach in Bloomington, and we encouraged (and ultimately required) their teaching on other campuses through a process of release trade-off time (never overload because that destroys the other aspects of academic value—including research). We also used adjunct faculty on both the Bloomington and on other campuses. These are usually library practitioners who, for a rather modest additional stipend, teach specific courses, rarely more than one per year. They do this because they want to help and because they enjoy teaching, not for the money. In general this works well, and indeed professional societies encourage library educators to use more adjuncts, perhaps because they do not trust us enough to teach "practical" things they believe we should teach. That, of course, opens up the whole Pandora's box of education versus training, about which I have written and spoken in other settings. I will summarize at this point only by saying that if we only train and not educate, we are not going to be much as a profession. Similarly, if academic librarians simply provide requested documents and do not concern themselves in the information process, then, no matter how well they do it, they will not have much of a professional identity, either. Supplying requested documents only is a warehouse function.

In my experience the use of adjuncts has been highly successful, and student course evaluations indicate no discernible difference in their perception of quality of instruction. And yet, there are concerns, particularly with teaching off the main campus, that must be addressed. The first I have already mentioned. This is graduate education and not just training. Individuals who, no matter how well qualified, simply teach from the framework of what they do on a daily basis, the "how I run my library good" syndrome, are not acceptable. The syllabus for courses, particularly when the same course is taught by several people on several campuses, must be the same so that the educational outcome is the same. Teaching styles of course can and should differ. However, and particularly when students have taken a course which serves as a pre-requisite to other courses, we must assure that students come equally prepared. At Indiana we do not have home campus full residency requirements. Almost all students spend at least one or two semesters, often in the summer, in Bloomington, although some are remarkably adept at avoiding that process. Since we send regular faculty members to them as well, the danger is minimized. Instead of residency requirements we control the process by a centralized decision over what courses we offer and do not offer. I insisted on centralized budgetary and administrative control over all non-Bloomington activities from the outset, in the realization that one of the expressions of the golden rule is that those with the gold make the rules. It had to be our program in terms of what courses to offer, and whom to assign to teach them. In essence, we simply rent space. With that as a framework, we were able to expand the program to two other locations that were not Indiana University campuses, but that operated in locations in which there was no convenient Indiana University campus. One of these is the University of Evansville, a private university. The other is the Cincinnati Public Library. Why Cincinnati? Because there was no convenient and suitable location in southeastern Indiana, and Cincinnati is only 15 miles across the state line. We were not unmindful of the fact that this might bring us students from Ohio, and indeed northern Kentucky, as well as southeastern Indiana, and I will spare you the details of the lengthy negotiations with the Ohio Board of Regents. I will note only that our relationship between in state and out of state fees (although we provide partial discount for out of state students) applies in Cincinnati as well. Ohioans in Cincinnati are out of state. The reason is simple. We expect that normally these students will enroll on two and perhaps more campuses. We want them to make this decision based on educational values, and not in the search for a tuition bargain.

Before I move to a description of our television courses, let me stress a point which I believe is crucial in all our determinations. The overriding concern is maintenance of quality. Distance education can not be, and certainly need not be, an acceptable rationale for poorer quality.
That television system is a state-wide operation, largely in the provision of equipment and other resources, that crosses not only campus boundaries (because all our campuses are funded separately by the state legislature despite central administration) but also institutional boundaries as well. We have not taught courses starting from any campus except Bloomington, and we have not to this point broadcast our courses to many sites outside our own University (such as Purdue University) but we could and probably will. My own experience here is limited to two courses I have taught over this arrangement, and the many others I have supervised in my role as dean, responsible for assuring that the quality of instruction is in no way diluted.

It is my observation that some courses are more suitable for this method of teaching than others. In particular courses which are largely lecture courses (and for example both mine and those of Dr. David Kaser are), that is a lot easier than if there is a laboratory segment (computer courses), or when there is constant review in the classroom. In these settings, but really for all courses, the provision of an on-site monitor in the classroom is essential. That individual can be a graduate student (such as a doctoral student or a junior professional, and of course in our field doctoral students are already professionals). Classroom monitors are important for taking roll, for making sure that equipment works, for the distribution and collection of material, and perhaps most subtly to assure that the same kind of classroom environment and courtesy exist than if the instructor were physically present. Students would not be reading a newspaper in my classroom, and I want to make sure they are not reading a newspaper in a distance education classroom. For their benefit, but also for the benefit of other students in the class.

In addition, we also employ a local coordinator on each campus, usually a part-time assignment for a librarian on the premises. This individual covers a myriad of duties—some routine yet nevertheless all essential. This individual is concerned with course registrations which may be in Bloomington in absentia or may be local for the appropriateness of the classroom, for other physical facilities (we once found we had a classroom next to a band practice room and since they weren't going to move it was essential that we could). Although we provide no-cost telephone contacts from all campuses to faculty advisors and the director of admissions, the local coordinator also serves as an advisor for the entire program, for students who sometimes don't come to Bloomington until well into their program if at all. We of course offer counseling on an equal basis to all students, but local students find it easier to take advantage of this opportunity. We could argue that for graduate students if a service is available that is enough, and then it becomes the student's responsibility to use it, but we try to make this extra step. In many cases the local coordinator knows the students and helps plan their curriculum program most directly, and this is particularly important to avoid the temptation, and it is a real temptation, to take a course just because it is conveniently available and because it counts toward the degree. Students will sometimes enter into unholy conspiracies, none of which will help them get the specific courses they're really out to get to meet their announced specialization. I have received petitions from a campus, asking for two elective courses—one on storytelling, the other on business literature. Both petitions have exactly the same 25 signatures, and of course that makes me suspicious. "I will take your course if you take mine." I recognize that this kind of "convenience" planning—taking courses because they fit a time slot—exists anywhere, but we try not to encourage and abet it.

This underlines once again the importance, as I see it, of running these educational programs as part of the overall school process, and not as dictated either by the local campus or by some centralized unit concerned with distance or off-campus education. What we do has a cost, and it is important that the process of employing monitors and coordinators not be short-changed in the maximizing of "profits." This fact that we care about the total program and not performance in specific classes or on specific campuses has two immediate benefits. We truly do not care, as a school strategy, where the student takes the course. Financially it is all the same, and we can concentrate on what is best for the student. Secondly, we do not cancel classes once announced
because of low enrollment. We understand that taking a particular course at a particular time is building a house of cards, and if you remove the assumed course that was the prerequisite for a future course, the entire plan collapses. We have taught courses with as few as four students, although it might of course teach us something about offering the course again. We of course have concerns about enrollment and cost, but those are for the program as a whole and not for individual courses. As an example, we look for an average of at least 12 students in each classroom, but we can accomplish this if a course in Richmond has eight students and a course in Fort Wayne has 16. In a decentralized setting the local authorities in Richmond would have canceled their class, and the authorities in Fort Wayne would have collected the money. More dangerously, Fort Wayne would have scheduled courses not based on need but based on projected enrollment only. How do I know? Because that is exactly what had happened before.

My insistence on total control over courses in my discipline was based on the stated threat that not only would we completely refuse to cooperate in such programs, but that our own quality control concerns would force us to refuse to accept these credit hours toward our degree programs. These would make the course largely worthless, and would in turn destroy their enrollment. In other words, it was our courses or none at all. Was that a bluff? No, it wasn't, but it was essential that I had first explained to my vice president and chief campus officer why he should support me, for the benefit of the educational process. There was another reason we succeeded, and this was really luck, but luck counts, too. Campus officials just don't get very excited about the potential benefits to them from library science courses, whether taught by adjuncts or over television. MBA courses, by contrast, interest them greatly.

The point I want to stress is that while the expanded program in all of its formats was financially viable (our university budget office insisted on that), it was never intended as a money-making operation but as a break-even educational extension (and I insisted on that). Ultimately, since we had the expertise and the contacts with both instructors and students, it was our ball. Budget officers can sometimes bluster, but they can't teach anything.

In using television courses (and I know that Darlene Weingand at Wisconsin would disagree with my assessment that they work beautifully for some kinds of courses, with difficulty with some, and not at all for some), the most obvious advantage is the ability to use visual and graphic aids. Indeed, with proper planning such a course can be much more interesting than the rather normal practice of writing on blackboards and displaying overhead transparencies. This obviously requires that in particular at the displaying end you work with a professional director and a professional staff, and that there is clear understanding of what is going to happen. We met each week three days before the class to discuss the class. We talked about guest speakers, camera angles, microphone requirements, and the visual displays we were going to utilize. For text material I found that if I gave them written copy they improved on it. That is their expertise, not mine. I was fortunate in having excellent and caring professional directors. Of course if I hadn't had one I would have complained, and I was pleased that one of these directors, in applying for a higher level job, used me for a reference.

The quality of TV reception is of course crucial, but that is not usually a problem. They have far more complex courses than ours--scientific experiments with visual impacts for one. Most of us just stand or sit there.

Two way audio is of course essential, two way video is probably not. However, the way two-way audio is provided is important. Having some central point in the classroom to which students can march to signal their desire to ask a question is simply too intimidating. Students have to be able to ask a question while they are in their seats, as in any classroom. In a recent visit to an IBM facility I saw an arrangement I really like. I recall the specific vendor, but I won't mention it because I am
sure there are others. Depending on the size of the class there were one or more television screens. The microphones and signal buttons were arranged so that two students shared one piece of equipment located between them. We did not have this, and I was very conscious that some students in distant locations said nothing all semester long.

One last point in terms of negotiations with the TV director. Some of them prefer use of a small studio, with even local students situated in a separate classroom as though they were on another campus. I do not, perhaps I teach as an actor would perform. I want a live audience of students even as I have a distant audience. I want to see facial reactions, because I play off those. Most facilities have TV studios large enough to accommodate a class. They may find it inconvenient to set up that way, but it is certainly possible.

One final point of advice. Always make a tape of what you are sending. It may be only a backup in case of interrupted transmission (and that happens even in networks let alone instructional environments), but it may also have other uses. The cost is really minimal. It involves the cost of the tapes themselves, because making the tape usually just means hooking in a machine. If you like, you can erase the tapes once you are certain that transmission was uninterrupted, and use them again.

Use of this format requires more discipline from the instructor. It requires more formalized advance preparation and consultation with the director, and shipping material to be distributed in advance. Classes are likely to be much larger, when you add the students at all of the locations 80 is not impossible, and we have surpassed 100. All of this means that instructors who teach in this format have to be given some trade-offs. Not additional money, because this only detracts from their research responsibilities. Probably a reduced teaching load. In a total overall budget system it is easily possible. When you have 100 students in class, that income tuition allows you to spend money elsewhere, but only if the money is yours to begin with.

There must also be concern about support materials, particularly in the way of outside readings and references to be consulted. There is some flexibility here, but also some limitations. I would not offer a course on Literature of the Humanities at a small community college location, I probably would teach it at Notre Dame, and as dean I would ask the instructor to certify personally that the support materials were there. In libraries the use of reserves is easily accomplished through a cooperative reference desk, and that is why libraries are a lot better than empty stores. There are also some possible surprises. Children's literature courses are usually better supported in public libraries than in academic libraries, for reasons that must seem obvious. We also, in recognition of the fact that many of our part-time students have other responsibilities and show up for the class and only the class, make heavy use of distributed reading packets which we sell at cost. Fortunately, obtaining copyright clearance in the field of library science is not difficult.

For courses offered specifically on local campuses, we utilize a traveling reference collection moved from one campus to the next. Sometimes that is the base collection if the course is not offered that semester on the home campus, but usually it requires the purchase of duplicate materials. For TV courses it requires the purchase of lots of duplicate material, but think of all those enrollments! Because these are Bloomington courses and the University Library is responsible for supporting the instructional program, I have always held the Library responsible for the cost of this process, although I am certainly willing to endorse and support its request for additional funds for this unusual purpose.

I should mention audio cassettes as teaching devices, if only to state that I don't care for them. Obviously they are not interactive, but if I am going to participate in a non-interactive process, I would prefer to read rather than listen. We read faster than others speak. Certainly, we could
conceivably listen while we do something else, but then the question is of whether or not we concentrate. Let me just leave it, as an instructor, by stating that I am suspicious. To me, academic credit by home study or audio cassettes has severe potential drawbacks. Besides, that was an old technology, and not at all necessary any longer.

What does this experience as a teacher in library science suggest to me with regard to the provision of off-campus library services? If anything, it is that this process should be simpler. The technology is simple and in place. What may be missing is money, but I am a long time adherent of the writing of Peter Drucker. It was Drucker who stated that in the question of offering a service that people truly want, cost becomes irrelevant. The issue is not cost. It is political justification.

I have spoken about this topic repeatedly in out-of-the-way places like Alaska and Wyoming, as well as to library groups indigenous to New Mexico. In all of these talks I insist that there is no practical, and certainly no insurmountable reason, to suggest that citizens of these locations, whether in public libraries or academic settings, should not be able to have the same kind of library access as residents of citizens of Boston or Cleveland, except for the ability to browse. Please forgive me for seeming simplistic, but I see no handicaps except for political barriers, and political barriers are eliminated whenever those who have erected them decide it is worth their while.

Bibliographic access has become literally instantaneous to any location that has electrical power or even a portable generator. It does not require a library at all, as the National Library of Medicine constantly reminds doctors. Document delivery does require some sort of centralized store from which to deliver, but the mechanisms are simple, ranging from the electronic to commercial delivery services like Purolator and even the good old Postal Service which also promises one day delivery. Obviously for a price, but if you haven't heard me say that price is ultimately an irrelevancy you haven't been listening. The point is that document delivery from anywhere to anywhere within 48 hours is easy, within 24 hours or less possible. Where the physical library collections for document supply of already identified items will be is the non-issue of the next millennium and even the next decade, and if we refuse to deal with that reality somebody else will do it for us. We have come to depend on FAX machines to such an extent that we can't remember how we did without them. E-mail is another example, although I find some excesses here in the use of E-mail for no real purpose whatsoever.

Technology, then solves the bibliographic and document delivery problem as long as we are only dealing with specific requests for specific documents. Even here we have had options that an emphasis on tradition has perhaps caused us to ignore. Way back in 1975 I served as a consultant for the then planned Pahlavi National Library in Iran. That library never came to reality, for reasons you understand, although it could just as easily have been built by the next government, except of the suspicious approaches toward "Western" culture and information. In planning that library, the team of consultants recognized that interlibrary loan through the normal mail system—depending on roads, railroads, and airports—would not work in Iran. We designed a building with a heliport on the roof, with interlibrary loan service through helicopters. It was not a particularly startling thought, and the only thing I found startling is that many people considered it radically innovative. It would occur to me instantly that the best way to deliver interlibrary loan in Alaska, given the geography, would be by seaplane. Alaska has few roads and few airports, but many lakes. Fishermen certainly know the best way to get around in Alaska, why don't those concerned with moving documents?

One more example. Indiana is an institution in a group of midwestern universities called the Big 10, although now there are 11 of them. Indiana and Illinois, both major ARL institutions are close enough to make an easy three hours drive between the two routine. It has always occurred to me that the simplest way to handle interlibrary loan between the two libraries is not to mail or even
FAX requests and then mail requested books. It is to call the university travel office to find out what faculty members from our school are on their campus today. There are probably at least a dozen, who have room in their car for a little lone book, and would be glad to bring it back with them this afternoon if we just asked them. Why haven't we? Not as a favor to us, as a matter of academic courtesy to their colleagues. We could FAX or phone the request, and then use the messenger.

For reference work, when users don't know specifically what they want, and this is the essence of our professional credit if it is anywhere, the issue is a little more complicated but not much more so. First of all, I note that in academia we tend to do very little reference work even for the people on our own campuses. There is a classic contradiction in value systems between education and information service--between an emphasis on self-help and on help, and we need to come to grips with that. We might want to ordain self-service in the information process for students because it is good for them, but there are limits to this. Don't try it with faculty or with administrators. One major university which sought to make faculty members self-sufficient by offering courses in on-line searching found very few faculty members in attendance. The faculty members had sent secretaries and graduate students. So much for the premise that faculty are just dying to do their own information work. Are you surprised? I'm not. My point is simply that if your programs to offer off-campus library services only go as far as document delivery, you are not doing the status of this profession any favors. You are not giving them what they really want, and if they haven't asked you it is primarily because they are sure you wouldn't do it anyway. Haven't you been telling them how swamped you are? Even more dangerous is the possibility that they haven't asked you for information interaction because they don't think you are smart enough.

The solution for library information work at a distance is, to me, the good old 800 number, available 7 days a week, 24 hours a day. American Express has been doing it for a long time. If I can't sleep, I can always ask for a review of my account from somebody who is paid not to sleep. Think of what we could do with qualified librarians any time of the day or night, working with a local collection and with terminal access. They can answer your question directly, working with a local collection and with terminal access. They can answer your question directly or by getting back to you. They can send you material through a whole variety of delivery mechanisms--they can send you bibliographies, they can send you a whole combination of all of these. What is the problem, funding? Sure it costs money, but a nation that spends $50 billion on processed pet food annually can afford this. Besides, what are the alternatives? There are only two. Immense duplication of effort at really exorbitant costs, or ignorance, planned and anticipated. Neither alternative is acceptable. And, indeed, this solution is so obvious that I can predict with confidence that somebody will do it. It just might not be us.

Our nation deserves not only an educational but also an informational system that is not restricted by arbitrary boundaries of geography. Such boundaries, in the present and evolving electronic era, are increasingly irrelevant. Ultimately people will get what they want and need, and if we don't do it somebody with an MIS background or a computer background will. That is bad for us, but also bad for the users.

The need is there. The opportunity is there. Our abilities are there. Do we have the courage and the conviction?
Library Outreach Services: A Vision of the Future

Donna Whitson, Keith Cottam and William Van Arsdale
University of Wyoming

Introduction

Library outreach services haven't changed much since they first started to appear. Fixed-location collections and interlibrary loan still prevail. But academic libraries can no longer be thought of as simply assets for single institutions. They are part of an information system of complex relationships with other libraries and organizations. Knowledge in the form of published information is an enormous resource. It is commercialized. It is transient and only some is permanent. It is needed at home, on the campus and at distant locations. It is deeply imbedded in social, economic and cultural needs. All these factors and others cause us to reexamine the persistent traditional model for library outreach services.

We believe that successful library outreach services must surely build on past successes, including collection resources, but they will more likely succeed by developing, improving and applying new thinking and new technologies to make information accessible and then to speed it to the people who need it.

We are just as romantic as the most emotional humanist scholar about the need to browse great collections and commune with bound volumes and the printed page; we are however, realists in a library world dislocated by new technologies, information costs and expectations for expanded educational opportunities and information access not constrained by campus residency requirements.

We believe that while massive research collections and even smaller college libraries are essential to meet local instructional and research needs, they are often treated as if medieval citadels perched on ancestral ground and surrounded by high walls breached only by the elect. Preservation of our great collections is necessary, prudent but more effective use of all library resources is essential to an educated population.

This paper looks very briefly at library outreach services in the past, summarizes current experience and practice, challenges current applications, and proposes a vision for the future.

Perspectives on the Past

Although academic institutions have been providing off-campus educational opportunities in various ways for over 100 years, interest in off-campus education activities rose dramatically after World War II. Only since the 1980s, however, have extensive efforts been made to meet library demands for off-campus programs. The literature on off-campus library services is sparse and reflects the slow development in the field, with but a few landmark applied studies published and almost no basic research conducted.

Recognizing the need for standards for providing library services, the Association for Field Services in Teacher Education adopted standards for off-campus courses in 1961 that included the statement, "... the same level of library resources will be available to extension students as are
available on the university campus* (Association of College and Research Libraries [ACRL], 1967, p. 54).

While formal library standards were first adopted for four-year and junior colleges in 1959 and 1960 respectively, they considered only on-campus experiences. In response to the need for off-campus standards, the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) Committee on Standards began working on guidelines in 1963. At the 1965 ALA Annual Conference the Committee sponsored a program on "Library Services for College Extension Centers" (Tanis, 1967). Additional discussions and advice from accrediting associations, the National Association of Evening Colleges, the U.S. Office of Education, the National University Extension Association, the Association for Field Services in Teacher Education, several other ALA divisions, public and state librarians, and other interested parties, resulted in a second draft of the document.

The adopted "Guidelines for Library Services to Extension Students" were published in 1967 (Association of College and Research Libraries, 1967). The ACRL Committee on Standards, however, clearly indicated that the guidelines were subject to change as innovation in services required.

In 1980, the Committee proposed revisions based on a survey of academic libraries that indicated support of more explicit guidelines. The following year, "Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Services" were adopted with the intention that they would encourage stronger existing programs and new initiatives. The guidelines were published in 1982 (Association of College and Research Libraries, 1982) and brought up for review again in 1988. Revised by a task force and approved by the ALA Standards Committee at the annual meeting in 1991, the guidelines serve as the benchmark document for library outreach services.

Before 1980, occasional articles appeared in library and education journals, especially focused on adult, non-traditional students. Early work was done by McCabe and Tjarks (1979). Lessin from Central Michigan University was also making national presentations and publishing his views (1983). In 1980, Walker and Maxwell surveyed the literature for a 25-year period and found three types of articles that they labeled:

1. those explaining how off-campus teaching faculty were used as couriers or delivery personnel;
2. those on how to establish reserve collections and to contract with local public libraries for additional services; and
3. discussions of efforts involving permanent satellite libraries. (Walker & Maxwell, 1983)

The first Off-Campus Library Services Conference was held at the initiation of Central Michigan University in 1982. The published proceedings from that meeting and subsequent conferences in 1985, 1986 and 1988 have been the most significant contributions to the literature.
The 1982 proceedings began the process of defining areas of concern for the field. Library outreach service providers categorized how service was organized as exemplified by the topics reported in the 1982 Off-Campus Library Services Proceedings.

- Administration and Planning
- Uses of Technology
- Model Programs
- Document Delivery
- Bibliographic Instruction
- Program Evaluation (Lessin, 1983)

Besides the conference proceedings, Lessin proposed in 1985 that five basic models were being used for the delivery of off-campus library services.

- branch library
- use of on-campus library for both on- and off-campus clients
- trunk system (book and material delivery)
- use of local libraries
- some combination of the previous four models (Lessin, 1986)

Changes in the field are reflected in the Off-Campus Library Services Directory published in 1990 (Lebowitz and Schultz, 1990). The directory represents off-campus library programs for 68 institutions in 31 states and Canada. Most programs listed provide the following services.

- Reference assistance--usually by telephone
- Online and CD-ROM searches--some for fees
- Document delivery--usually by postal service, courier or facsimile
- User education--includes on-site instruction, guides and workbooks, point-of-use aids, computer-assisted instruction, and video-taped librarian presentations
- Contractual arrangements with local sites to provide some materials and services
- Satellite collections (Lebowitz and Schultz, 1990)

**Current Experience**

Using this literature review and the Off-Campus Library Services Directory (Lebowitz and Schultz, 1990), we arbitrarily selected ten current programs for a telephone survey of current practice and experience. The survey was conducted in May and June of 1991 and included:

California State University-Chico
Central Michigan University
Gonzaga University - Washington
Mercer University - Georgia
Nova University - Florida
University of Alaska
University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign
University of Maryland University College
University of Northern Colorado
University of Phoenix
The following four questions were asked of the ten institutions surveyed.

1. What new library programs and services are in place at your institution to support distance education?

2. What new technologies have been added in the past two years to enhance user access and document delivery for distance education?

3. What formal relationship does the library outreach program have with the institution's extension/outreach division? Is it independent? Is it coordinated? Are there formal ties?

4. Would you describe some of your most successful library service programs and/or technologies? Would you describe your worst nightmares?

Almost all new services added by the surveyed programs were tied directly to technologies, such as:

dial access to online catalog (6)
videotaped instruction/publicity (2)
planning for E-mail transmission of requests in near future (2)
toll-free telephone number (2)
new book collections at sites (1)
teleconference delivery of user education (1)
online interlibrary loan form (1)
use of cable television channel for publicity (1)

Since the relationship of library outreach services and academic extension/outreach services often determines how programs operate, we were also interested in what those relationships were. Six of the ten programs surveyed had formal relationships, five were under distance education divisions, four received budget support from academic programs, and in three instances, librarians had faculty appointments in the academic extension divisions. Ties were cooperative but informal in three cases, and only one program reported a difficult relationship with the academic extension division.

The successes and nightmares were not unexpected given current development in the field. Successes most often mentioned were collaboration between librarians and faculty (4), automation for faster service and easier statistical analysis (3), and growth of programs prompted by user demands (2).

Nightmares included automation breakdowns or failures, slowness of document delivery, library illiteracy, politics and turf issues, poor communication and coordination, and public library closings.

Confronting Current Practice

This background, garnered from the literature and the survey, provides a springboard for moving ahead to the future, and several questions emerge for consideration.

- Why don't we use technology more effectively?
- Why do we persist in establishing collections and largely ignore access and document delivery?
• Why don't we spend more on automation?
• Why don't we talk to each other, the faculty and administrators?
• Why do we hesitate to compete with private enterprise for the provision of information?
• Why aren't librarians considered valued partners in the educational process?

Over the last ten years extensive discussions about library services for the future have ensued in the face of dramatically changing libraries. Hacken asked the question, "Tomorrow's Research Library: Vigor or Rigor Mortis?" (1988), and in 1989 the work of a group of academic librarians who met to discuss the future was published as a proposed model in the Journal of Academic Librarianship (Woodsworth, et al, 1989). The following issue published reactions to the model. During the past few years Herb White has continually challenged us about who we are and what we should be doing, and last January Dougherty promoted the issue of user-responsive research libraries (1991a). As all of us envision the library of the 21st century, we must be reminded that the 21st century begins in about nine years, and the time for planning and dreaming is over--the need for action is here.

After searching, thinking, reading and listening, and working to develop library outreach services in Wyoming, we are ready to propose a vision for the future of library outreach services. We will consider five areas:

1. Librarianship--leadership and professionalism
2. Politics
3. Information economics
4. Bibliographic mapping
5. Technology.

Librarianship--Leadership and Professionalism

One of the most revealing aspects of the many reports on the quality of American education over the past few years is the extent to which libraries, and especially librarians, are excluded. Rarely has anyone mentioned them as an integral part of the educational process, and there has been a generally ineffective response from librarians. Not only has there been no effective outcry from librarians, many are probably unaware of the omissions or apparently unconcerned if they noticed. Librarians whine a great deal about their image; in reality, they do little to change the image.

Studies of the relationship of librarians' personality types and vocational choice have been conducted since the 1940s. Agada surveyed the literature on librarians and personality types and concluded that the findings of all these studies tended to confirm work done by Clayton in 1968 that found librarians to be "disinclined towards initiative, decision-making and assertiveness-traits inappropriate to the achievement of leadership positions of higher status" (Agada, 1984, p. 33). White has taken us to task many times about librarians and leadership. He says, "Does librarianship need leaders? Can there be any doubt? One look around at all the missed opportunities, unmet priorities, and lost turf should be enough to persuade" (White, 1990, p. 53). White proposes that librarians tend to confuse management with leadership, and he cites Thomas Cosgrove's definition of managers and leaders that indicates the terms are often opposite in meaning.

Managers concentrate on problem solving, leaders on purposes and causes.
Managers are production driven and are fascinated by statistics, leaders are driven by values.

Managers seek conflict avoidance, in particular with other high-level managers. Leaders not only accept but also invite conflict.

Managers thrive on predictability, leaders are ambiguous.

Managers are good soldiers who assure that the organization's objectives are achieved even if they disagree with them. Leaders concentrate on assuring that their objectives become the organization's objectives. (White, 1990, pp. 52-53)

Creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship are descriptors not usually applied to academic librarians but always to leaders. Studies have described "intrapreneurial" behavior and librarians (Cottam, 1987).

Without leadership in academic library outreach programs, we will continue to be left out of the process. All the other issues--politics, information economics, bibliographic mapping and technology--hinge on strong leadership in libraries. As White (1990) puts it, "... if we need and want leadership and leaders, that doesn't necessarily mean that we want what leaders do. Are we willing to accept the pain, the work, the risks, and the challenges to passivity and rationalization that leaders would make us face? I'm not at all sure. It is certainly much easier for the profession to preach leadership than to embrace it." (p. 53)

We think it is worth the risk. But how do we do it? How do we produce, develop or attract leaders to librarianship? How do we change current practitioners? While this issue may well be the most critical, it is also the most difficult to solve. It cannot be resolved quickly but will require a dedicated, persistent effort by the profession.

We propose three initial activities to build and strengthen library leadership.

- Training
- Rewards
- Recruitment

First, the training component can be addressed in two ways--through formal library education programs and through continuing education and on-the-job programs. Library and information science degree programs must include a curriculum containing, in some form, the following elements:

- critical thinking/decision-making skills
- creative/innovative skills
- assertiveness training
- communication skills
- interpersonal skills
- public speaking skills
- group dynamics/team building skills
- change agent training
- self-esteem/self-confidence training
- image/self-projection skills
- fiscal and analytical skills
Second, when these traits and characteristics are exhibited in librarians, they must be rewarded and encouraged. We must learn how to break out of traditional, task-oriented thinking and be rewarded when we do so with time and opportunity to work on projects requiring creativity. We must resist the tendency for tunnel vision that prevents us from seeing things in new ways. Beyond the reward of time and opportunity for breaking away, we should support leaves with pay for professional development, fund special workshops and institutes, enhance authority for projects and ongoing activities, improve salaries for exceptional performance, and give public recognition for achievement. Rewarding the behavior we want to encourage is a positive step.

Third, we must recruit some non-librarian professional specialists to work in libraries. For example, a specialist in adult education with additional library training and experience may be more effective than a librarian in managing a program. For several functional areas in larger programs, such as personnel, fiscal management, instructional design and teacher training, specialists from non-library disciplines are often superior for the jobs. The thinking that the MLS is the only qualifying credential for library work is constraining the profession (Cottam, 1976).

These three suggestions will not resolve the issue of library leadership, but can certainly have a positive impact in that direction.

Politcs

Library leadership has built hundreds of examples of great campus libraries over the past several decades. But we don't hear much about library services established out in the countryside to support the needs of distance education programs. We acquire material to support courses taught on campus and to meet the scholarly needs of the faculty; students and faculty away from the campus must usually fend for themselves. We build campus libraries bigger because size is an easy way to claim adequacy—even quality—but we give little thought to the needs of outreach students unless they ask embarrassing questions.

Sometimes we would be well served to ask embarrassing questions of ourselves. Several out-of-state colleges and universities are now offering distance education programs in Wyoming, and we have asked some unwanted questions of colleagues in other states. A typical encounter goes something like this:

"Good to see you again. How are things going at good ol' Beta College?"

"Well, we're not doing too bad. A new addition to the library is going up and our special collections program is coming along nicely. The acquisitions budget is hurting, but the vice president says we can expect some special attention as soon as possible, and the library endowment is growing."

"Oh, that's great. Say, I noticed the College is offering some graduate programs in Wyoming now."

"Yeah, I noticed that."

"What are you doing about library services up there?"

"Mmmm. The vice president hasn't talked to me about it and I haven't given it much thought. I guess the faculty takes care of it, and the students can probably get what they need from local libraries. You know, I really should think about it."
Thinking about it isn't enough. The discontent regarding the matter is mounting among outreach education students even if librarians, faculty and administrators are not responsibly addressing the issue. Politically speaking, we have been quite artful and protective in dodging the issues, but we have also been dishonest.

To cope better, we believe the sanctity of campus libraries—particularly large campus libraries—must be reassessed. We agree with Dougherty (1991b) who recently wrote that "research libraries must abandon the idea that 'bigger is better.' Since...simpler times," he said, "computer and telecommunication technologies have rearranged the library landscape" (p. A32).

We also believe we must become an active part of the process for outreach program planning and decision making, learn to collaborate with other libraries on outreach service issues, and work to build alliances within an outreach service area.

First, consider the decision making process. Unfortunately, libraries too often find themselves in a corner because parent institutions establish outreach, distance education programs and then inform the libraries that library resources and services will be expected. While the vice president may not inform us of outreach programs, we are at fault as librarians for not being more active and visible forces on campus. We don't feel responsibility for being a key participant in outreach education program planning. We don't insist on not only our responsibility but also our right to be a partner in the planning and development process. So speak out and be heard.

Here are several practical ideas that will help, ideas that came from the 1987 ACRL President's Program in San Francisco:

- Be a library advocate on campus through professional, social and intellectual contacts.
- Write and publish material that demonstrates expertise and competence.
- Establish library priorities in harmony with institutional priorities.
- Participate in academic department faculty meetings.
- Involve faculty members in librarian recruiting.
- Integrate bibliographic instruction into courses. (Rader, 1988)

Participants in the San Francisco Program concluded that "Librarians must have an interest in the academic enterprise and play academic politics successfully..." We add to this that we also must learn—our institutions must learn—that it is not wise to implement distance education programs without full library participation. If it does happen, libraries are foolhardy to either make excuses about all the reasons library service is not possible or try to stretch a little more and go it alone.

In a paper before the 1988 Tennessee Regent's Conference on Higher Education, Cottam (1988) stated:

We have a choice: We can be curators of library collections and managers of study halls, or we can direct them as essential gears in the academic community. The latter implies interconnections, energy, power and action. (p. 28)

Second, collaboration with our colleagues in distant libraries is essential. We know how difficult that is in Wyoming: 97,914 square miles, a few more than 453,000 citizens, one university, seven community colleges, 23 county libraries, a state library, a handful of special libraries, and a lot of miles and open road. Even with such a small population we have difficulty communicating and coexisting. Getting together to talk about the issues is difficult, which makes it easier to turn a deaf ear and blind eye to the need for forging library service arrangements and policy. Turf awareness is also alive and well in Wyoming, like so many cattle barons home on the range staking claims to the
integrity of local campus and public libraries. And funding is tight and getting tighter. Collaboration does not always occur, alliances are not forged and everyone recoils from responsibility for the failures to do so. The total complex of probable relationships—the politics of the matter—are not always addressed.

We must learn to collaborate at the front end, to reassess the library landscape that Dougherty describes, and to explore new alliances with both technology and political entities. Just as research libraries have stubbornly built larger and larger collections, outreach programs have stubbornly clung to excuses to avoid the library issues. Even worse, we have looked the other way to avoid collaboration to develop and build new cooperative ventures.

Third, build alliances. There are, of course, several real factors that influence our relationships, such as copyright, finite budgets, community expectations, local governance practices, and the fact that library directors are held accountable for managing and preserving their institution's library resources.

In full view of these real factors, we reject the general notion of fencing and protecting our libraries from "others," and we propose a model that will recognize that all libraries have inherent weaknesses that may be complemented by the strengths of others. Our premise challenges the traditional, independent and self-sufficient library model, even when backed by interlibrary loan or satellite collections, and urges new alliances to share costs and responsibilities.

Alliances may take the form of technological connections, institutional arrangements, operating policies with shared authority and joint responsibility, and contractual relationships. They are cooperative agreements designed to meet the information needs of people distant from a fixed-base library. They transcend the constraints of traditional library services. They surmount information access barriers.

Building alliances runs against the grain of most library directors. It requires leaving the library, exploring other parts of the institution and the outreach area, sitting down and talking to others about the possibilities free from constraining assumptions, being assertive about what the library can and cannot do, looking for innovation and taking a little risk.

We believe in acknowledging legitimate boundaries within alliance building relationships—special interests and community values, real cost constraints, governance realities, local accountability—but we also believe we must work at defining new relationships and goals free of past constraints, real or imagined. Securing the resources to support this new direction then becomes the productive challenge rather than the hunkering down behavior of fending off distance education information needs with turf conscious arguments.

Let's look further at the legitimate boundaries. Libraries in academic communities are bound up in their institutions by shared values, social norms, common purpose and governance realities. These ties define expectations, not only for the communities but also for outsiders. At stake are membership prerogatives, ownership and property rights, financial control, management power and authority, hierarchical control, and social and cultural expectations. In short, academic libraries are imbedded in their local environments, and that can't be ignored. They are important community assets, and library directors will naturally respond to the web of expectations to manage the asset properly. They are typically careful not to give away the shop, but in doing so they often isolate the very people they are charged to serve in distant locations, as well as students from other institutions who need freedom of access to information.
Library directors will tend to be loyal to delegated responsibility, comfortable with familiar circumstances, and satisfied with what they know best. All those faceless distance education students just cause problems for collections, staffing and operations support. "Our first responsibility is to serve the campus," is almost a battle cry. Piecing together the sentiment expressed by some of our colleagues in the intermountain region, we hear: "If I extend my resources to them, the collections will wear out from all the abuse of mailing the stuff, and the demands on my staff will just be impossible. And what about copyright? And besides, we'll probably lose a lot of material if we let it go clear out there." The chorus is one of finding reasons not to respond, to entrench and protect, even though prospective library users away from the campus have as much right to the resources as someone who can walk in the front door.

And what about those people from other institutions? Without collaboration and alliance building, the climate may make them feel alien. The library staff may project a reluctance to extend service. The educational process may be chilled.

Overcoming the natural tendency to manage the library asset as a campus possession not to be shared becomes the challenge and the basis for a new model of library outreach service behavior. In today's democratic societies, knowledge is difficult to control. It flows over the radio, through the TV, by way of publications, and within our schools. Even patents and copyrights, intellectual property rights, fall victim to photocopy machines, FAX technology and electronic networks. Traditional library hierarchy and management control doesn't work very well where distance education and information access and delivery are being demanded. People have ever increasing expectations for information access in a free society and expanding environment of distance education. No longer does a site-bound collection in size or content that met yesterday's needs respond to today's. We must rethink such issues as governance, information access and document delivery, copyright royalty arrangements, networking and resource sharing.

The model, we believe is simple and direct: become a key player in developing the role of libraries in distance education programs, collaborate and build alliances. We are impressed by the British Open University model (Normie, 1988) and our own experience in Wyoming (Johnson, 1984). We are also impressed by the potential of such ventures as the New Mexico Consortium of Academic Libraries (Oberlander, 1991), the annual Wyoming Academic Libraries Articulation Conferences (Johnson, 1983; Whitson, 1989, 1990; Barstow, 1991), and the Coalition for Networked Information (Kirk, 1991) that bring together key players in collaborative forums. Although little or no collaboration occurs outside of correspondence and documented agreements, the Reciprocal Faculty Borrowing Program (R. D. Van Orden, personal communication, May 31, 1991) also represents a lowering of information access barriers for distance education students and faculty through cooperative resource sharing. And Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries (CARL) demonstrates a successful networking and resource sharing system that enhances the teaching and learning environment for participating institutions (Lenzini and Shaw, 1991).

Information Economics

The issue of information economics for off-campus users deserves an article all by itself. For purposes of this paper, let us focus on two basic problems and then pose several possible solutions. The usual means to meet off-campus student and faculty information needs, a combination of local library usage and document delivery services from a campus library, has always been confusing for the user while complicated and staff-intensive for the campus library. Local libraries are not uniform in their holdings so that reliance upon a main campus library is variable. Staff from a campus library are usually required to provide articles or books as well as basic reference services to off-campus students and faculty. Expansion of that service through application of technology raises the economic cost. For example, facsimile equipment must be available at a main campus library...
and a local library. Trying to deliver directly through facsimile may be an ideal but is unlikely until more individuals have computers with FAX boards, personal FAX machines, or personal accounts with public FAX services. Providing remote access to a main campus library's online catalog requires terminals or microcomputers with terminal software as well as telecommunications charges from local libraries to the campus library.

The ability of a main campus library to serve as the information safety net for off-campus needs is also suffering because of economic trends that are quite familiar to most of us. The pressures that led many, if not most, academic libraries to cancel or plan to cancel serials and periodicals during the last several years include slowdown in growth or actual reductions of library materials budgets, rapid inflation in the cost of journals, deteriorating value of the dollar overseas, and poor local state economies. Traditional library practice—that is, to try to preserve serials at the expense of other portions of the materials budgets—means even greater reductions in the acquisition of non-serial literature. As academic libraries begin to turn to access rather than purchase to meet the needs of on-campus users, off-campus users will also be affected.

The pressures on information economics for off-campus users require some changes in traditional library practice. First, libraries have to take a long, hard look at their purpose and goals. While philosophically most academic libraries would readily agree to the ACRL Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Services (Association of College and Research Libraries, 1990), budget allocations indicate off-campus users are frequently second-class citizens. Off-campus students and faculty typically cannot drop by the library to check out a book, sit down to a CD-ROM workstation and print out a list of citations, or locate a bound periodical volume in the stacks and photocopy an article. If a library is serious about supporting the needs of off-campus users, it must allocate resources for staffing, equipment and innovation.

Besides getting more of the current library budget, managers of outreach services need to look at ways to generate additional funding. Charging off-campus students a library services surcharge per course would produce some supplemental funding that could pay for needed staffing or equipment. If a university's administration rejects the notion because off-campus users are not being treated the same as on-campus users, then they have bolstered the argument for a greater share of regular budgets. Fund raising from local organizations where off-campus education is offered might help equip remote sites. But expecting off-campus service managers to engage in these activities must be spelled out in their job assignments and they must be given appropriate time to carry this out. Collaborating and negotiating with local libraries to place hardware or arrange access to campus library resources may encourage concessions for off-campus students and faculty. For example, in Wyoming our interest is to locate dedicated CARL public access catalog terminals with printers and telefacsimile machines in each of the local community college libraries for the benefit of our students and faculty. In return the college library will provide local library services for our users while also gaining bibliographic access to our resources for their users. Finally, coordinating off-campus library service needs with the agency responsible for offering off-campus courses should result in additional legislated appropriations, grant funding and operating budgets for library services. At Wyoming, coordination has resulted in sharing the cost for daily courier service between Laramie and Casper, dividing the printing and distribution costs for informational brochures, and support for telecommunications and equipment costs for sites without a dedicated terminal.

Bibliographic Mapping

One of the major problems for off-campus students and faculty is trying to determine where to locate needed information. This has been particularly vexing in a state like Wyoming with few resources spread thinly across a large territory. As with all searches for recorded information, there are two interrelated issues. The first is bibliographic access, which is answering the question, "What
specific article or book should provide information I need?" Responding to this question requires access to library catalogs or abstracting and indexing tools so that a user can convert subject-based inquiry into specific citations that may yield the desired information.

The second issue is physical access, which is answering the question, "How do I get a copy of a specific article or book?" We are quite familiar to the solution to this concern since that has been the focus of outreach efforts from the very beginning.

A suggestion to dealing with both the bibliographic and physical access questions for off-campus users is to provide them a roadmap so that they can do as much as possible on their own before seeking assistance. The notion of bibliographic mapping is derived in part from Michael Keresztesi's notion of "bibliographic topography" (Keresztesi, 1982, p. 21). A primitive sort of map found in many states is a directory of libraries and other information sources that informs a user what resources are available in the region. Most directories, however, don't provide enough information on resources to allow a user to decide to travel to a neighboring library. We propose a more effective map that not only summarizes the bibliographic topography of the library landscape, but also illustrates the information resource relationships within a region or state. Included on such a map should be county, academic, state agency, hospital, special, and private libraries as well as resources in museums, county extension offices, law offices, and other places where libraries and information centers are located. The map would indicate more than location including explanations about access to and document availability. For those libraries with online catalogs, their existence should be cited and their searching explained; for others, the map should provide lists of journals, indexing tools, and special collections. Important additional information that should be provided are to indicate services available to outreach students and faculty that have been negotiated between a campus library and a local library.

Just as a roadmap indicates highways, the bibliographic map will indicate the electronic highways or telecommunications links to the main campus library as well as access for other online services. Obviously, use of these highways requires easy-to-use instructions on how to access remote resources. In Wyoming, the electronic highways include a statewide circulation system, dial access into CARL, the Wyoming Higher Education Consortium Network (WHECN) with high-speed access to the University of Wyoming VAX cluster, and a developing statewide telecommunications system. Available through these Wyoming connections are library holdings databases of the CARL full and associate member, other bibliographic databases (like the Wyoming Water Research Center's Water Bibliography or the Libraries' Yellowstone Bibliography), electronic reference tools (like the Academic American encyclopedia), numeric databases (including Center for Research on Security Prices [CRSP files]), and full-text files (like Choice reviews). Connection to the UW VAX cluster gives access to the Internet and, when it becomes a reality, the National Research and Education Network (NREN). Massive numeric files, other library catalogs, and electronic journals are currently available. Other information resources that are available off-line through outreach services should be mapped as well, such as stand-alone CD-ROM bibliographic databases or census data distributed to depository libraries. Finally, resources from vendors such as Dialog, BRS, Prodigy and TEXT can be mentioned, particularly if arrangements have been made to subsidize the searching costs.

Another possible level to the bibliographic map is to indicate structure of disciplines to guide users in their pursuit of specific information. This is seen as the electronic analog to printed disciplinary bibliographic guides except they will be structured through expert systems software. Users will be advised to use the most appropriate titles first and will not be overloaded with peripheral or minimally useful titles. General instruction on search procedures, the difference between different types of indexing, and description of the array of services from the outreach services office should also be included. The hope, if not the execution, is to make off-campus users
as independent as possible, just as we work to make on-campus users literate, while providing a human safety net of additional services.

Given the variety of information that the bibliographic map could provide, we envision electronic media (diskette or CD-ROM) will be used rather than printed documents. Such an implementation will require hardware in host libraries and would improve the ability to analyze use of the map. It should be obvious that successful maps for off-campus users will require extensive consultations with local and other affected libraries. While we have discussed bibliographic mapping in relationship to off-campus students and faculty, we believe the concept has potential value for on-campus clientele as well.

Technology

Leadership and professionalism, politics, information economics and bibliographic mapping may ultimately fail or succeed because of their relationship to technology. Today's information society is largely technology driven, and librarians often become computer and telecommunications experts who serve as vital links in the information chain. Malinconico (1991) describes the workplace for librarians as an "electronic goldfish bowl." He says we have shifted our concerns from developing and maintaining physical collections to "locating information wherever it may be, moving it from where it is to where it is needed, and adding value to it" (Malinconico, 1991, p. 25). Information, communication and computers are inseparable in modern libraries. Library outreach services are affected by the technology that has automated acquisitions, cataloging, circulation, interlibrary loan and reference services. While all these enhancements benefit off-campus library services, distance education programming must be complemented with additional technologies focused on educational delivery. For the first time ever, these technologies are equalizing information access for off-campus users. We know from experience in Wyoming that once people become aware of what is possible, they are never satisfied with the status quo. With technology, change is the only constant. In looking at technology from both the user and the library viewpoint, we are proposing three possible scenarios.

First we must remind ourselves that technologies cannot be implemented in isolation within one institution, and especially not just in the library. Planning and implementation of technologies require both a state and national perspective. In developing highways for information access and delivery, connections and networks of people, resources and telecommunications channels must be established. The effort must include cooperative planning and funding. The most expensive and elaborate equipment is useless if there are no telecommunications connections. For instance, in Wyoming there are communities where the only communications connections to the State and nation are literally copper wires strung along fence posts. We may know how to send messages on one end and receive them on the other, but if the middle of the electronic highway is copper wire, high speed transmissions are impossible. Data and messages will be lost. Video transmissions are not possible. Audio conferencing is difficult. In Wyoming a state telecommunications office has been established to work cooperatively with the University of Wyoming and the private sector to develop a state-wide network.

The best example of national networking is the proposed National Research and Education Network (NREN) which would connect most educational institutions in the United States. Librarians must be tuned in and involved in the development of this network since user education for accessing the information component will likely fall to libraries (NREN, 1991).

The second proposal we call an information center model using interactive technologies to bring in resources beyond the library. This model is based on a Kellogg funded project established in Colorado, Montana, Utah and Wyoming called the Intermountain Community Learning and
Information Services project, or ICLIS (Cottam and Whitson, 1991). The program became operational in 1986 with a mission of providing access to information and education for rural citizens. Information centers were located in local public libraries in cooperation with state libraries, land-grant institutions and a number of other local, state, regional and national resources. Traditional delivery and innovative technologies were used in the project. A new technology at the time, audiographics, was installed at pilot sites in all four states. The system utilized telephone lines to deliver still-frame video and graphics via personal computers, coupled with audioconferencing for interactive delivery of educational programming. The audiographics pilot illustrates the speed of change in technological development since the four-year-old system is currently being replaced by a full-motion compressed video technology.

While compressed video offers tremendous opportunity for academic course delivery, it is an even more exciting tool for library resource delivery. The system employs equipment at both the sending and receiving sites. Both groups can see and hear each other and are able to see projected text, illustrations, overhead transparencies, slides, video and other graphic materials. Outreach centers located in public libraries, public schools, county cooperative extension offices, etc., could be directly connected to academic libraries through compressed video. The technology would allow the patron to interact directly with the reference staff in the same kind of face-to-face interview as with on-campus patrons. Reference staff could project material onto the screen so that the patron could make informed decisions about the appropriateness of the material requested. The selected material could then be sent by telefacsimile or mailed to the patron. In addition to enhanced reference service, the compressed video technology could be used for bibliographic instruction or information literacy sessions to off-campus faculty and students.

A compressed digital video system has recently been installed at Arizona State University linking the University's three campus sites for intercampus meetings. Connections are being made to other state institutions, and possible uses for distance education and joint ventures with business are being considered (Staff, 1991).

The third component of the technology proposal centers around the online public access catalog. Of the ten libraries we surveyed for updated information, eight provide off-campus access to online catalogs. We will use the University of Wyoming's online catalog, CARL, as an example of what is possible. CARL is an automated information system that provides access to the University of Wyoming collections plus more than 100 other online catalogs. In addition to the catalogs, CARL provides access to other kinds of databases such as UnCover, a current index to articles from some 10,000 journals. CARL's newest product, UnCover 2, is certain to be an even greater asset to off-campus users.

UnCover 2 will provide scanned images of most articles indexed in the UnCover database. It will work like this ... A patron will access the UnCover database from a library terminal or through a network connection; once articles of interest have been identified the patron may request them online and will be prompted for a credit card number and a local FAX number (CARL charges CCC fees and its own service charge); if the article has already been scanned and stored on disk it will be delivered by CARL computer to the user's FAX within a few minutes; if the article has not yet been scanned it will be pulled by CARL staff in a contributing library within 24 hours; but now that the image is electronic it can be delivered within minutes for the next request. (Recession, 1991)

The possibilities are unlimited. Other exciting technologies are being created and developed at a rapid pace. We are impressed with the application possibilities of such projects as the text and image digitizing projects of the National Agricultural Library (Norris, 1991), and new scanning.
equipment and optical disk advancements such as the cooperative pilot project with Interactive
Home Systems for electronically digitizing images at the Seattle Art Museum (Heather McLeland,
personal communication, July 9, 1991). Members of the scientific community are convinced that
their discipline will embrace electronic media and networks almost totally during the next few
decades. We believe we should stay in touch with the electronic landscape, technologies, visions,
issues and challenges described in such studies and the recent report of the American Physical

While politically sensitive library outreach alliances must be established by reasonable people
collaborating to figure out ways to meet distance education needs, technology is the key to breaking
into the open. We suggest more openness to the opportunities in a climate of cooperation and
creativity.

- Concentrate on adopting new technologies for greater networking and resource sharing.
- Accelerate the application of new technologies that provide information access.
- Adopt the premise that some collection development funding is better expended on paying for
  expendable electronic information rather than hardcopy material that will be retained in the
collection.

This discussion has included the state/national networking perspective, an information center
model, such as ICLIS, compressed video and online public access catalogs, all essential elements to
be combined in various ways for maximum use of the technologies in library outreach programs.
They must be combined with established systems such as telefacsimile and the U.S. Mail to optimize
off-campus library services. In this electronic network environment, connectivity is the key word.

Librarians themselves may be the greatest obstacle to library operation in a technological
environment. As Dougherty told the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education last spring,
"We not only need libraries that are technologically linked to networks, we will need librarians who
understand how to use the information technologies, how the literatures of disciplines are structured,
and how to match the products of information systems with the needs of users" (U.S. Congress,

We have given you our vision. Library outreach services can implement the future in innovative
librarianship by leading the way in leadership and professionalism, politics, information economics,
bibliographic mapping and technology. The challenge is yours.
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Extending Boundaries of Access: Library Services in an Educational Consortium

Donald Wing and Kul B. Gauri
Macomb Community College

Increasingly, community colleges are being asked and expected to assume a more dominant role in transfer education, in addition to their commonly understood roles and responsibilities in career, compensatory and community education. While the collegiate function of preparing students for transfer to senior colleges for baccalaureate education has been a part of their mission, expansion of non-collegiate, career curricula have produced misperception about their role in the scheme of postsecondary education, as if that is their only role. A growing number of students, instead of enrolling in four-year colleges, are choosing community colleges for their freshman and sophomore years (Collison, 1991). On the other hand, adult learners, mainstay of community colleges, are also showing strong interest in pursuing baccalaureate education.

The university campus and the university extension centers are the two primary models by which senior institutions deliver instruction. Ideally, the university campus provides a comprehensive college education and experience, but the adult learners, encumbered by time and mobility constraints are often limited in their access to the world of post-secondary education. Thus, the traditional response to increased access to adult learners has been the creation of extension centers in and around community colleges by four-year institutions and universities.

A parallel mode to extension centers made possible by technology has been the distance education model in which students and institutions create a learning environment by using computers and video technology containing--educational--packages delivered by telecommunications technology. There is seldom if ever a face-to-face meeting of the student body and the instructor (Slade, 1988, p.420).

The last two models of educational delivery--extension centers--and distance education centers--have strong, inherent shortcomings in not being able to provide services, like access to libraries, counseling, job placement and other related services. Above all, the lack of college life experience is a significant shortcoming to be ignored in any off-campus education delivery. What follows is the description of a unique model of education delivery and library services in a collaborative approach by five education institutions (Wayne State University, Oakland University, University of Detroit Mercy, Walsh College and Central Michigan University) to a remote site developed and managed by Macomb Community College (MCC).

Macomb Plan

Macomb Community College is the only public postsecondary institution in the Macomb County, located north of the City of Detroit, with a population of over 700,000. Students wishing to pursue a baccalaureate degree must travel considerable distance to a regional educational institution. For most students and adult learners, the time-consuming drive not only becomes a drain on their energy and resources, but extremely inconvenient and impossible to fit into their life schedules. The extension education center run by senior educational institutions in the county offers only a minimal and partial amelioration of the problem.
The "Macomb Plan" (Lorenzo, 1989) is a unique model, developed by Macomb Community College, approved and funded by the voters of Macomb County. It offers an innovative response to the needs of the residents of the county for baccalaureate, and possibly graduate, education within the county.

Following this plan, the college has developed a "partnership arrangement" for providing the infrastructure which regional colleges and universities will use to offer programs and courses leading to baccalaureate degrees. Also, the college works with selected institutions to ensure that their offerings meet the specific needs of the community. This approach not only frees up the time needed for commuting, but also gives opportunity to students to easily incorporate educational pursuits into their life schedules. It promises to provide a close coordination between the college's lower division and upper level courses, assure the education track for a major early on, foster full use of the college services by students, and above all offer opportunity to fully savor college life experiences. Saving students from an intense pressure of choosing an outside distant institution for transfer and constant questions about the transferability of courses is the most intangible benefit of this plan. In a specified way, the articulation of joint curricula and programs is assured to students who plan to pursue baccalaureate degrees under this program during their freshman year.

The essence of the plan is its ability to bring four-year college education and experience to the area and population that lack convenient access to it. This model combines the best of extension and the college campus models for the delivery of instruction. Its appealing feature is the fact that program and courses offered are specifically developed to suit the needs of the community, based on surveys of needs. The college is planning to proactively administer the program in a newly designed physical facility of 70,000 sq. ft., named University Center, dedicated exclusively to this purpose.

The planning and delivery of library services for fall 1991 start-up, along with other services -- computer labs, counseling, advising, etc.--has been no less challenging than the selling of the idea for four years to the community before it was formally approved in 1988. Unlike experiences of most librarians, ours has been that library services to students by five different institutions who agreed to offer programs were given serious consideration and were never an afterthought or an ad hoc response to specific needs (Slade, 1988, p.437) or, left alone to muddle along when the need arose.

**Nature of Library Collaborations**

While there are numerous examples of collaborative off-campus education delivery in distance education using telecommunication technology, neither models nor examples of collaborative approaches in classroom are commonly found. A similar situation prevails in providing collaborative library services. While the use of telecommunication networks for providing access to library resources is a commonplace feature in library services, there is hardly any "consortial" approach in providing full library services, especially at an off-campus location, by a group of libraries.

Again, most of the collaborative arrangements support a specific type of library function; for example, acquisition and storage as in Center for Research Libraries, use of database for cataloging, or book preservation plans, with OCLC and RLIN as models. But a joint arrangement for supporting students with orientation, checking out of books and their delivery, off-campus reference service, telefax service, etc., at a common location by five institutions with the host institution as coordinator, to our knowledge, does not exist (B.M. Lessin, personal communication).

From the institutional perspective, most of the consortial arrangements maintain, of necessity, a "federated" (Kaplan, p.249) nature of their operations--preserving their autonomy and strong self-interest without giving up their competitive stance. The obvious reasons for this mode of cooperation, or the lack of it, are distrust of any supra or umbrella organization established to
administer the consortial activity, limited control over the cost of such an organization, and, above all, the tradition and the prevailing ethos of autonomy of our institutions.

The disadvantages of the federated structure of services in our situation were apparent from the early stages of discussion and planning. The partner institutions have neither means nor strong commitment to establish their presence at the University Center, nor can the college library provide the requisite level of library services. Being at a distant location, the student will unlikely receive full service unless he or she makes an extra effort to seek out help, or travel to the home library for information/library needs. Since the college library was not fully equipped to ensure quality service, the "mail order" library service was the only viable model in this federated arrangement. Thus, measures to achieve a higher level of service under this "mail order" framework of operation were actively discussed and explored.

In this innovative venture, all participants were not equals, although had equal authority, in the sense that one participant, Walsh College, did not possess an integrated on-line system for its library operations. Thus, there was no possibility of accessing its holdings from a remote site. While there was a strong willingness on the part of this library to provide quality service, it was very much limited in its resources to do so. Another library, Central Michigan University, had a regional plan for supporting off-campus services in place with a toll-free telephone number and mail delivery of all documents from its main campus library. The services offered by this library could not be customized, nor was there a willingness to do so because of the organizational change it required. Oftentimes during discussions there was a hint of some "federated" members "protecting their vested interests at the expense of innovation and service quality" (Whetten, 1981, p.23).

Another interesting aspect of the planning process to be noted is that all five partners were unequal in their share of the student population, and the numbers of baccalaureate programs offered by each. Strangely enough, there was no correlation between the size of the programs offered by a partner institution and the concomitant, interest or enthusiasm shown by the institution in the planning of library services. Thus, it was the role of Macomb Community College to assume an aggressive leadership role in establishing and coordinating policies and procedures for a quality library service.

The Planning of Library Services

Institutional Context

In the planning and delivery of library services by five partner institutions at Macomb Community College, an effort was made to involve and inform higher level administrators right from the beginning. It was done not just to ascertain their level of support or build consensus, but to invite their commitment and impress upon them the uniqueness of the collaboration and their ongoing obligations. While there were strong concerns expressed about their share of costs to be incurred and the available resources to deliver library services, the college offered to assist them in identifying problem issues and explore a joint solution to them.

The Macomb County Library, located in close vicinity of the college library expressed its concern that its services will be heavily used, overextending its current capabilities. It may be unable to overextend its resources to meet this unexpected and unplanned demand for service. To alleviate their concerns, a joint memorandum of understanding was developed and agreed upon by the college and the county library boards. It stipulated full service to students and sharing of resources as much as possible.
The planning of library services proceeded at the same level as the marketing of the programs to the community, planning of the new facility and equipment needs, and articulation and publication of programs and courses. It is often complained that library services are an afterthought in most educational enterprises. But in our case, no distinction was made; the planning proceeded on a parallel track along with other services.

The progress of planning process and agreements reached was publicized at all levels and shared with other committees (steering, operations) in their regular meetings. The appointments made by partner institutions to the library service planning committee implied that the institutional representatives should be able to make decisions during the committee deliberations, and not defer to other persons or delay it because of lack of authority.

In the view of Macomb Community College, its coordinating, first point-of-contact library and facilitating role were considered crucial in ensuring that students received the best support in their initial exploration of library needs. In this collaborative plan of library service, stipulating modified policies of partner institution, an active role by the host institution was considered essential. Short of mandating agreements and control measures, every effort was made to clarify the partners' roles in providing library service.

**Technological Context**

While there are models of resource sharing using technology by bilateral and multilateral agreements on interlibrary loans, sharing technology or other specific aspects of technical of public service, that do not disturb the good old patterns of distinct ownership and access, no models of collaborative service are available. The imperatives of the Macomb Plan of delivering instruction and library services jointly to a remote location pushed the partner institutions to a higher dimension of cooperation. Not only is this a new and unique venture, it took some time to expand thinking during the planning process to establish a new paradigm of library service. Other than total reciprocity of services among partner institutions to all students enrolled in the program, all possible measures were open for discussions. These can be categorized into three separate areas:

1. **Access to library holding information.**

   MCC Libraries have never been a part of any consortium, local, regional or bibliographic utility, even though its bibliographic records have been in machine-readable format since 1975. In its search of a local integrated on-line system, it decided to join Detroit Area Library Network (DALNET), a NOTIS-based consortium with six academic, one public, one law, and six hospital libraries. The decision to join this consortium, and not go on its own or join the county library's CLSI-based system, was largely influenced by the possible inception of the University Center in the Macomb Plan. The librarians and the college administration looked for profile similarity in its search for a system and sensed the likelihood of Wayne State University--fiscal and operating agent for DALNET--emerging as a principal partner in the Macomb Plan. In the fall of 1990, one year before the opening of University Center, MCC Libraries joined and completed the loading of its bibliographic records and patron files into the DALNET database.

   The screen displays of both these files are shared, i.e., multi-institutional displays. Coincidentally, two other partners (Oakland and U of DM) are also members of DALNET, thus the holdings of four institutions (along with eight others) are displayed in the on-line catalog displays.

   DALNET's database, as alluded to earlier, is a multi-type institutional database, with academic, public, legal and medical as its members. It has, as of this writing, 3.4 million bibliographic records, over 260,000 patron records, 3,400 network terminals, over 2 million look-up and about 400,000
check-out transactions per month (DALNET, 1991). Central Michigan University is using NOTIS system independently and its holdings are accessible in dial-up mode anywhere in Michigan. The fifth partner, Walsh College, is an OCLC member but without any in-house on-line system.

During the period of intense discussions and explorations of the methods of accessing holdings information, an opportunity to apply for Title III-C grant for creating a state-wide bibliographic database using OCLC became available on the county level. This proposal was funded, thus facilitating loading of Macomb’s holdings into OCLC as well as allowing the use of Group Access Capability of OCLC for inter-library loan system with all the partners libraries. This grant also supported the buying of hardware to access the OCLC System.

2. Access to and use of collections.

It took some time to clarify procedures to access collections use by students enrolled in the programs offered by five different institutions. MCC Library decided to give full privileges of use to all students, except in the area of interlibrary-loan and database searching. The questions raised during discussions were:

1. How will the access of holdings information and item status be provided to students and who will bear the cost? This is discussed in detail in the next section.

2. Can the books be checked out to students directly by their home institutions and delivered directly to them? Only one institution, Central Michigan, had a mechanism in place to do so.

3. Alternatively, can the books be checked out to the MCC Library as an intermediate step, and MCC Library in turn check these out to students on its campus? Three institutions, members of DALNET, preferred this procedure.

4. How will these books be delivered and who will bear the cost? UPS and a van document delivery system were to be explored among the DALNET members of the consortium.

5. How will the overdues, returns, lost materials, holds, etc., be tracked and can the partner libraries individually assume such responsibilities, or will this have to be done in collaboration with MCC Library? It was agreed that overdues will be collected by MCC Library when the books returned are overdue but all other aspects of return of materials will be the responsibility of the three partner institutions. Books returned will be delivered back either by UPS or a van by MCC Library to the three partner institutions. To clarify issues involved and to fix responsibilities associated with the access and the use of collections, a flow chart was prepared. This was critically examined by the system people of DALNET.

With the help of a minor fix to the circulation system developed by the Florida-NOTIS group, it was possible for MCC Library to check out books on behalf of the three DALNET partner institutions and collect overdues on their behalf. But tracking of non-returns, overdue notices and lost books recovery was reserved by partner institutions to be their domain of responsibilities.
The principles adopted in all these deliberations and decision-making were based on the following premises:

• Partner institutions must support their students to the same extent that they do their own on-campus students.

• MCC Library will extend full services and privileges to University Center students, except inter-library loan and on-line database searching, but not necessarily with any additional collections and resources.

• MCC Library will not only assist partners to provide library services, but also initiate them and provide some measure of quality assurance in library service.

While the three partner institutions that are members of DALNET agreed to use the system for access to and use of the collections, the other two partners, Central Michigan and Walsh College, decided to continue their existing arrangements in support of off-campus students to students enrolled in the program.

3. Reciprocal borrowing.

The use of a library system collaboratively with composite display of holdings by member institutions invariably raises expectations of sharing of resources. To meet these expectations, inter-library loan between disparate members and intra-library loan between institutions sharing a local library system are often agreed upon. But somehow reciprocal borrowing by users within a collaborative local library system is rarely practiced. While we often hear the statement that access, and not the ownership, should be the guiding principle in resource sharing, reciprocal borrowing, the ultimate level of resource sharing, is rarely a reality.

As described earlier, DALNET with its joint database and composite display of holdings, and with its joint patron database and effective coordinating mechanism in place could easily facilitate reciprocal borrowing. A student enrolled in one of the four partner institutions with a University Center ID could easily borrow books from any of the DALNET member libraries directly.

Even though this issue has been favorably discussed at the consortium level and also at the DALNET level, no immediate implementation of the idea is foreseen.

There is no doubt that libraries have put almost total emphasis on inter-library loan as the only means of resource sharing in libraries for the simple reason that composite display of holding, joining patrons and item information of a group of libraries are not always easily accessible. The fear of loaning materials to "alien" patrons which may not be easily recovered by a library may equally be a significant factor. It has not been proven that the cost of unreturned items, a major concern in reciprocal borrowing, is more expensive than the cost of providing inter-library loan service by a library. Thus, it appears that disfavoring reciprocal borrowing is not based on any convincing rationale. More discussion on this issue by the profession is needed.

Cost Issues

As noted in the literature on off-campus library services, issues of cost and priority of such services figure very prominently. At a time when libraries are struggling to seek support and provide quality library service on their main campuses, off-campus services are often considered a drain on resources and rarely given full support. In our situation, this was very much apparent in the early
discussions. One library openly stated that it did not have any increase in its book budget in the last few years and without the infusion of new funds it will not be able to fully support its off-campus "adventures". Following the same rationale, it was reasoned that the University Center administration should advocate for additional funds on its behalf to its administration for this additional burden of providing off-campus library services.

To diffuse strong concerns about cost and the lack of immediately available resources, the college offered up-front to underwrite half of the cost of major services to be provided by partners and prorate the remaining half based on the number of baccalaureate programs each partner planned to offer. For example, once it was agreed that a half-time library coordinator will be needed at the college library, one-quarter of the salary of that librarian will be paid by the college and other quarter by partner institutions' libraries jointly. The latter split by thirteen undergraduate programs offered at the University Center will be shared by partner libraries. The college library also agreed to defray the cost of hiring one half-time paraprofessional and two student assistants needed to support enhanced library services.

In keeping with overall agreement, all the capital costs of computer hardware, office equipment and furniture are to be absorbed by the college. The cost of six additional terminals to access on-line catalog (DALNET), furniture to locate them, one personal computer, and three printers with A & B switches are the responsibility of the college.

No new subscriptions of monographic material will be added to the college library in support of the programs. Providing all materials, including reserve materials not found in the college library, to its respective students, was regarded as the responsibility of the home institution. In anticipation of the arrangements, the college did acquire two Canon L920 fax machines for sending student requests and receiving journal articles. The college did, however, earmark $5,000 for augmenting its reference collection and to acquire books that are likely to be frequently used and enhance the quality of its collection.

To facilitate document delivery, an arrangement with existing services sponsored by two public library regions of cooperation has been initiated with no cost to the college. While the college has established a schedule of charges mostly in the form of rental of space, no such schedule for cost recovery or charges for library services is contemplated. The only cost to students who use libraries will be a nominal charge for receiving a fax document from their home institution libraries.

Conclusion

Whether it is the expected future trend or a vision, one hears often the statement that electronic information will not be bound by physical location; access to, and not the acquisition of library materials should guide our library policies. Giving this idea a practical shape requires a shared vision.

The planning of the University Center and every detail of its operations is the result of a shared vision. The college, acutely aware of the lack of educational opportunities for its residents in the county, worked relentlessly with local groups and city governments in sharing and pursuing the vision. This was accomplished in the wake of an overwhelming public opinion and slogans espousing "no new taxes" in 1988.

The automation of library services and the subsequent choice of joining DALNET was also guided by the vision of sharing resources as well as the vision of progressive librarians in the region. Michael Schrage has pointed out in his recent book, Shared Minds (1990), that we have to move beyond the traditional model of learning and collaborative ventures as an exchange of information
and instead see it as a process of creating shared understanding. There is a need to manage information, the basis of all learning, scholarship and an instrument of change, not in isolation but within the context of relationships. Forging relationships, or to use the buzz-word "partnerships," has been the basis of the whole enterprise described here. As we all know from our personal experiences, the process of establishing and maintaining relationships has never been an easy task. Initiating and fostering them, in our experience at the institutional level, is no less challenging.
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Measuring the Off-campus Library Services Program: Two Approaches

Virginia Witucke
Central Michigan University

Central Michigan University has provided library services to off-campus students since 1975. In that time, a variety of means have been used to evaluate the program. This paper will look at two recent projects—one ongoing—that have brought together data on the Off-campus Library Services (OCLS) program. The emphasis will be on the project methodology, which readers can adapt to local use; highlights of results will also be reported.

CMU's OCLS program consists of two major parts. There is a document delivery service, quartered on campus, and accessed by a toll free number. Students and faculty may request up to 15 specific items per week from that service. Reference assistance is available by telephone. Users call the librarian serving their area; there are full time off-campus librarians in suburban Detroit, Fairfax, Virginia (suburban Washington), and on campus.

Central's Extended Degree Programs and Credit Courses enrolls about 10,000 students. Most are pursuing master's degrees in administration; there is a small undergraduate program. Courses are offered at over 50 sites. Most sites have a program representative who serves as the university's liaison with students and faculty.

In 1989, students were surveyed for their use of and satisfaction with Off-campus Library Services. This study updated surveys done in 1981 and 1985. In addition to that national study of library use, an analysis has been made since the 1988-89 school year of the reference questions coming into the Fairfax office of the OCLS. Each study represents a different approach to data collection.

Student Survey: Planning and Administration

In the 1986 Off-campus Library Services Conference Proceedings, Barton Lessin reported on the results of surveys administered in 1981 and 1985. The questionnaire looked at student use of OCLS and of local libraries, as well as satisfaction with libraries used. Background information included gender, number of courses completed, area of employment, and number of courses requiring papers and library use. To maintain the four-year interval between surveys, the study was repeated in 1989. Since Lessin had accepted a new position, I took over the direction of the study. To get comparable information, the earlier survey form was used as a basis for the current study. We decided to add questions, so as to get more in-depth information.

The 1981 and 1985 surveys had been sent to all students taking courses at a given time, using the mechanism for passing out and collecting end-of-course evaluations. Utilizing this method provided us not only with a ready-made means for questionnaire distribution, but the ability to survey a total universe, rather than a sampling.

Early in the 1989 study I consulted with staff of the campus Computer Services, where the data would be tabulated and statistical analyses performed. As with the earlier studies, students would record answers on an optical scan sheet. I chose the form with provisions for ten possible answers...
for each question, since this allowed for more precise responses than did the form with five choices. We agreed to continue to use Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for data analysis.

In revising the survey instrument, the intent of the earlier version was kept firmly in mind, although the number of questions more than doubled. Various versions of the form were circulated to colleagues for comment, resulting in questions being added, dropped, or clarified.

I went over drafts of the questionnaire with the Director of Institutional Research, Gary Shapiro. Next, I started copying the questionnaire to class visits, where I asked the early arrivals to test the draft. Several unclear and inaccurate questions were revised. When a succession of students completed the instrument without problems, the questionnaire went to the University Press for reproduction. This piloting process also showed that the form took about minutes to complete.

The actual questionnaire is found in Appendix A. It was divided into five parts, and labeled accordingly: Background Information, Local Library Resources, CMU's Off-campus Library Services, CMU's Document Delivery Service, and Summary. Although the form is seven pages long, it has an uncluttered look, and requires only multiple choice responses. Background information included gender, status (graduate/undergraduate, degree/non-degree), area of concentration, type of employer, number of courses taken, number of courses requiring papers/library use, and length of time in the Extended Degree Program. Students were asked what kinds of local libraries they used as CMU students, and for their rating of the adequacy of treatment and collection of the local library most heavily used.

The third section looked at contacts with Central Michigan University libraries and staff, use of the CMU Library Guide, and how students found out about OCLS. Questions on the document delivery service concerned frequency of use, satisfaction, promptness, fulfillment rate, accuracy, and quality of reproduction. The Summary consisted of two questions: whether the student relied more on local libraries or on Off-campus Library Services, and the overall impression of our service.

I approached the director of Extended Degree Programs, Dr. Robert Trullinger, to get his permission to administer the OCLS survey. I also asked if he would sign a letter endorsing the study, to be sent to the two groups whose support was vital to the success of the survey. These were the local program representatives, who would be asked to distribute and collect the forms, and the faculty, whose class time would be used while the students completed the questionnaires. Dr. Trullinger agreed to both requests.

Preliminary letters were sent to program representatives, telling them of the upcoming survey. Librarians were asked to contact reps personally, to enlist their support for the survey. November was the month chosen; this gave us enough time to organize the study properly, and a schedule representative of our curriculum. A master schedule was prepared, organized geographically, made up of all courses which met the first week in November. Program representatives were sent separate packets for each local class being offered. These packets consisted of 35 questionnaire forms and 35 scan sheets per class. A cover letter reviewed the study, and gave directions for administration. Each class packet included a cover letter for the faculty member, explaining the study, asking for cooperation, and expressing appreciation.

Completed questionnaires (2500) were returned to the Off-campus Library Services office on campus. An editor checked scan sheets to be sure that the symbol for the center was on each form, and that all were filled out in pencil. When the scan sheets were filled out by pen, she made pencil copies readable by the scanner. The questionnaires could be delivered to Computer Services. We requested tabulations of all questions, and many cross tabulations of one question by another (e.g.,
gender by library used most often). The data have been retained should we wish to request additional cross tabulations.

Student Survey: Results

About three-fifths of the respondents were male, four-fifths graduate; almost all were in degree programs. Graduate concentrations were in general administration (63%), health services administration (14%), and public administration (5%); others were not indicated. Respondents were most likely to be employed by corporations (profit or non-profit) (63%), the military (16%), government (12%), or educational institutions (4%). Students ranged from those taking their first course to those nearing graduation.

Respondents were asked to indicate all the type(s) of libraries they had used at least once as CMU students, and which they used most:

Table 1

Percent of Students by Type of Library Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of library</th>
<th>Used at least once</th>
<th>Most used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military post/base</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked whether they relied more on the Off-campus Library Services or on local libraries, sixty-six percent of the respondents reported that they were more reliant on local libraries. Students (71%) reported satisfaction with their treatment in local libraries, though somewhat less satisfaction with the adequacy of those libraries. We use many channels to promote the off-campus library program. Not all seem to make an impression on respondents, who were asked to indicate the methods by which they heard about the CMU library program. Students were asked to check all methods that applied.

Heard about Off-campus Library Services through:

Library handout in recruitment packet 68%
Instructor(s) 64%
Program representative 59%
Bulletin of the Extended Degree Programs 56%
Welcome letter/packet from Off-campus Library Services 56%
OCLS Bookmark with library telephone numbers 54%
Promotional brochure describing the Extended Degree Programs 48%
Other students 45%
Syllabus cover sheet with contact information 42%
Advisor 38%
Issue(s) of the Communicator 29%
OCLS poster(s) 12%

Forty-nine percent of the respondents reported having had a librarian visit class; twenty-one percent had had two or more such visits. Most of those whose classes had been visited said that they were very satisfied (73%) or somewhat satisfied with the visit (14%); almost no dissatisfaction was expressed. Fifty-five percent reported contacting an off-campus librarian for reference assistance. Two thirds of them were very satisfied with the results, 19 percent somewhat satisfied; nine percent expressed dissatisfaction. Users were also asked about the accessibility of the librarians; fifty-nine percent were very satisfied, twenty-three percent somewhat satisfied. Again, nine percent were dissatisfied.

Responses to the question about the number of librarian class visits were cross tabulated with the indication of whether the student relied more heavily on local libraries or CMU Off-campus Library Services. The table below shows that the more times a librarian had visited a student's class, the more likely a student was to report reliance on OCLS.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More reliance on # of Libn. Visits</th>
<th>Local Libraries</th>
<th>CMU OCLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or More</td>
<td></td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although only 34% of the students had requested any of the free handouts available from Off-campus Library Services, 54% had used the document delivery service available from the campus at least once. Half of those had used the service two or more times. Those using the document delivery service reported the following levels of satisfaction:

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very sat.</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Neither + or -</th>
<th>Somewhat dissat.</th>
<th>Very dissat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promptness</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Generally users reported receiving most of the materials they ordered, with most requests being filled correctly. Materials were almost always legibly reproduced.

The overall impression of CMU's Off-campus Library Services was very or somewhat positive (69%); 26% were neither positive nor negative. Five percent of the respondents had a negative impression of the service. Since the survey took place at a time when the document delivery was overwhelmed by requests, the positive response was particularly gratifying.

Comparisons to Earlier Surveys

Far more surveys were completed in the current study, 2500, compared to 1496 in 1981 and 1833 in 1985. Students reported the same preferences for types of libraries used, all three years; expressions of satisfaction with local libraries in terms of treatment and collection adequacy also were consistent. Local libraries were most heavily relied upon in 1981 (86%), least heavily in 1985 (63%); in 1989, 73% of the respondents relied most on local collections.

Not quite half of the 1981 and 1989 students reported having had a librarian visit, while 54% of those in 1985 were visited. The satisfaction with the librarian visit rose slightly over the years: 82% in 1981, 84% in 1985, and 87% in 1989.

The most important comparison shows that the majority of students now have used Off-campus Library Services, which was not the case in 1981 and 1985.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Students Using Off-campus Library Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Assistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference Analysis: Planning and Administration

The Fairfax (Northern Virginia) office of the Extended Degree Program, where I work, serves students and faculty from the East Coast, Ohio, and a few other sites. While a variety of activities is performed by the library staff, a major function is providing reference service. Whenever anyone (student, faculty, staff) calls or comes in for assistance, a form is filled out documenting the request. There are spaces for user name, local center/site, course number, date of call, date of completion, topic of question, and librarian response. Thus a large amount of data is routinely being collected.

Having been introduced to an inexpensive version of Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, called SPSS/PC+ Studentware, I decided to use it to tabulate the existing information on reference
activity. With the help of a faculty member, Studentware was installed on an office computer, and
the study planned. Several variables were chosen for analysis:

gender
status (student, faculty, staff)
center (center where course was taken)
month (month when request was received)
daymo (date of the month when request was received)
year (year when request was received)
lapseday (number of days elapsed between receiving and completing inquiry)
topic (general topic of request)
dept (academic department of course which generated request)
course (specific course which generated request)
responses to questions:
strategy (process outlined for finding information
readyref (answer to specific question given)
style (answer requiring use of style manual)
file (material sent from office file)
online (online search performed)
campus (question referred to campus staff)
copymat (pages from office reference collection copied)
other (miscellaneous responses)
Nrrresp (count of the number of different responses to questions).

For each variable, lists of values were developed and assigned codes. For example, the day of the
week when the question was received (weekday) is a variable. That variable is assigned a specific
field in the database. Since the office is only open five days a week, there were five values for the
variable weekday. For computer purposes, those value labels had to be converted into a code, which
could be entered into the field:

weekday: Monday=1
Tuesday=2
Wednesday=3
Thursday=4
Friday=5

Arbitrary codes were developed for the value labels for some of the variables: center, gender,
status, topic, and type of response. Other variables had literal value labels: month, daymo, year,
lapseday, dept, course, and Nrrresp. A screen was developed, using R-base, which cued the coding of
each item. Appendix B shows the screen used for data entry. For convenience, some of the coding
done before data entry, including an entry ID for each inquiry.

The analysis is done by fiscal year (July through June). At the end of the year, the data list is
printed and checked. There is one line on the list for each inquiry. Once the data list is corrected,
the analysis can begin. Simple commands result in tabulations of data, e.g., frequency
variable=category. You can request mean, median, mode, range, standard deviation, and percentiles
for each variable.

Cross tabulations of data are also possible, to examine relationships between variables. For
example, to see if there were gender differences in questions asked, I typed the command cross tab
topic by gender. This resulted in a table with the value labels for topics along the left side of the
field, and those for gender horizontally. Again, more complex statistics can be requested, e.g., chi
square, contingency coefficient, lambda, and Pearson's R.
SPSS offers several other features that were helpful in examining data. I could ask for regroupings of the data entered. For example, the month of request could be recoded so that the codes for January to March would be combined into a new value, labeled 1st quarter. CMU centers are organized by area, and recoding would allow us to look at area results, as well as those for the individual center. Recoding does not lose the original values, but allows them to be used in more than one way.

Another useful feature is the ability to compute. I determined that there were eight different types of responses routinely given to callers (see list above), and treated each one as a separate variable. Value labels were yes (1) or no (0), for each variable. To see how many different types of responses we gave to students, the compute command was used to total the number of occurrences of each response variable per inquiry: compute strategy + readyref + style, etc. Since there were eight possible responses, the value labels were 1 through 8.

Reference Analysis: Results

Tabulations were run for the fiscal year, and a file was also made combining the data collected. The results that follow are for 1988/89 and 1989/90. Some of the results simply objectified what we already had observed; others were unexpected. Some highlights:

A larger percentage of the women in the program requested help than did men.

Monday (which included requests that came in on the answering machine and from weekend class visits) was the busiest day of the week, with a third of the questions coming that day.

October was the busiest month, December the least busy.

The first week of the month was slightly busier than succeeding ones. Eighty-eight percent of the questions came from students, eight percent from faculty, and four percent from staff.

Questions asked were most likely to concern management (22%). Eighteen percent of the questions were library-related (e.g., Who in my area subscribes to National Journal? Am I allowed to use the local university library?).

The most common response to requests was to guide the caller through a search strategy; this response was given 62% of the time. A third of the questions were of the ready reference type. Other common responses were to send relevant materials from the file (21%) or to do an online search (22%).

Over half the time, only one type of response was given to the inquirer; a third of the time two responses were given.

Only rarely were more than three types given. Seventy-seven percent of the time the question was completed on the day received, either by telephone or by mail.

Comments on the Projects

I anticipate that both of these projects will be continued. The work involved in performing the reference analysis is not great, now that the system is in place. Request slips are coded and entered monthly; data are corrected and run each July. I would expect to run annual and multi year data. No changes in method or form are anticipated, as the study seems to be doing what it was intended to do—tabulate existing data to look more systematically at the work of the Fairfax office of the Off-campus Library Services program.
I strongly recommend that we continue the national student survey, using the same basic questionnaire form, while continuing to refine it. I believe it should be aimed at all students in a given time frame, rather than a sample. But a three-year interval seems more useful for information gathering. A two-year interval would be even more helpful, as we could get feedback from a larger percentage of the student body (students take an average of two years to complete the program). But that is probably impractical in terms of expense and staff time. A more efficient means of distributing questionnaires needs to be developed. However, this major and continuing project needs to be augmented by a greater number of small but formal measurement and evaluation projects, some of which include the use of open-ended questions.

Since the local program representatives are crucial to the success of the survey, it would be wise to involve them in planning the logistics for the study. Several representatives made suggestions after the fact for survey administration.

Objective data can be important tools for program evaluation, planning, and decision making. In an education organization, statistics on activity are often required by the institution and by outside agencies (e.g., accrediting and licensure bodies) examining the institution. In addition to all the formal reasons that support program measurement and evaluation are the librarian's own need for in-depth knowledge of his or her program. Insights, relationships, confirmation of assumptions and observations (or the refutation of inaccurate ones), the raising of questions previously unasked, the satisfaction of curiosity, are all worthwhile results of evaluation activities.

The two approaches to measurement discussed here were undertaken to get a clearer picture of the activities of Central Michigan University's Off-campus Library Services program. The survey helped us identify some of the characteristics of those who use our program, revealed something about their patterns of library use, showed the relative effectiveness of means of promoting the program, and determined basic satisfaction with the service. The analysis of reference questions in the Fairfax office quantified something about the backgrounds of the users, the topics of questions asked, the types of responses given, and the timing of calls.

The results of these projects are as useful as we make them. Certainly the responses verified basic satisfaction with the Off-campus Library Services program, and did not uncover major problems. Results provided information useful in planning, program promotion, staff scheduling, and collection development. There were some new insights, such as the fact that the more times a student has seen a CMU librarian at a class visit, the more likely that student is to rely on CMU library services. Questions were raised. For example, why are women more likely to request assistance than are men? Why are standard promotional activities not reaching the students?

It is easy to avoid getting involved in program measurement and evaluation, because of perceived lack of time or skill. The potential usefulness of the results of such activities more than outweighs the hesitations. As for me, I would like to see the Off-campus Library Services program develop a more systematic approach to evaluation, that would give us a clear, accurate picture of our program and user response to it, and that could help generate new procedures, streamline current ones, and jettison those that are ineffective.
Appendix A

CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
EXTENDED DEGREE PROGRAMS

Off-Campus Library Services

In order to get feedback from students to use in program involvement, the Off-Campus Library Services staff is asking that you complete and return this questionnaire in class today. Many thanks for your participation.

Please record your responses on the optical scan sheet. Indicate your center code by darkening the appropriate spaces in the second column (the one beginning 0 0 0 0 0). The instructor can provide the center code.

For each question below, darken the appropriate space on the optical scan sheet; use a #2 pencil.

Background Information

1. Gender:
   (0) Male  (1) Female

2. CMU student status:
   (0) Graduate  (1) Undergraduate  (2) Non-degree

3. CMU degree status:
   (0) Non-degree seeking  (1) Degree seeking

4. Area of concentration if you are a graduate student:
   (0) Does not apply; not graduate student
   (1) General Administration
   (2) Public Administration
   (3) Health Services Administration
   (4) Security Administration
   (5) Education
   (6) Other

5. Area of concentration if you are an undergraduate student:
   (0) Does not apply; not undergraduate student
   (1) Organizational Administration
   (2) Industrial Administration
   (3) Service Sector Administration
   (4) Guest Services Administration
   (5) Community Development: Community Services
   (6) Community Development: Health Sciences
   (7) Community Development: Recreation
   (8) Other
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6. Employer:
   (0) Government
   (1) Military
   (2) Educational institution
   (3) Corporation (profit/nonprofit)
   (4) Self-employed
   (5) Not employed
   (6) Retired

7. How many courses have you taken in the Extended Degree Programs (including this one)?
   (1) One
   (2) Two
   (3) Three
   (4) Four
   (5) Five
   (6) Six
   (7) Seven
   (8) Eight or nine
   (9) Ten or more

8. How many of your CMU courses have required the preparation of papers/reports/presentations?
   (0) None
   (1) One
   (2) Two
   (3) Three
   (4) Four
   (5) Five
   (6) Six
   (7) Seven
   (8) Eight or nine
   (9) Ten or more

9. How many of your courses have required the use of library materials?
   (0) None
   (1) One
   (2) Two
   (3) Three
   (4) Four
   (5) Five
   (6) Six
   (7) Seven
   (8) Eight or nine
   (9) Ten or more

10. Length of time in the Extended Degree Programs (from the time of your first class)?
    (0) 1 to 4 months
    (1) 5 to 8 months
    (2) 9 to 12 months
    (3) 13 to 18 months
    (4) 19 to 24 months
    (5) 25 to 36 months
    (6) 37 to 48 months
    (7) More than 4 years
Local Library Resources

Which of the following kinds of LOCAL libraries have you used at least once in preparing for your class assignments? Please reply to questions 11 through 15 with one of the following responses:

(0) Have NOT used this type of library for CMU assignments
(1) HAVE used this type of library for CMU assignments

11. Public library
12. Academic library (community college, college, university)
13. Base/post library
14. Special library (e.g., corporate, federal, hospital)
15. Personal library

16. Which ONE of these types of local libraries have you used MOST in preparing your CMU class assignments?

(0) Does not apply; have used none of these for CMU assignments
(1) Public library
(2) Academic library (community college, college, university)
(3) Base/post library
(4) Special library (e.g., corporate, federal, hospital)
(5) Personal library

17. In the local library that you use most, how satisfied are you with the treatment you received?

(0) Does not apply
(1) Very satisfied
(2) Somewhat satisfied
(3) Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
(4) Somewhat dissatisfied
(5) Very dissatisfied

18. In the local library that you use most, how satisfied are you with the adequacy of the collection?

(0) Does not apply
(1) Very satisfied
(2) Somewhat satisfied
(3) Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
(4) Somewhat dissatisfied
(5) Very dissatisfied
CMU’s Off-Campus Library Services

How did you learn about the CMU library program? For questions 19 to 30, indicate whether or not you heard about the program in these ways:

(0) Did NOT learn about CMU’s library program in this way
(1) Learned about CMU’s library program in this way

19. Library handout in recruitment packet
20. Bulletin of the Extended Degree Programs
21. Promotional brochure describing the Extended Degree Programs
22. Program Representative
23. Advisor
24. Instructor(s)
25. Welcome letter/packet from Off-Campus Library Services
26. Bookmark with library telephone numbers
27. Issue(s) of the Communicator
28. Syllabus cover sheet with contact information
29. Other students
30. Poster(s)

31. How many of your classes has a CMU librarian visited (including this one)?
   (0) None
   (1) One
   (2) Two
   (3) Three
   (4) Four

32. If a librarian visited your class(es), how satisfied were you with her presentation(s)?
   (0) Does not apply; no librarian visited
   (1) Very satisfied
   (2) Somewhat satisfied
   (3) Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   (4) Somewhat dissatisfied
   (5) Very dissatisfied
33. If you have contacted a CMU librarian for reference assistance, how satisfied were you with her response?
   (0) Does not apply; have not contacted librarian
   (1) Very satisfied
   (2) Somewhat satisfied
   (3) Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   (4) Somewhat dissatisfied
   (5) Very dissatisfied

34. If you have tried to contact an Off-Campus librarian, how satisfied were you with her accessibility?
   (0) Does not apply; have not contacted librarian
   (1) Very satisfied
   (2) Somewhat satisfied
   (3) Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   (4) Somewhat dissatisfied
   (5) Very dissatisfied

35. Which of these statements BEST describes your use of the CMU Library Guide?
   (0) Never received a copy
   (1) Received a copy but never referred to it
   (2) Read through it once and rarely/never go back to it
   (3) Refer to it from time to time
   (4) Read through it and refer back to it as needed

36. If you have received a copy of the CMU Library Guide, how satisfied are you with its guidance in helping you use libraries and gather information?
   (0) Does not apply; never received a copy
   (1) Very satisfied
   (2) Somewhat satisfied
   (3) Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   (4) Somewhat dissatisfied
   (5) Very dissatisfied
CMU Mail Document Delivery Service

37. Have you used the Off-Campus Library Services order form to request handouts?
   (0) No
   (1) Yes

38. How frequently have you requested materials from the CMU Library in Mt. Pleasant?
   (0) Never
   (1) One or two times
   (2) Three to five times
   (3) Six to nine times
   (4) Ten times or more

   If your response is “never,” please skip to item 45.

39. How satisfied are you with the usefulness of the mail delivery service?
   (1) Very satisfied
   (2) Somewhat satisfied
   (3) Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   (4) Somewhat dissatisfied
   (5) Very dissatisfied

40. How satisfied are you with the accessibility of the mail delivery service?
   (1) Very satisfied
   (2) Somewhat satisfied
   (3) Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   (4) Somewhat dissatisfied
   (5) Very dissatisfied

41. Are the materials you requested from the mail delivery service reaching you promptly enough to be useful?
   (1) Always
   (2) Most of the time
   (3) Some of the time
   (4) Seldom
   (5) Never
42. Of all the materials you have requested from the mail delivery service, how many did you receive?

   (1) All  
   (2) Most  
   (3) About half  
   (4) A few  
   (5) None

43. Were the items you received from the mail delivery service the ones you ordered?

   (1) Always  
   (2) Most of the time  
   (3) Some of the time  
   (4) Seldom  
   (5) Never

44. Were the materials you received from the document delivery service legibly produced?

   (1) Always  
   (2) Most of the time  
   (3) Some of the time  
   (4) Seldom  
   (5) Never

Summary

45. For your CMU assignments, do you rely more heavily on local libraries, or on CMU’s library services?

   (0) Local libraries  
   (1) CMU’s Off-Campus Library Services

46. What is your overall impression of CMU’s Off-Campus Library Services program?

   (1) Very positive  
   (2) Somewhat positive  
   (3) Neither positive nor negative  
   (4) Somewhat negative  
   (5) Very negative

Thank you for your assistance! A summary of the results will appear in the Communicator or other appropriate communication.

Please return the questionnaire form and the scan sheet to your instructor.
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Press [ESC] when done

REFERENCES RESPONSE INPUT FORM

RECORD ID:  

CMU Center:

Gender of Requestor (1 = Male; 2 = Female; 9 = Unknown):

Status of Requestor (1 = Student; 2 = Faculty; 3 = Staff; 4 = Non-CMU; 9 = Unknown)

Request Date:  

Day of Week:  
1 = Sat, Sun or Mon  
2 = Tue  
3 = Wed  
4 = Thu  
5 = Fri  

Day's Lapse to Response:
0 = Same Day  
1 = 1 Day Turnaround  
2 = 2 Day Turnaround, etc  
8 = 8 or More Days  
9 = Unknown

Turnaround

Course (Literal):

Subject of Request:
1 = MGT  2 = HLTH  
3 = EDUC  4 = MILI  
5 = PUBLIC  6 = LIB  
7 = PAPER  8 = OUTSIDE  
9 = OTHER  0 = N/A

[I ESC] Done [F2] Clear field
Form: ginaia  Table: GINIA
Field: id  Page: 1

Footnote

Specialized tools for attorneys in higher education are few. The Legal Deskbook for Administrators of Independent Colleges and Universities (Macon, Ga: Mercer University Press for the Center for Constitutional Studies, Mercer University, 1988) is a loose-leaf service that began in 1981 at the University of Notre Dame. It has subsequently gone through three revisions. Attorneys complain that while it was a good idea, it has not been kept sufficiently current and substantive. The Journal of College and University Law, published by the National Association of College and University Attorneys (ISSN 0093-8688) is the key journal for the field.