10-19-1973

Academic Library Cooperation in Fairfield County

Richard Matzek
Sacred Heart University

ACADEMIC LIBRARY COOPERATION

IN FAIRFIELD COUNTY

A study commissioned by HECUS

(Higher Education Center for Urban Studies)

by

Richard A. Matzek

University Librarian

Sacred Heart University

October 19, 1973

Bridgeport, Conn.

Table of Contents

ACADEMIC LIBRARY COOPERATION IN FAIRFIELD COUNTY: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This study, commissioned by HECUS, discusses the history and structure of interlibrary cooperation throughout the country with particular attention paid to academic and intertype library consortia. The barriers to cooperation are examined. The history and present level of development of library cooperation in Connecticut are traced including a detailing of SCLS planning and activity.

The study includes an analysis of the library strengths of the Fairfield County institutions: public, academic, and special libraries. The next section is the heart of the study, Interlibrary Cooperation - Guidelines for the Future. This section analyzes the responses of the directors of the eight HECUS institutions with separate library facilities to a questionnaire covering interlibrary organization and activity. These answers form the basis for the proposals detailed in section six, summarized here:

1. Organization and funding: Creation of a separate HECUS Library Committee closely linked to SCLS with funding on a program basis.

2. Specific cooperative activities in four areas:

   A. Descriptions of Holdings

      1) Directory of subject strengths

      2) Union list of serials

      3) Union list of Audio-Visual materials

   B. Delivery and Communications

      1) Delivery service

      2) Communication devices

   C. Technical Services

      1) Microfilming agency

      2) Storage and retrieval center

D. User Services

    1) Photocopy service

    2) Expanded interlibrary loan

    3) Reciprocal borrowing privileges

A concluding section emphasizes the need for continuous cooperative planning and includes a scenario, drawn from the point of view of the student user, of the future academic library as a node in a regional system.

Appendix information includes the three questionnaires utilized in the study and the tabulated results of the questionnaires. A description of an on-going program of periodicals exchange among the academic libraries (funded by Public Act 140) is included.

I. Introduction.

One of the more frustrating aspects of library cooperation might best be described by analogy with the rock of Sisyphus. The closer cooperative activity gets to reaching a plateau where those pushing it along might rest and catch their breath, the greater the chance of the whole support structure collapsing and the entire cooperative rock tumbling down at the librarians' feet.

The history of academic library cooperation in this area consists of a number of groups actively involved in supporting that rock: tri-university cooperation with the University of Bridgeport, Fairfield University and Sacred Heart University; the foundation of HECUS and the expansion of its role beyond urban studies; HECUS-wide discussions leading to academic library membership in SCLS which itself grew out of an Arthur Little study and federal/state funding. This current year SCLS is supported only by membership fees thus increasing the weight of the rock on each of the members' shoulders. Unless other financial props can soon be identified, once again library cooperation might find itself down at the bottom of the hill.

There is absolutely no question but that library cooperation is essential if the densely gathered population of Fairfield County is to be served with even adequate library collections, facilities and programs. On the academic side, the Commission for Higher Educations soon-to-be-released master plan clearly shows that the state can ill afford to build expensive new facilities if the utmost use of present facilities, public and private, has not been made. There is a wealth of library resources in this area, especially in the private university libraries, which can be made available to students of public institutions through such programs as the PL 140 grant recently appropriated (described below) and to all

area residents through SCLS cooperation.

This study, which is most intimately concerned with HECUS academic library cooperation but which recognizes the interdependence of all area libraries, is designed to identify potential cooperative areas and to make recommendations for programs which will enhance area library service. In compiling it I have sought to consult primarily the individuals most directly concerned with academic library work, the HECUS library directors, as well as a number of other librarians and interested laymen. Their help has been constant and enthusiastic. David Weill, the director of SCLS, has been especially interested and helpful in these efforts; his awareness of the needs of all area libraries - public, academic, and other - is exceptionally keen. Acknowledgement must also be given to the HECUS Board and to H. Parker Lansdale, the executive director of HECUS, for their recognition of the need for more intensive cooperative planning among the academic librarians of the HECUS institutions. HECUS has shown itself to be in the forefront in Connecticut and beyond in academic consortium activities, and the commissioning of this study clearly demonstrates its continued interest in fostering improved library service for the students and faculty of its institutions.

II. Library Cooperation: History, Structures, Barriers.

On July 27, 1973, the Bridgeport Post reported the initial findings
of the Master Plan of the Connecticut Commission for Higher Education.[1]
This draft proposal includes a discussion of the efforts of HECUS; it
states that "HECUS is the most sophisticated model for operational
cooperation in the state at the present time." HECUS itself is urged
to be "continued and expanded."

HECUS, then, could play a vital role as a node in a statewide
academic network with the statewide network itself linked regionally and
nationally. The New England Board of Higher Education (NEBHE) already
exists as a loose regional consortium. Its library division (NELINET)
of which more will be noted later has been operational for a number of
years especially in the area of cooperative processing of library materials.

In order to place local academic library cooperation more appropriately
in the context of current and future planning and practice, some historical
comments are needed to show the evolution and basic structures of library
cooperation.

Although it is only since the late 1950's, and especially during the
heyday of federal funding in the late sixties that library consortia and
other cooperative ventures proliferated as never before, there nevertheless
are numerous examples of significant attempts to achieve specific cooperative
goals dating back to the early part of this century. Prime examples are
the National Union Catalog to which key libraries throughout the country
have for years contributed cataloging and location information, the still
very useful union lists of serial and newspapers, the Farmington Plan,
recently discontinued, which for a quarter of a century brought into the
United States "every book and pamphlet of research significance wherever
published.[2]" In this plan, some sixty research libraries agreed to develop

in specialized areas complete collections of the publishing output of
sixteen nations. The program has been terminated for a number of
reasons, chief among which is cost. In these days of fiscal restraint,
few libraries, even the largest, find it possible to collect, compre-
hensively, materials which may have little or no use. J.H.P. Pafford
criticized this plan as being "a large, costly, and rather clumsy sledge-
hammer to crack so small a nut."[3] There are two lessons of importance
here which have bearing on the consideration of library cooperation: any
effort must be tested and evaluated at regular intervals to see if the
original goals still apply and are being achieved efficiently. Secondly,
cooperative efforts may well be more costly than non-cooperation. While
a prime reason for establishing library cooperation is more efficient
expenditure of funds, there is no question but that in many cases the
fruits of cooperation will be expensive indeed.

With the influx of federal funds in the 1960's, and spurred on by
a new generation of librarians (and supporting college administrators)
who saw past the walls of any one campus, academic library consortia
blossomed everywhere within the groves of academe. The Directory of
Academic Library Consortia[4] lists 125 different academic consortia in
the United States which include library involvement. Add to this figure
the various cooperative efforts of libraries of different types, and the
picture is one of considerable complexity and variety. There have been
a number of attempts to analyze that picture so that a clear understanding
of the basic purposes and structures of library cooperation, within and
without formal consortia, can be determined. One of the best of these
attempts is by G. Flint Purdy in his seminal article "Interrelations among
public, school, and academic libraries."[5] Purdy divides all specific
cooperative efforts into two classes:

1. methods of <u>sharing</u> resources more generously, more systematically,

   and more expeditiously than they would otherwise be shared

2. <u>strengthening</u> the resources to be shared.[6]

Such devices as union lists of serials, union catalogs, cooperative book
processing, reciprocal borrowing privileges, unrestricted interlibrary loan,
etc. are examples of Purdy's first class of library cooperation. Often
costly, especially at first, there well may be eventual savings (except
in such arrangements as reciprocal borrowing privileges where the increased
numbers of users imply increased costs); the chief goal of these plans is
improved and extended service. The second class - joint acquisitions,
assigned subject areas, etc. - is of necessity quite costly. This class
represents the recognition of area library needs and a willingness to
use library cooperation as a framework for the expansion of resources to
meet those needs.

In another article in the same issue of <u>Library Quarterly</u>, John
Mackenzie Cory provides a useful analysis of library cooperation within
the larger framework of total library development.[7] He sees library
development as a four generation process with the fourth and last generation
as yet unborn:

1. 1st generation: a single library of a single type.

2. 2nd generation: a system, network, or combination of several

   libraries, all of the same type.

3. 3rd generation: a combination of several different types of

   libraries or systems of libraries, whether independent or dependent.

4. 4th generation: a combination of library and non-library agencies

   concerned with related activities.

One flaw with this generational analysis is that the implied parallel with
computer development suggests that each further generation represents progress:
greater speed and efficiency. While this progression is true of computers,

it is not necessarily the case in regard library cooperation. In the near

future it is likely that a given academic library may serve in all four

generational modes serving its population primarily as a single unit and

being linked to other academic libraries for certain purposes, to public,

special and school libraries for other purposes, and directly to other

agencies such as health centers, business associations, etc. An important

consideration of this paper is to see whether all cooperative needs for

the academic community of the Fairfield County area can be met within the

framework of the Southwestern Connecticut Library System, Inc., a third

generation network involving, at present, two types of libraries, public

and academic.

[Section V of this report is a point-by-point examination of the

numerous kinds of cooperative ventures which have been tried in the past

or which are in current usage and which might be considered by area

libraries working in concert.]

Library cooperation, then, attempts to put to best possible use

existing library resources through a multitude of cooperative activities

or to add to existing resources new materials which will strengthen the

total library holdings of the community served. And this cooperative

activity can take place among libraries of the same type as in most

academic consortia or among libraries of a number of types. The planning

of cooperative activity, then, is an extremely complex process since

well over twenty-five kinds of cooperative activities have been identified

as presently or recently in practice. Basically there are four phases in

the development of any planning leading to a library consortium; these

phases are outlined in a publication entitled Guidelines for the Development

of Academic Library Consortia.[8] Even when a formal consortium is not

intended or achieved, many of these basic steps, which need not be performed

in this sequence, are vital to the consideration of cooperation on a less

formal basis. And while they are meant here to apply to <u>library</u> cooperation, they obviously are general considerations applicable to the planning of the parent body. HECUS, of course, has successfully trod these paths for some years now.

1. Exploratory phase.   Two to four months.

    Consideration of existing consortia

    Identification of potential members

    Discussion of feasibility

    Consideration of higher education consortia

2. Planning phase.   Six to twelve months.

    Identification of objectives

    Determination of organizational structure

    Development of program plans

    Determination of regional financial support

    Determination of funding sources

    Formulation of regional agreements

    Appointment of director

    Location of facilities

3. Detailed activity design.   Varies according to activities.

    Assignment of personnel

    Establishment of implementation schedules

    Development of operational policies

    Development of reporting precedures

    Development of evaluation procedures

    Modification of goals and objectives

4. Operation and evaluation phase. Continuous.

    Trial implementation

    Initial activity evaluation

    Design modification

Final implementation

Evaluation

Many of these developmental concerns will come into play later in this

report, especially in regard organizational and funding possibilities.

It is obvious to any observer of library cooperation that while

library literature is filled with reports on working ventures, there are

nonetheless numerous and serious obstacles to successful library cooperation.

And equally obvious is the fact that most of these obstacles center about

people. Orin Notting lists five kinds of barriers to effective cooperation:[9]

1. Psychological barriers:

   Custodial mentality of librarians, inertia, indifference.

2. Lack of information and experience:

   Ignorance of needs of users, failure to inform the public on

   library collections and services.

3. Traditional and historical barriers:

   Fear by large libraries of being over used and undercompensated,

   lack of adequate funds.

4. Physical and geographical barriers:

   Distance between libraries, distance of users from a library.

5. Legal and administrative barriers:

   Too many taxing units.

Dr. Edwin E. Olson's study, Interlibrary Cooperation, an excellent source

for solid analyses of current practices, surveyed a number of directors

of cooperative projects on this very point.[10] His model for library

cooperation consists of the "power budget" (structure, resources, decision

process), "opportunities and constraints" (orientation of the project

director, staff development, perception of barriers, environmental character-

istics), "cooperative domain" (goals of the cooperative in terms of resources,

population to be served, and services rendered). In looking at each of the

three parts of the model, the human element is quickly seen as the chief

obstacle to successful cooperation. In the "power budget" area, while

lack of funding is frequent, more significant is the fact that the

general requirement for total or near unanimity among members diffuses

cooperative efforts to the extent that few activities are feasible.

Under "domain" the goals acceptable to the membership are generally

established single library goals. And finally, there is a definite barrier

in the attitudes and educational backgrounds of librarians themselves who

need to be trained "to think in network terms and to deal with the fears

about cooperation."[11]

To my mind there are fears far more real and in need of immediate

response than librarians' "custodial mentality, inertia, or indifference,"

valid though these concerns might be. There is understandable reluctance

to rush headlong into something that might prove disastrous to the single

library and its clientele. Or, as one writer put it in a more whimsical

fashion, "Librarians approach cooperation in much the same way that

porcupines make love - with great caution." Some of the more substantial

concerns that must be answered are the fear of loss of autonomy - some

outside individual or body will be making decisions affecting the operations

of a single library; the fear of the deluge in which a library is swamped

with requests from outsiders, a real possibility for the largest node of

a network; and the usual fear of the smaller nodes, that precious staff

time will be lost to excessive network demands. Alleviating these fears

and others may be the most difficult part of cooperation whether through the

efforts of academic administrators or a consortium director. A brief

examination of the membership of consortia throughout the country reveals

that in many cases there has been an attempt to link libraries of relatively

similar size as well as type. For example there is a consortium in New

Hampshire with seven academic library members: St. Anselms, Mount St. Mary's,

Rivier, Notre Dame, New England, Plymouth State, and Keene State. The total volumes owned by these seven libraries (1971 figures)are just under 500,000. In the same state but not participating in equal library cooperation with the seven are Dartmouth, which alone has over one million volumes, and the University of New Hampshire with almost 600,000. (The University of New Hampshire is a "supporting member" of this consortium.) The libraries of both these institutions participate intensively in NELINET and other network activities. The message is clear: in regard certain activities there must be realistic awareness of the "haves" and the "have-nots." Greatly dissimilar libraries in terms of size and type can and do participate in consortia, but only when there are restrictions on types of activities or carefully delineated plans for compensation.

While in the flush of federal funding during the mid and late sixties, network achievements seemed limitless. These days libraries with their own fiscal belts tightened are somewhat more wary of entering cooperatives which will probably require additional out-of-pocket expense at least at the first. Yet even in a time of financial conservatism (or perhaps especially at such a time since college presidents are particularly alert to experimentation with cooperative efforts which obviously save funds such as sharing access to Chemical Abstracts rather than purchasing it separately), the chief goals of library cooperation should be clearly before us at all times:

1. To make available library resources to more people in more efficient and systematic ways

2. To expand those resources so that more books, periodicals, documents, etc. are available.

The demands of the last fourth of this century will not wait for ideal social, political and economic conditions under which library cooperation can easily be nourished. It is clear that librarians and others interested in expanding library resources and services cannot afford to ignore the

possibilities of interlibrary cooperation. And they cannot afford to
postpone cooperative activity until the day when more sophisticated
computer systems are developed. The numerous active library consortia
of this country are proof that much can be accomplished now while still
allowing for future technological developments to produce more efficient
results in the future. The choice is ours: to begin cooperation now or
to wait until a few more student generations have been denied access to
expanded services and resources. There are two ways to get to the top
of an oak tree - by climbing, or by sitting on an acorn. Far too often
have academic librarians in particular chosen the latter approach.

III. Library Cooperation in Connecticut.

Here in the state of the Charter Oak, there are ample instances of both climbing and acorn-sitting. This section covers, quite sketchily, some of the attempts past and present to link Connecticut libraries and library activities. Instrumental in these attempts have been the State Library, the Connecticut Library Association, and a host of far-sighted librarians, trustees, and others who have responded enthusiastically to the library needs of our times.

Statewide.

It is difficult at this particular time to ascertain the precise level of library cooperation in Connecticut from the point of view of the academic librarian because Connecticut libraries are about to undertake two significant statewide programs, the full implications of which cannot be predicted. These programs are rapid information service and a state-wide library card. At this time exactly how closely involved will the state academic libraries be in these programs has not been determined.

In the past five or six years there has been considerable tension in Connecticut between proponents of statewide cooperation and those who support regional development. The issue was crystallized by Kenneth Shaffer in an address to the Connecticut Library Association in 1971.[1] Very pointedly he stated: "If regional systems of any kind are to come to Connecticut in terms of the present state of economic reference, it will be only through a plan which will mandate the use of state aid funds for specific cooperative, if not system, purposes." From this concept came - for a time - such a plan and certain funds to implement it. Until the present fiscal year federal funds, administered by the state agency, have been in existence to support the three Connecticut regional systems:

Capitol Region Library Council

Southern Connecticut Library Council

Southwestern Connecticut Library System

Shaffer went on to suggest that this all important question of statewide versus regional cooperation be considered carefully by a group such as the Connecticut Library Association. Out of this and other suggestions, came an ad hoc study committee of over thirty state librarians and trustees. They met in a number of intensive planning sessions and produced the Target '76 plan, a five-year plan for statewide library cooperation which additionally provided support for certain regional concepts and activities.

Prior to any further consideration of this question, which is given in the section on SCLS activities, our attention must be turned to the considerable activities of the state agency, the State Library, in regard library cooperation in Connecticut.

State library.

There is no space here to present a schema of the complex operations of the State Library. Traditionally it has performed, in addition to services directed to support of the executive and legislative branches of state government, a myriad of extended services designed to help the small public library in particular. Connecticut has numerous small public libraries with meager holdings, short hours, and staffs which are non-professional and underpaid or volunteer. To aid these libraries and their staffs, the Connecticut State Library has provided consultant service, library service centers to increase bookstocks and to provide centralized processing, bookmobiles to aid transfer of collections and service to rural areas. Numerous public library buildings have been constructed with the aid of federal Library Service and Construction Act funds (LSCA) administered by the state agency. Workshops and institutes have been sponsored and conducted to aid the public librarian.

More recently a number of efforts have been begun to aid all Connecticut libraries and their users by tapping the resources of the larger Connecticut libraries, public and academic. An interlibrary loan system was created by which the collections of a number of libraries in the state are

systematically searched with Yale serving as the ultimate back-up resource.
(This method, which is not the most efficient way of locating a book, is
nonetheless a time-tested mechanism for avoiding one of the pitfalls of
library cooperation, the placing of an excessively heavy burden on the
largest node in the system.) The creation recently of a union catalog of
the newer acquisitions of major libraries in the state has made at least
part of the interlibrary loan process more efficient. Teletype communication
throughout the state, a reality for several years, has also served to reduce
the time needed to transmit interloans and other cooperative business.

Regional system.

Although the other two regional library associations of the state
could well warrant individual attention, our focus must remain on Fairfield
County and its regional system, the Southwestern Connecticut Library System,
Inc. At this point in time SCLS is entering what may prove to be a crucial
year in its existence. The federal support of its activities (LSCA Title
I funds administered by the State Library) has been removed, and for fiscal
'73 - '74, SCLS will need to operate on funds provided by the participating
libraries. (Other sources of funds are possible: foundations, other federal
or state programs such as the P.L. 140 program described below.) A number
of previous member libraries have dropped their memberships for '73- '74,
and, of course, the loss of each member places a greater financial burden
on the continuing membership because of the large proportion of fixed
operating costs. No attempt was made to try to achieve permanent establish-
ment, with permanent funding, in the 1973 legislative session because the
SCLS director, David Weill, and his board, believe that without statewide
support of the need for regional cooperation there could be no successful
legislative effort. At this time there is no real understanding of what will
happen to federal funding in the near future because of the instability of
the current national political scene.

SCLS was organized in 1970 with 1971-72 being the first full year
of its project activities. Under the successive administrations of Mrs.
Pat Olsen and Mr. David Weill, SCLS has added to its original complement
of public libraries the academic libraries of HECUS. There is now provision
in its by-laws for the inclusion of membership of any type of library and
of any non-library agency (as associate members). During SCLS's most
active year to date, 1972-73, some thirty libraries were full members of
the system including the following academic libraries, the entire HECUS
membership:

Bridgeport Engineering Institute   Sacred Heart University

Fairfield University   University of Bridgeport

Housatonic Community College   Univ. of Connecticut - Stamford

Norwalk Community College   Western Connecticut State College

Norwalk State Technical Institute

The activities of SCLS to date have included:[2]

Film service. The academic libraries have been unable to utilize the

SCLS film service to any extent because of restrictions on school use

by the lending organizations as well as funding limitations of LSCA

which preclude service to other than public libraries.

Reference service. A centralized system reference point was established

at the Bridgeport Public Library with direct, toll-free, phone hook-up.

Telephone reference service after Aug. 30, 1973 will be contingent upon

the operation of the State Library's new statewide Telephone Information

Service.

Delivery service. During the first year of the project, UPS was used for

interlibrary deliveries. In 1972 the system purchased a truck, and

delivery service ranging from daily to twice a week as established

for system member libraries. The primary reason for delivery service

is the interlibrary loan program, but many other kinds of materials -

messages, flyers, posters, etc. - were sent out via the truck.

Interlibrary loan. During 1972-73 the Interlibrary loan service was a coordinated effort with the State Library with SCLS serving as a clearinghouse for all requests. Current plans are to develop a "library-operated cooperative interlibrary loan service" with libraries searching for requests while the driver waits at each stop.

Workshops and institutes. A number of successful reference workshops were held covering kinds of materials and services of interest to SCLS librarians. Current plans include the establishment and coordination of "cooperative service groups" in such areas as:

. Reference and information services

. Readers' services (including selection of acquisition of adult materials)

. Children's services

. Audio-visual services

. Technical services.

These groups are to meet on a monthly basis and are intended to be program-oriented as well as part of an ongoing education program.

Planning research and development. Announced plans for 1973-74 include:

. Examination of the adequacy of library holdings and development of programs for improvement within current library fiscal restraints.

. Exploration of the need and feasibility of a coordinated automated library technical and information services program.

. Investigation of the possibilities of last copy storage.

Other services and activities.

. Administer the operation of the system and its programs.

. Seek outside funding for specific projects and supplementary support.

. Coordinate other regional activities as needs arise.

. Advise libraries in areas of staff expertise on internal library problems.

- Promote regional concept around the state and assist other regions
  as time permits.

- Work with Target '76 to improve statewide library development.

- Work with the State Library to improve statewide library development.

- Work towards legislation for state funding of regional library systems.

- Develop cooperative programs and relations with other regional groups.

- Maintain awareness of national developments.

- Maintain resume clearinghouse.

- Procure and distribute free materials to members.

The activities of SCLS have been successful for the most part, but they have
been directed primarily to the public library and its users, as in the case
of the film exchange program. Even when a service such as rapid delivery
of interlibrary loans would seem to benefit academic libraries as well, the
academic libraries have not fully utilized the service. Some academic librarians
have been unwilling to extend interlibrary loan service to undergraduates.
The service in the case of little used scholarly books has been extremely slow
with delays of up to four weeks common. The traditional gap between types of
libraries is not easily bridged, and the experience of these early years of
SCLS reveals that only a temporary walkway now exists with a more permanent
structure still some distance in the future.

Academic libraries.

There is an interesting, and rather revealing, statement in the Fall
1970 issue of Connecticut Libraries:

Back in the 30's Fremont Rider tried to organize a Connecticut

based cooperative group for active exchange and cooperative

use of academic library materials.

The path of Connecticut academic library history is marked with a number
of such milestones, most of which are long overgrown with the weeds of
neglect. Here, as throughout the nation, cooperative efforts have often been

seen as a panacea. They have been attempted in limited areas and in more grandiose schemes, and they have most often been the first efforts to be curtailed or abandoned in times of fiscal or personnel stress.

There are several union catalog or union list of serials projects in various states of use and abandon:

. Fairfield University for some years sent main entry cards to be available for consultation at the Bridgeport Public Library.

. There was a short-lived tri-university, manually produced, union list of serials in the mid-sixties.

. The Library Administrators' Group (LAG) produced a ULS of the holdings of public libraries, and plans were initiated to add the serial holdings of the area's academic libraries.

. A number of academic libraries throughout the state have contributed cards to the new state union catalog.

Many other similar union catalogs or lists may well have been attempted or at least discussed throughout the state. There is one important aspect of union catalog efforts which causes eventual problems of continuance, and that is the need to provide for regular updating of information. It is a bit of a cliche to say that we are at a point of breakthrough, but at this time it is accurate to make that statement. The kind of on-line cataloging with which Fairfield University is currently involved through NELINET and OCLC has the potential of developing full union catalog capabilities for every participating library in a system. While the immediate benefits of this spin-off product are minimal, because only current additions would be identified, the long-term possiblities of developing a centralized computer bank of locations are self-evident in terms of interlibrary loans, acquisitions, subject bibliographies, etc.

Although Target '76 has been concerned chiefly with programs of direct benefit to the public library users, the awareness of library cooperation, indeed

of libraries themselves, has improved in the state legislature in great part due to the Target '76 effort. The voices of Connecticut librarians have been raised above a whisper, as the inevitable one-liner puts it. This increased awareness has led to Public Act 73-10 which permits a pre-registered student in any of the state's units of higher education to use the library of any other unit. The geographic distribution of the state units of higher education ranging from the community colleges to the state university at Storrs should preclude any undue strain on a single library under this program although the findings of the study of this plan should be interesting after a year or so.

Student of HECUS _public_ institutions of higher learning will be aided as well because of an $8,000.00 grant to be coordinated by Sacred Heart University. This grant for 1973-74 will assist the three _private_ universities in HECUS in their development of periodicals holdings and services which are made readily available to the students of the _public_ institutions in the HECUS area. Arrangements for the performance of this service are currently being made.

Where are we now? The next section of this report describes in some detail the current status of Fairfield County libraries, public and academic (with additional notes on other types of libraries). In terms of staff, holdings, facilities, and services of individual libraries, a fairly complete picture of where we are now is thus available. In regard cooperative activities the picture is less complete, but a few conclusions can be drawn:

. Among county academic libraries cooperation has been chiefly conversational until the inclusion of the academic libraries in the SCLS consortium through the leadership of HECUS.

. Even in SCLS, the academic libraries have tended to utilize the available services to a far lesser extent than the public libraries. Reasons for this low rate of use include:

Belief that SCLS services are public library oriented;

Failure to inform users (and even staff) of SCLS services.

Restriction of interlibrary loan to graduate students and faculty.

Time-delays in obtaining materials tend to inhibit student use.

. Academic librarians have been hardpressed to keep up with their own needs and have lacked the time, funding, and staff to explore extra-library needs.

. Too great a size disparity prevails among the HECUS libraries.

. The physical grouping of the libraries has been a deterrent to intimate cooperative efforts.

While this picture seems quite negative, there are some additional considerations at this time which point to increased cooperation:

..The four largest libraries - University of Bridgeport, Fairfield University, Western Connecticut State College, Sacred Heart University - will, in a few months, all have large new buildings. The physical freedom provided by a new building tends to make cooperative efforts more feasible.

. SCLS leadership, while aware of its precarious financial picture, has indicated increased interest in projects of direct concern to academic libraries.

. Hardware and systems analysis are considerably more sophisticated than a few years ago, and such operations as the NELINET/OCLC processing system are already in use in the county.

. The HECUS leadership is directly and enthusiastically concerned with in-depth library cooperation among member institutions. The stimulus provided by HECUS college presidents and deans will spur the librarians to far greater involvement in cooperative activity than before.

IV. Library Strengths.

The total picture of Fairfield County library resources includes public, academic, school, and special libraries. As noted earlier in this report, the SCLS Board has made provision for membership for libraries of any type although to date only public and academic libraries have entered the system. This section of the study presents a brief analysis of the current strengths of area libraries with by far the greater attention paid to public and academic libraries.

A. Public Libraries.

Data on Fairfield County public libraries was obtained from two sources: the American Library Directory, 1972-73 (New York, Bowker, 1972) and from a questionnaire sent to twenty-four area public libraries. The questionnaire is attached to this report as Appendix A along with a tabulation of the results. Replies were received from eighteen libraries, a return of seventy-five percent. The statistics presented are therefore not exact, but enough evidence is available to delineate a relatively complete pattern of operation for Fairfield County's public libraries. This pattern reveals two significant trends: 1) area public libraries rank high among New England public libraries in a number of important comparisons; 2) within the county area library support and strengths are remarkably diverse.

REGIONAL COMPARISON.

Using American Library Directory, 1972-73 figures, Fairfield County public libraries are exceptionally strong when compared with libraries throughout the rest of the state, the New England area, and New York and New Jersey (Figure 1). Since the population of Fairfield County is greater than that of each of the entire states of Vermont and New Hampshire and almost equal to that of each of the states of Maine and Rhode Island, comparison to entire states has validity. Fairfield County is in first place in books

circulated per capita (6.4) and is second only to New York State in
funding per capita. Within the state of Connecticut itself, the public
libraries of Fairfield County are well above the per capita figures in
circulation and operating expenditures, while the book collections are
less impressive, 2.7 books per capita compared with 2.5 throughout the
state. One national note: throughout the country only four states (Iowa,
Nebraska, Utah, Wyoming) show a higher book per capita circulation than
does Fairfield County; Connecticut itself in toto ranks in the top quintile.

FAIRFIELD COUNTY.

The materials owned by public libraries in Fairfield County are not
exceptional in quantity with no library exceeding a half million volumes
and a per capita bookstock of 2.7 throughout the county. In terms of
financial support and circulation of books, however, the county libraries
rank high as might be expected because of the unusual affluence and high
educational level of area residents. Nevertheless, individual public
libraries within the county show wide extremes of collections, services,
and support as can easily be seen on this brief scale.

	LOW	MEAN	HIGH
Expenditure per person served	$1.59	$6.68	$20.67
Books per capita	0.7	2.7	7.2
Circulation per capita	2.4	6.4	15.7

The questionnaire replies reveal some important patterns of public library
operation which will be compared below to those of the college libraries:
emphasis on nonbook materials, especially films and recordings, but not
on microforms; space problems with many libraries reporting holdings equal
to or in excess of volume capacity; relatively limited reader space and
hours of operation.

There is no one library that can be said to typify public library

operation in Fairfield County; the geographic, economic and social milieu of the area is far too complex. Yet a composite public library can be drawn from survey data, and such a "typical" public library will be of some use in comparison with the "typical" academic library.

POPULATION SERVED		33,530	
TOTAL AREA	19,671 sq. ft.	PUBLIC SEATING	96
VOLUME CAPACITY	104,808	HOURS PER WEEK	51
HOLDINGS, BOOKS	86,223	PERIODICAL SUBSCRIPTIONS	236
MICROFORMS	305	FILMS, FILMSTRIPS	171
AUDIO HOLDINGS	1,908	CIRCULATION	194,212
STAFF, PROFESSIONAL	6.3	STAFF, OTHER	17
SALARIES	$161,448	BOOKS & PERIODICALS	$35,883
A-V	$3,188	BINDING	$1,610
OTHER	$42,866		
TOTAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES		$244,995	

One last comment: there are three public libraries whose operating budgets approach or exceed the million dollar a year mark: Bridgeport, Greenwich, Stamford. Each of these libraries has a long history of spirited cooperation in extending its resources and services to users of smaller libraries. In any kind of a cooperative system the larger libraries have resources which are tapped by the smaller with little likelihood of reciprocity. At time of writing, the plan for the statewide library card includes reimbursement for loans in excess of borrowings which will serve to preclude overwhelming strain on the budgets of the larger libraries although such compensation tends to be well under true costs of acquisition, processing, storage, and retrieval of materials. Yet large libraries, for a multitude of reasons, have traditionally extended a hand to their smaller cousins, and Fairfield County public libraries have long proved to be no exception to this rule.

FIGURE 1. COMPARISON OF PUBLIC LIBRARY STATISTICS BY STATE

A.   Population
B1. Volumes
B2. Volumes per capita
C1. Circulation
C2. Circ. per capita
D1. Expenditures
D2. Expend. per capita

NEW HAMPSHIRE
A.   731,767
B1   3,241,303   B2   4.4
C1   4,218,503   C2   5.7
D1 $2,856,053   D2 $3.87

MAINE
A 831,855
B1 3,217,962
B2 3.9
C1 4,585,804
C2 5.7
D1 $2,958,876
D2 $3.66

VERMONT
A.   393,824
B1   1,676,200
B2   3.7
C1   1,948,006
D1 $1,183,061
D2 $2.66

NEW YORK
A.   18,165,922
B1   35,723,516
B2   1.96
C1   83,181,579
C2   4.57
D1 $127,497,125
D2 $6.98

MASSACHUSETTS
A.   5,685,869
B1   18,826,034   B2   3.3
C1   34,844,291   C2   6.1
D1 $31,340,523 D2 $5.50

RHODE ISLAND
A.   949,723
B1   1,987,075   B2   2.1
C1   3,628,538   C2   3.8
D1 $3,300,068   D2 $3.47

NEW JERSEY
A.   7,192,930
B1   15,911,774
B2   2.21
C1   33,119,158
C2   4.6
D1 $39,287,272
D2 $5.07

CONNECTICUT
A.   3,028,825
B1   7,691,115   B2   2.5
C1   15,783,013   C2   5.3
D1 $15,838,947 D2 $5.03

FAIRFIELD COUNTY
A.   810,205
B1   2,214,236   B2   2.7
C1   5,189,473   C2   6.4
D1 $5,413,834   D2 $6.68

B. <u>Academic Libraries</u>.

Two sources were used for obtaining data on the libraries of the

HECUS member institutions: the <u>HECUS Academic Library Profile</u> and the

<u>Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities</u>, Parts A and B, Fall 1971

(published by the National Center for Educational Statistics for the Office

of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1972).

For national comparisons, the Fall 1969 Analytic Report of the previous

edition of this latter document was used; the 1971 Analytic Report was

not as yet available. <u>Profile</u> responses were received from all but one

of the eight HECUS academic libraries with separate facilities. (The

Bridgeport Engineering Institute materials are not included in the

tabulations; it currently houses most of its materials in the Sacred Heart

University Library with approximately 4500 volumes at Sacred Heart and

another 4000 volumes elsewhere.) The profile, attached as Appendix B,

is quite detailed; the responses to it form an almost complete picture

of area academic library operation which, as in the case of public libraries

in this area, is again exceptionally diverse.

REGIONAL COMPARISON.

The data in Figure 2, Comparison of Academic Library Statistics, was

compiled from <u>Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities</u>, Parts A

and B, Fall 1971 so that the same basis for comparison might be established

with the other academic libraries in Connecticut. The figures are two years

out of date; library directors in the colleges and universities of the nation

have just now sent in the Fall 1973 figures which will be available sometime

in 1974. However, the percentages have undoubtedly varied little in the past

two years although the total book holdings have increased by as much as 15%.

Statistically speaking, the academic library situation in Connecticut

is a tale of two worlds - Yale and the rest of us. Yale's library, while

serving only eight percent of the student population of Connecticut, has

over 1,400,000 more volumes than the total academic library holdings of Connecticut. Put another way, while students in the other 44 institutions have an average of 38.1 books per student, Yale students each have 654.1 books available to them, a total of 5,829,035 volumes in Fall 1971.

There is a story, often quoted at orientation sessions in small colleges, about a would-be student who inquires of an admissions officer how many volumes the college library has. "Sixty-five thousand," replies the admissions officer. "Well," says the candidate rather loftily, "I could go to Yale; they have over five million volumes." The admissions officer isn't at all taken aback. He says, quickly, "Son, why don't you enroll here. When you finish our sixty-five thousand volumes, I'll make sure they get you more!"

Any director of a Connecticut academic library often finds his library in the shadow of Yale's Sterling, Beinecke, and other libraries. His students plague him with requests to use Yale collections, often seeking materials gathering dust on his own shelves. And Yale's exceedingly high outside-user fees have become a point of irritation to local faculty members who remember fondly the $25.00 a year fee of a few years ago. One way or another Yale's library presence is felt, and when her resources are added to those of the 44 less fortunate libraries of Connecticut (although to call Weslayan, Trinity, or the University of Connecticut less fortunate may be stretching the point) Connecticut academic libraries are wealthy indeed in comparison with the national averages (See figure 2). Even without Yale, Connecticut students have available to them reasonably adequate collections and services, as seen in this comparison of volumes, total expenditures, and book budgets.

	Total Conn. with Yale	Total Conn. without Yale	National
Volumes / student	81.4	38.1	43.4
Expend. / student	$67	$117	$78
Book $ / student	$22	$35	$28

The non-Yale Connecticut total is bolstered primarily by the independent university and college libraries of Connecticut as can clearly be seen in this comparison:

	Total Independent without Yale	Total Public
Volumes / student	65.1	23.2
Expend. / student	$83	$58
Book $ / student	$27	$21

The picture in Connecticut (again disregarding Yale) is that of strong independent college and university libraries with just over half of the number of students attending public institutions (41,967 to 76,022) but with almost a million more volumes already in the collections and significantly greater per student total operating and book budget expenditures. This tradition of strong private institution collection development is true in the HECUS area as well as in the rest of Connecticut although to a lesser extent, as can be seen in these figures:

	HECUS Independent	HECUS Public
Students	14,114	11,890
Volumes / student	28.5	13.7
Expend. / student	$60	$42
Book $ / student	$22	$12

It is important to recognize that all the HECUS institutions are, by Connecticut standards, young with most of their growth taking place in the past decade. Consequently their library holdings will tend to be meager in comparison with those of such well-established schools as Trinity, Wesleyan, and Connecticut College. However, the amount of current financial support should tend to compensate for the relative weakness of the collections; to illustrate current support here is another comparison:

	Total HECUS	Other Conn. Public	Other Conn. Total (w/o Yale)
Volumes / student	21.7	25.0	42.7
Expend. / student	$52	$61	$72
Book $ / student	$18	$21	$24

Compared with the rest of the state (excluding Yale), HECUS libraries

fare rather poorly, in volume count, per student expenditures, and book budgets. The three _private_ institutions of HECUS included in this comparison are about on a par with the _public_ institutions of the rest of the state while HECUS' public institutions are substandard in every category of support again in comparison with the rest of the state.

What are the implications of this comparative analysis? First of all, some allowance must be made for the fact that the HECUS institutions, especially its public institutions, are young, and that four of the eight are two-year institutions. Secondly, just as the figures for Connecticut private institutions are bolstered by the strengths of such private libraries as Wesleyan and Trinity, the public figures are dominated by the collections of the University of Connecticut. Nevertheless it is clear that Fairfield County academic libraries, unlike the public libraries of the area, are far from being the strongest in the state. The implications of this recognition are chiefly these two:

1. Students from the HECUS area number about 22% of the total Connecticut enrollment (without Yale) but have available to them under 13% of the total bookstock of Connecticut academic libraries. Access to collections in other parts of Connecticut should be an essential part of cooperative planning.

2. The excellence of the total public library picture of Fairfield County combined with obvious weaknesses in the academic library situation suggests greater need for intertype cooperation than might be true in other parts of the state and the nation.

FAIRFIELD COUNTY.

An updating of the figures presented above indicates a somewhat healthier academic library picture with an estimate 684,694 volumes available to the 28,479 full-time-equivalent students of the HECUS institutions (excluding

B.E.I.), or 24 volumes per student compared with 21.7 two years ago. Here
it is important to distinguish between four-year and two-year institutions.
The four-year (and up) HECUS libraries show a per student bookstock of
34 books while the two-year institutions have approximately 7.5 books per
student.

Library use in the two-year institutions across the country is both
quantitatively and qualitatively different from that in the traditional
four-year colleges. Many of these two-year school libraries bear little
physical resemblance to the typical university library; they are often
called learning centers with emphasis given to use of non-book material:
films and filmstrips, slides, records, tapes, cassettes, videotapes, and
other newer media applications. This essentially different kind of
collection, a clear reflection of dissimilar teaching methodologies, is
amply evident in the following comparisons of the holdings of the three
independent four-year school libraries with those of the four public
two-year institution libraries. (Estimated figures from the public four-
year institution in the HECUS area are not included in the following
comparison.)

Category	Independent, Four-year	Public, Two-year
Students (FTE)	12,591	10,888
Volumes	463,077	81,695
Volumes / student	36.8	7.5
Square footage	119,849	26,484
Seating	1,466	313
Periodical subscriptions	4,874	799
Periodicals per student	0.39	0.07
Microfilm reels	24,236	4,343
Other microforms	390,338	111,760
Motion pictures	23	686
Filmstrips	332	262
Slides	3,700	5,720
Audio recordings	2,007	1,216
Books & periodicals	$309,523	$47,202
Books / student	$25	$4.34
A-V expenditures	$6,366	$8,589
A-V $ / student	$0.51	$0.79
Salaries & wages (exc. stu.)	$397,490	$179,603
Salaries / student	$32	$17
Total $ / student	$71	$25

Prior to an analysis of a number of selected areas of library operation, it is important to note the significant shift in enrollment revealed by comparing the FTE figures obtained from the Profile with those from the Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, Fall 1971.

	Independent Four-year	Public Two-year
Fall 1971	14,114	7,538
HECUS Profile (1973)	12,591	10,888

Such a shift from the independent four-year institutions to the public two-year institutions results in corresponding shifts in volumes per student and expenditures per student which will be compensated for only over a period of time. Nevertheless it is evident that library support is several times greater in almost all areas of library operation in the traditional four-year institution. It is equally evident that the two-year institution depends heavily on audio-visual aids, especially films, while the book collection is not supported to the same extent. Note that the book budget for the three four-year institutions is over one-third of the total operating budget just short of the national average of 36%, while that of the two-year schools is about 18%.

The latest national analytic figures available (Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, Fall 1969) show an average of 12 books per student for all public two-year institutions and an overall expenditure of $45.00 per student. Again it must be noted that the rapid influx of students in the past two years has affected the per-student figures in the HECUS public two-year institutions; for example, the per-student operating expenditure figure for the HECUS public two-year institutions in the Fall 1971 report was $34.00 as opposed to the $25.00 figure compiled from responses to the 1973 Profile questionnaire.

In summary, then, having looked at the eight HECUS libraries with separate facilities from two points of view, whether public or independent, and whether four-year or two-year institutions, a revealing picture emerges.

There are four four-year (and up) institution libraries roughly parallel in terms of volumes and expenditures per student with collections ranging from slightly over 80,000 volumes to a quarter of a million, and there are four two-year institution libraries with much smaller collections. The focus in the four-year school libraries is on books, periodicals, and other research materials; in the two-year school libraries it is on films and other non-book acquisitions with the book collections little supported by research materials. (An exception to this is the Encyclopaedia Britannica ultra-microfiche collection of research materials owned by one of the two-year institutions.) Lastly, the four-year institution libraries are open about 90 hours per week on the average while the two-year institution libraries are open an average of 56.9 hours per week.

These findings suggest three key questions:

1. What kinds of shared services can be developed among libraries as dissimilar as those in the HECUS consortium?

2. The total strength of HECUS libraries, while not critical especially among the four-year institutions, is below that of other Connecticut libraries and also below the national averages. Will shared programs and collections help the individual libraries or will they tend to spread the collections even thinner?

3. What library cooperative activities will be useful to other kinds of libraries in the area and to their clientele? Are there strengths revealed in this analysis of academic libraries which might be of importance to the public library user?

COMPARISON OF ACADEMIC AND PUBLIC LIBRARIES.

The next sections of this report investigate the kinds of activities which the academic library sector might consider for cooperation among itself and with other types of libraries, especially public libraries. Here is a comparison of the "typical" public library, referred to in the first part of

this section, with a "typical" academic library. The comparison is drawn

for the purpose of showing certain emphases in collections and services;

the same caveat applies here as before in that the academic libraries tend

to be widely dissimilar in that they serve the populations of schools

ranging from two-year technical institutes to full universities with

graduate programs.

Category	Public	Academic
Population served	33,530	3,560 (students)
Volume capacity	104,808	140,789
Holdings, books	86,223	85,587
Microforms	305	4,358 reels
		62,762 microforms
Audio	1,908	460
Films, filmstrips	171	186
Periodical subscriptions	236	784
Hours open per week	51	74.2
Staff, professional	6.3	4.35
Staff, other	17	5.24
Salaries	$161,448	$93,844
Books & periodicals	$35,883	$54,842
A-V	$3,188	$1,857
Binding	$1,610	$3,652
Other	$42,866	$17,670
Student help		$9,572
Total expenditures	$244,995	$171,865

(Circulation figures for the academic libraries are not available.)

Even such a brief comparison of mythical, composite libraries reveals

quite dissimilar patterns of service responding to the needs of the public

as opposed to those of a student body and faculty. While the book collections

are roughly the same size (although undoubtedly quite different in actual

holdings), there is great emphasis on research materials in the academic

library shown by the large average numbers of reels of microfilm and individual

microforms. The emphasis on periodical subscriptions reinforces this pattern,

while the stress on audio-visual software is more typical of the public rather

than the academic library. (The film, filmstrip figure for academic libraries

is inflated by the holdings of two of the two-year institution libraries.)

The public libraries, while open an average of 51 hours per week, employ a much larger staff than the academic libraries, which are open an average of 74.2 hours per week, although the employment of students is not included in staff,other and would add almost three additional persons to that total. Nevertheless it is suggested that the public libraries are more service-oriented while the academic libraries are more collection-oriented if such a broad generalization can be drawn from what must be recognized as scanty evidence. Certainly the fact that the materials budget of the typical Fairfield County public library is only 12% of the total compared with the 33% of the academic libraries underlines this difference although the large number of small public libraries in the poll increases staff costs considerably. Furthermore, the other operating costs of public libraries include heat, light, etc. costs that are not reflected in academic library budgets.

There is, therefore, one strong implication in these findings with bearing on library cooperation: public libraries and academic libraries in many ways complement each other; they do not necessarily duplicate collections and services to any great extent. At a time when the traditional walls of the campus are being torn down to accomodate more and more community interaction, the academic library can readily serve as an additional resource for the user of the public library through the kinds of intertype cooperative activity planned and in actual operation through such efforts as those of the Southwestern Connecticut Library System.

FIGURE 2.   COMPARISON OF ACADEMIC LIBRARY STATISTICS.

A   Number of students
B1   Volumes owned
B2   Volumes per student
C1   Operating Expenditures
C2   Operating Expenditures per student
D1   Book Budget
D2   Book Budget per student

HECUS Independent - 3		HECUS Public - 5		HECUS Total - 8	
A	14,114	A	11,890	A	26,004
B1	401,952	B1	162,743	B1	564,695
B2	28.5	B2	13.7	B2	21.7
C1	$844,706	C1	$497,573	C1	$1,342,279
C2	$60	C2	$42	C2	$52
D1	$316,732	D1	$140,824	D1	$457,556
D2	$22	D2	$12	D2	$18

Other Conn. Ind. (w/o Yale) 18 libraries		Other Conn. Public 18 libraries		Other Conn. Total (w/o Yale) 36 libraries	
A	27,853	A	64,132	A	91,985
B1	2,328,076	B1	1,603,329	B1	3,931,405
B2	83.6	B2	25.0	B2	42.7
C1	$2,656,200	C1	$3,924,339	C1	$6,580,539
C2	$95	C2	$61	C2	$72
D1	$829,540	D1	$1,354,679	D1	$2,184,219
D2	$30	D2	$21	D2	$24

Yale 1 library			
		C1	$6,980,819
A	8,912	C2	$781
B1	5,829,035	D1	$1,835,534
B2	654.1	D2	$206

Other Conn. Ind. (with Yale) 19 libraries		Other Conn. Total (with Yale)	
A	36,765	A	100,897
B1	8,157,111	B1	9,760,440
B2	221.9	B2	96.7
C1	$9,637,019	C1	$13,561,358
C2	$262	C2	$134
D1	$2,665,074	D1	$4,019,753
D2	$72	D2	$39

Total Independent (w/o Yale)		Total Public		Total Statewide (w/o Yale)	
21 libraries		23 libraries		44 libraries	
A	41,967	A	76,022	A	117,989
B1	2,730,028	B1	1,766,072	B1	4,496,100
B2	65.1	B2	23.2	B2	38.1
C1	$3,500,906	C1	$4,421,912	C1	$7,722,818
C2	$83	C2	$58	C2	$67
D1	$1,146,272	D1	$1,495,503	D1	$2,641,775
D2	$27	D2	$21	D2	$22

Total Independent (with Yale)		Total Statewide (with Yale)	
A	50,879	A	126,901
B1	8,559,063	B1	10,325,135
B2	168.2	B2	81.4
C1	$10,481,725	C1	$14,903,677
C2	$206	C2	$117
D1	$2,981,806	D1	$4,477,309
D2	$58	D2	$35
22 libraries		45 libraries	

National Averages (Fall 1969)
2,431 libraries

		C1	$584,800,000
		C2	$78
A	7,572,000	D1	$212,900,000
B1	328,600,000	D2	$28
B2	43.4		

C. Other Libraries.

In addition to the academic and public libraries of the area, there are other types of libraries in this highly developed part of Connecticut. All secondary schools and almost all elementary schools have libraries with collections geared to the level of the students and the subject areas of the curricula. There also are numerous parish and temple libraries of varying size and quality. The materials within these scattered collections are not of any real value to a large library system: such small libraries often are not catalogued; interchange of materials is impeded by the lack of professional personnel; and basically the resources in these libraries are generally not worth the effort and expense involved in linking them in a system.

Of far greater potential value are the special libraries of Southwestern Connecticut. Special libraries are located in industrial firms, corporate headquarters, museums, hospitals, etc.,and they can be extremely useful resources in a third generation library system because of the specialized nature of the parent organizations. The American Library Directory, 1972-73 lists some fifty special libraries and provides a volume count for most of these. Grouping the libraries by type provides an interesting glimpse of the areas of interest of these specialized collections.

TYPE OF LIBRARY	VOLUMES	
Law	211,000	(one library: 200,000 vols.)
Medical	26,517	
Chemical Firms	49,975	
Engineering	15,000	
Other Technological	43,550	
Business	10,500	
Other	22,500	
TOTAL	379,042	

The total figure of 379,042 volumes is, in a sense, inflated because of the 200,000 volumes reported by one law library. (As a rule, law library collections are high because of the large number of lengthy runs of serial publications, e.g. court reports, such a library will own.) Perhaps the most significant figure shown is the large number of chemical and chemical engineering libraries in this area with reported volumes numbering almost 50,000.

At this time no attempt has been made to arrange interchange of materials owned by special libraries on a county-wide basis although there are some informal arrangements between libraries within a given locality. Here again there is a wide disparity of personnel, cataloging and classification methods, and other organizational procedures which may prove inimical to cooperation. If and when SCLS receives the financial support necessary for full system operation, the next type of library which should be included in the system is the special library. The addition of these specialized legal, medical, chemical, and other technological collections to the system holdings will result in an extremely significant extension of materials and services to the users of the present member libraries. The employees of the parent organizations of these special libraries will profit similarly as the library staffs of the special libraries begin to understand the advantages of system development and learn to tap the resources of the academic and public libraries of the region.

V. Interlibrary Cooperation - Guidelines for the Future.

[The opinions expressed in this section of the study are those of the directors of the eight HECUS institutions with separate library facilities. These opinions were registered in a lengthy questionnaire which covered, as completely as possible, the different activities of interlibrary cooperation along with types of organization, potential for funding, meeting frequency, and other topics. The results of the questionnaire are, I feel, extremely useful in spite of the usual limitations of this method of obtaining survey opinion: imprecise phrasing, ambiguity and misreading of questions, and lack of completeness. As a result, no attempt should be made to draw final conclusions solely from the findings of the questionnaire although certain patterns did emerge which are clear enough to offer a definite sense of direction. Lastly, it would be difficult indeed to express my gratitude to the librarians who completed these lengthy forms promptly and uncomplainingly. The full results of the opinion questionnaire are provided in Appendix C of this report.]

Organization.

A clear picture emerges from the answers to the first nine questions: the majority of the academic library directors see a need for continued SCLS involvement plus HECUS library cooperation which should be somewhat structured (with a formal joint committee and subcommittees) but which should not have a salaried director of its own. It would seem then that most of the academic librarians believe there are certain kinds of activities which might best be served by cooperation among a single type of library.

Meetings.

Consortium meetings should occur at a frequency of two to six times per year and involve the top library administration and other professional librarians but not the clerical supportive staff.

Funding.

The first three questions of this brief section presented three options for funding: outside funds, institutional funds, a combination of outside and institutional. The clear preference in terms of a HECUS consortium is for outside funding or a combination, while for SCLS funding there is a greater willingness to see institutional funds as a necessary part of consortium funding. In neither case are the majority of academic library directors willing to accept the notion of total institutional funding without outside support.

Types of Consortium Activities.

GENERAL COMMENTS. In the main section of the opinion questionnaire a five-point answer spectrum was used to give respondents greater flexibility; as a result the answering patterns are less clear than in the earlier sections. However, by considering the three left-hand points (MU, VU, U) as positive and the two right-hand points (LU, NU) as negative, some trends are easily discerned. Prior to a question-by-question analysis, here is a summary of positive, negative, and inconclusive replies to the fifty-five questions in this section.

20.	Identification of subject strengths	Positive	(6-2)
21.	Assignment of subjects for in-depth development	Negative	(3-5)
22.	Joint purchase of material	Inconclusive	(4-4)
23.	Intent to purchase notification – periodicals	Inconclusive	(4-4)
24.	If minimum price is exceeded	Positive	(6-2)
25.	Checking of other catalogs	Negative	(1-7)
26.	Gifts and exchanges	Positive	(7-1)
27.	Centralized acquisitions investigation	Inconclusive	(4-4)
28.	Centralized periodicals subscriptions	Negative	(2-6)
29.	Exchange of films and filmstrips	Positive	(5-3)
30.	Exchange of records, tapes, cassettes	Positive	(5-3)

31. Delivery service   Positive   (6-2)

32. Frequency of deliveries   (3 of 6 reporting preferred twice a week)

33. I-L-L to follow ALA code   Positive   (5-3)

34. I-L-L to be unrestricted   Positive   (6-2)

35. Unrestricted loans   Positive   (5-3)

36. Limited to faculty & graduate students   Negative   (2-6)

37. Undergraduates with librarians' permission   Positive   (6-2)

38. All loans without creating equity   Negative   (2-6)

39. Reimbursement for loans over borrowings   Inconclusive (4-4)

40. Central bibliographic & reference collection   Negative   (1-7)

41. Abstracting & other bibliographic services   Inconclusive (4-4)

42. Translation services   Negative   (2-6)

43. Last copy storage center   Positive   (6-2)

44. Periodical storage & retrieval center   Positive   (6-2)

45. Library centered research   Positive   (5-3)

46. Coordinated orientation programs   Negative   (2-6)

47. Reference center   Inconclusive (4-4)

48. Union list of serials   Positive   (7-1)

49. Union catalog of books   Positive   (6-2)

50. UCB for partial collections   Inconclusive (4-4)

51. Union list of A-V materials   Positive   (7-1)

52. Directory of subject strengths   Positive   (8-0)

53. Exchange of acquisition cards   Negative   (3-5)

54. Cooperative binding programs   Negative   (2-6)

55. Central computer center & staff   Inconclusive (4-4)

56. Central microfilming agency   Positive   (7-1)

57. Replacement of bound periodicals with micro.   Positive   (8-0)

58. Free photocopy   Negative   (3-5)

59. Minimum fee for photocopy	Inconclusive	(4-4)
60. Basic per page charge	Positive	(6-2)
61. No charge to xx pp.; then basic charge	Negative	(3-5)
62. Centralized processing	Negative	(3-5)
63. Access to NELINET/OCLC	Positive	(6-2)
64. Investigation of other processing coop.	Inconclusive	(4-4)
65. TWX - teletype devices	Positive	(6-2)
66. WATS - line	Positive	(6-2)
67. Facsimile transmission	Positive	(5-3)
68. Clearinghouse activities	Inconclusive	(4-4)
69. Workshops	Positive	(7-1)
70. Personnel interchange	Negative	(3-5)
71. Consultant services	Positive	(6-2)
72. Staff recruitment & placement	Negative	(3-5)
73. Consortium newsletter	Positive	(7-1)
74. Monographic or serial publications	Negative	(1-7)

The activities listed in these questions are all in practice in at least one consortium in this country at the present time. Therefore it should come as no surprise that only two of the fifty-five questions evoked a response which was totally positive or negative. Twenty-seven (27) replies were chiefly positive; sixteen (16) were chiefly negative; eleven (11) inconclusive, and one (1) reply (number 32) called for an answer which cannot be tabulated.

ACQUISITIONS. The majority of respondents saw value in identifying subject strengths of the participating libraries, undertaking a gift and exchange program, and sending notification to the participating libraries of intent to purchase expensive materials. The private college librarians might also investigate joint purchase of expensive materials and a periodicals subscription centralization. They would also see an advantage to interchange of

intent to purchase slips for periodicals. The public institution librarians, on the other hand, showed slight preference for question 27: should the consortium investigate the advantages and disadvantages of centralized acquisitions?

CIRCULATION. Interlibrary loan of audio-visual material, both visuals (films and filmstrips) and audio recordings (records, tapes, and cassettes), was acceptable to a slight majority of respondents with the private college librarians less willing than those from the public institutions to exchange this kind of material. Six of eight librarians felt a delivery service was important with the recommended frequency of twice a week (current SCLS practice for most of the academic libraries). A majority of respondents felt the latest A.L.A. interlibrary code should be followed explicitly while a larger majority would opt for unrestricted loan. (The A.L.A. code does not recommend I-L-L for undergraduates unless other local arrangements are made.) A narrow majority of respondents said they would permit unrestricted loans to all consortia users, although the private school librarians were opposed, two to one. Also, with most of the respondents not wishing to limit loans to faculty and graduate students, there might be greater likelihood of undergraduate loans with librarians' permission. To put it more simply, the most feasible options seem to be unrestricted interlibrary loan and direct loan with librarians' permission in the case of undergraduates, with direct unrestricted loan to all somewhat less satisfactory to the participating librarians.

On the question of financial reimbursement for loans, there was general agreement that some attempt to create equity should be made, but the typical solution of reimbursement for loans in excess of borrowings while completely acceptable to the private college librarians was rejected by four of five public institution librarians.

REFERENCE. This section encompasses an extremely wide variety of services

ranging from union lists of materials to creation of a storage area. One

of the two totally positive responses to survey questions on types of

activities took place in this section with all eight respondents in favor

of developing a directory of subject strengths of the participating libraries.

Union lists of serials and A-V materials were also considered high priority

items while union lists of books for total collections, a last copy storage

center, and a periodical retrieval center all received six-to-two votes.

In the last two cases all of the public institution librarians were favorably

disposed while two of the three private school librarians were definitely

opposed. The group was strongly opposed to any idea of developing a central

bibliographic and reference collection.

TECHNICAL SERVICES. In this important area of library operation, little need

was seen for investigating cooperative binding or centralized processing

programs although the possibility of linkage through NELINET/OCLC was

considered worthy of inquiry. The question of a system-wide computer center

received mixed reaction as might be expected in that this topic is still

rather pie-in-the-sky to area librarians. The more immediate possibilities

of replacement of bound periodicals with microfilm and the development of

a microfilming agency received surprisingly strong support showing the continued

need for investigation of making lesser used research materials available

while keeping storage costs at a minimum. Similarly, there seems to be

general interest in developing interlibrary communication devices which will

speed access to materials: TWX, WATS-line, facsimile transmission.

Answers to the four questions on photocopy service revealed a willingness

to cooperate but with close attention paid to costs. Free photocopying was

rejected, three to five, while the majority of respondents preferred a basic

per-page cost to minimum fees or a free-page maximum policy.

OTHER ACTIVITIES. In this catch-all category, there was strong support for

workshops, consultant service, and a consortium newsletter with rejection of

other publications, staff recruitment, and personnel interchange. One

can surmise from these results that cooperative efforts in staff and

related areas must be restricted to limited, occasional activity. Recruit-

ment in particular is hardly a problem in these days of few openings and

frequent, unsolicited job applications.

Relationships with Other Libraries.

75.	Consortia with public libraries	Positive	(6-2)
76.	With special libraries	Positive	(7-1)
77.	With school libraries	Inconclusive	(4-4)
78.	All relatively the same size?	Negative	(1-7)
79.	Financial compensation for services	Inconclusive	(4-4)

The respondents belied any ivory tower isolationism by strongly

supporting intertype cooperatives especially with special and public

libraries. Even potential cooperation with school libraries drew an

"inconclusive" rather than the expected negative response. The participants

felt strongly that size of libraries was not an important consideration,

but they did not agree upon the importance of financial reimbursement. The

three private college librarians felt reimbursement was important while

only one of the five public institution librarians agreed. The answers

to this question repeat the findings of question 39, as should be the case,

and the implication is clearly one of size of library rather than whether

the library is in a public or a private institution.

Activities Priorities.

This last section of the questionnaire is intended to be a double check

on the type of activity section. Each respondent was asked to place the

twenty-six types of activity in order of preference. A simple point tabu-

lation was made (See Appendix C) so that a general ranking might be assigned

to the activities. It is important to recognize that this kind of priority-

assignment and tabulation lacks any real numerical validity and should be

used only as a directional signpost to future cooperative planning.

The list below shows the first twelve activities according to the tabulated rankings of this section of the questionnaire. On the right are the results of parallel questions from the type of activity section to serve as a reinforcement of opinion on these activities.

RANKED ACTIVITIES	POINT TOTAL		TYPE OF ACTIVITY OPINION	
1. Reference service	46		(Too general an area to draw any valid parallels.)	
2. Expanded interlibrary loan	57	34.	Positive	(6-2)
3. Union list of serials	62	48.	Positive	(7-2)
4. Photocopy service	65	60.	Positive	(6-2)
5. Delivery service	78	31.	Positive	(6-2)
6. Central resource	85	43.	Positive	(6-2)
		44.	Positive	(6-2)
7. Directory of subjects	87	52.	Positive	(8-0)
8. Reciprocal borrowing	87	35.	Positive	(5-3)
		37.	Positive	(6-2)
9. Microfilming	87	56.	Positive	(7-1)
		57.	Positive	(8-0)
10. Joint research projects	90	45.	Positive	(5-3)
11. Union list of A-V material	92	51.	Positive	(7-1)
12. Communication devices	96	65.	Positive	(6-2)
		66.	Positive	(6-2)
		67.	Positive	(5-3)

The fourteen lower ranked activities are listed below again with parallels to type of activity questions noted wherever possible.

13. Computer center	104	55.	Inconclusive	(4-4)
14. Exchange of lists	114	53.	Negative	(3-5)
15. Union catalog of books	116	49.	Positive	(6-2)
		50.	Inconclusive	(4-4)
16. Processing cooperation	116	62.	Negative	(3-5)
17. Circulation of A-V	130	29.	Positive	(5-3)
		30.	Positive	(5-3)

RANKED ACTIVITIES	POINT TOTAL	TYPE OF ACTIVITY		OPINION
18. Publications	130	73.	Positive	(7-1)
		74.	Negative	(1-7)
19. Assigned subjects	134	21.	Negative	(3-5)
20. Notice of intent to purchase	138	23.	Inconclusive	(4-4)
		24.	Positive	(6-2)
21. User orientation	138	46.	Negative	(2-6)
22. Clearinghouse activities	144	68.	Inconclusive	(4-4)
23. Personnel training	147	69.	Positive	(7-1)
		70.	Negative	(3-5)
24. Joint purchase of material	151	22.	Inconclusive	(4-4)
25. Binding service	157	54.	Negative	(2-6)
26. Recruitment	157	72.	Negative	(3-5)

[Section VI of the opinion questionnaire included a request for type-of-library and size-of-area-covered information. The instructions provided for this section were unclear and confusing, and as a result the answers turned out to be inconclusive and are not tabulated.]

VI. Proposals for Academic Library Cooperative Organization and Activity.

Organization and Funding.

It is evident that there is need for a more formalized cooperative structure among the HECUS libraries and librarians. It is equally evident that the HECUS units should be encouraged to continue to participate actively in the SCLS organization and activities. Therefore the following organizational structure is proposed:

1. That all HECUS libraries be full members of SCLS and continue to participate in its activities;

2. That all HECUS libraries be institutional members of a HECUS Library Committee (HECUS-LC) with ex officio membership for each HECUS library director plus the executive officers of HECUS and SCLS.

3. That HECUS-LC elect officers from its membership, meet at least two times per year, and plan activities which will be coordinated with SCLS programs and which are of paramount concern to the academic library sector.

Secondly, funding of HECUS-LC activities should be on a program basis with no institutional funds required for membership other than what is stipulated for membership in SCLS. SCLS, currently operating on membership funds only, must be encouraged to solicit federal, state, and other funds in order to support its activities. So that each HECUS library is encouraged to become or remain a member of SCLS, the following is proposed:

1. That SCLS membership funds be paid by HECUS for the entire HECUS academic library community rather than by each separate library as at the present time. HECUS, in turn, would receive these funds from each of the member institutions as part of the annual HECUS dues.

2. That all sources of potential funding be investigated for SCLS and HECUS-LC activities with HECUS-LC empowered to solicit funds directly for activities which pertain directly to academic library cooperation.

Types of Activities.

The primary planning body for academic library cooperative activity, HECUS-LC, will be responsible for the design and implementation of any of the following projects working in concert with the SCLS Board and director. The following proposals are the result of an analysis of the opinions expressed in the questionnaires and in interviews and a recognition of the real strengths of the area academic and other libraries.

[PL 140. Since the $8000.00 grant for extension of the periodical collections and services of the private institution libraries to the public institution community has already been made, this activity must be given top priority. Attached as Appendix D is the basic plan to be presented to the HECUS librarians at a meeting in October, 1973; the plan has been developed by the independent college library directors.]

There are ten cooperative activities which should be considered for adoption by the HECUS consortium libraries. Some of these activities are already being performed as part of the SCLS operation although it seems that the academic libraries have not to date made significant use of them, e.g. delivery service and expanded interlibrary loan. These ten activities are here described in four groups: descriptions of holdings, delivery and communications, technical services, and user services. Although without full committee planning it is impossible to determine cost, staff, equipment, etc. factors, an attempt has been made to indicate the types of libraries which might be involved plus the probable time needed to implement each of the programs.

DESCRIPTIONS OF HOLDINGS

Directory of subject strengths.

Librarians generally agree that a total union catalog of books is the optimum solution for regional interlibrary loan problems in that it permits quick, positive location of needed items. However, the costs of such projects

are immense if an attempt is made to include retrospective collections.

In as much as there are almost three million volumes in the public and

academic libraries of Fairfield County, and since there is a statewide

union catalog of recently acquired holdings of major Connecticut libraries,

it is recommended that no attempt be made to develop a regional catalog

of books.

The development of a regional Directory of Subject Strengths, on the

other hand, has validity. The primary purpose of such a directory is to

permit the reference librarian to guide a library user to an area library

where his needs might best be met. There should be little concern that

such a directory would result in flooding large libraries with requests

from the users of the smaller libraries. Rather would it result in more

efficient referral service.

Questions:

1. Should such a directory include all area libraries, only academic

libraries, libraries above a minimum size, special libraries?

2. Should such a directory list strengths by classification number

only or should it include special collections such as the papers of a town

resident and other historical and archival material?

3. Should funding be sought to employ a special coordinator for this

project or can the work be accomplished by present library and SCLS staff?

Union List of Serials.

Most of the public libraries of Fairfield County have already partici-

pated in a project yielding a ULS of area materials. The state has recently

published a statewide ULS of the 1,000 most common titles. At time of

writing there seems to be no likelihood of a statewide ULS covering all serial

titles of all Connecticut libraries, or even the largest Connecticut libraries.

It is recommended that a computerized union list of the serial holdings of

the academic libraries of HECUS be compiled, and that this list be compatible for merging with the public library ULS. Provision must be made to ensure the regular continuation of the list so that its contents are up to date and accurate.

Questions:

1. If funding can be obtained, will the academic libraries be able to contract with the publishers of the public library ULS so that libraries need only submit their holdings lists for easy inclusion?

2. Is the public library list of sufficient detail and scope to meet academic library needs and standards?

3. Should only periodicals be included or should the list reflect holdings of all serials including annuals and irregular serials.

Union List of A-V Materials.

While many librarians, both public and academic, are wary of free interloan of audio-visual materials, there seems to be a more favorable attitude towards the compilation of a union list of these materials. This seemingly anomalous outlook is caused in part by the likelihood of damage to films, records, etc.; the obvious copyright restrictions on record, tape, and cassette duplication; and the existence of alternate methods of obtaining films. Nonetheless there are valid reasons for producing a union list of A-V materials even while interlibrary loan restrictions are somewhat severe: bibliographic control of such materials is less complete than it is for books, and a union list is a useful reference and acquisitions tool; most films, filmstrips, and slide sets should be previewed prior to purchase, and such previews could be arranged with the libraries participating in the union list; eventually, funding and copyright restrictions might be lessened permitting freer access to materials. Finally the use of this kind of library material will increase in the future suggesting

that the present is the proper time to begin compiling union lists. It is recommended that a union list of A-V materials owned by the academic libraries be compiled with the provision that such a list be compatible with the union list of films and other union publications of the area public libraries.

Questions:

1. Should such a list include films only or should it include filmstrips, slide sets, and video tapes as well?

2. Should such a list include audio material such as phonodiscs, tapes, and cassettes?

3. Can funding be obtained to collect, collate, and publish the wide range of audio-visual data which would be included in this list, and can such a project be undertaken with existing staff?

DELIVERY AND COMMUNICATIONS.

Delivery Service.

No change in the present delivery service sponsored by SCLS is recommended except that there should be regularly scheduled stops, twice a week, for all HECUS academic libraries. While librarians of some of the smaller institutions may feel that such service is too frequent for their present needs, there is good reason for requiring regular stops rather than stops on an as-needed basis so that every library in the area is aware of the pick-up and delivery schedule at every other institution. Furthermore, it is obvious that the academic institutions of HECUS could employ this delivery service for far more than just interlibrary exchange. At least one academic institution regularly delivers posters and flyers to the others through the service at considerable annual savings in postage. Similar uses should easily be seen: student newspapers, correspondence, course announcements, etc. How the statewide twenty-four-hour delivery service which is to be operative in the near future will affect SCLS service is,

of course, crucial to this area of cooperation.

Communication Devices.

One of the more fascinating areas of interlibrary cooperation is in the rapidly developing field of library communications. This entire area should be studied closely by HECUS-LC in terms of how to link the member libraries (and their parent organizations) as well as the other libraries of SCLS. Some possibilities which should be investigated include computer terminals, TWX hook-up (a number of the larger libraries already have TWX equipment), toll-free lines, and facsimile transmission.

Questions:

1. In the relatively restricted geographic area of Fairfield County is there a need for transmission of messages and documents with greater speed than currently available with the delivery vehicle?

2. An investigation into facsimile transmission was made a few years ago. Are there changes in recent technology which warrant reopening this topic?

3. A number of experiments with FM broadcasting and cable TV have been made resulting in improved interlibrary communication, communication with other agencies, and facsimile transmission (it is possible to transmit documents over the unused portions of the frequencies of existing FM stations). Should HECUS-LC and SCLS explore these areas in addition to the usual kinds of interlibrary communications development?

TECHNICAL SERVICES.

[No recommendation is made at this time for cooperative activity involving NELINET/OCLC computer processing. While a number of Connecticut libraries are currently using this service, or will be shortly, at the present time the system is feasible only for libraries processing a minimum

of six or seven thousand titles a year. The question of whether smaller libraries might be able to contract with larger libraries or might be able to band together with other small libraries to obtain access to a terminal deserves to be studied. Leadership for this kind of cooperation is currently coming both from SCLS and from the College and University Section of the Connecticut Library Association. It seems reasonable that after another year of experience with the system by individual libraries in the area this topic should be considered by HECUS-LC and SCLS.]

Microfilming Agency.

Even librarians with new library buildings become quickly aware of the space demands of periodicals, bound and unbound. Many libraries which would like to retire certain periodicals and other library materials cannot do so because of the expense of microfilming. There are two ways to solve this problem: by creating a low-cost consortium microfilm agency, or by developing a storage and retrieval center for infrequently needed materials. The two are not mutually exclusive, and there may be good reason for investigating both possibilities; the microfilm agency is a much less ambitious enterprise. It is recommended that HECUS-LC, in concert with SCLS, investigate the practicality of setting up, equipping, and staffing a microfilm agency which will produce microcopies of materials supplied by the individual libraries at cost.

Questions:

1. Are there commercial operations which can offer this service at reasonable cost?

2. Would the agency also bear the responsibility of selling or exchanging the replaced sets?

3. Can any material be legally microcopied or is such service to be restricted to those materials not available from such sources as Xerox

University Microfilms or Readex Microprint?

Storage and Retrieval Center.

Library history offers several examples of cooperative storage and retrieval centers such as the Center for Research Libraries (formerly the Midwest Interlibrary Loan Center). No one questions the advantages of retiring little used materials to a central storage facility (that is, no library administrator) especially at a time when the shelves of a number of area libraries are full to bursting. However, the disadvantages are not easily dismissed:

1. The cost of developing and operating such a center is prohibitive; there is a building to rent, a staff to hire and train, shipping costs, etc.

2. Academic libraries must face the often considerable wrath of a faculty member who is shocked to find that a book once in the building has been transferred to a less accessible location.

3. Many of the academic libraries here in Fairfield County have new buildings and therefore are not at the moment pressed for space; their directors would have great difficulty convincing top administration of the need for outside storage if additional institutional funds are required.

4. With the possibility (no matter how distant) of statewide or even New-England-wide storage facility development, the impetus to create such a facility regionally within the state is greatly weakened.

It is recommended, therefore, that HECUS-LC investigate the possibility of a modified storage and retrieval center recognizing financial and other limitations. Such an investigation should include the possible advantages of renting space and staff time at an existing library, of coordinating storage and retrieval programs with other SCLS activities, and of concentrating on materials and services in a limited area, e.g. periodicals. Eventually, such a storage facility combined with quick delivery and/or facsimile

transmission could result in significant savings and greatly improved service.

USER SERVICES.

Photocopy Service.

Almost all of the HECUS libraries currently provide photocopy service from bound volumes and most forms of microreproductions. It is recommended that HECUS-LC draw up a standard policy for the provision of photocopies coordinated with SCLS policy so that such service is readily available to all on the same cost basis.

Expanded Interlibrary Loan.

Interlibrary loan and reciprocal borrowing privileges represent two approaches to the same question: how can individuals not members of an academic community gain home access to the collections of the library of that community? (In most cases, there is no need for special permission to use the materials in the library.) In interlibrary loan, the material is sent to the user's own library; in the case of reciprocal borrowing privileges, the user travels to the other library. To as great an extent as possible there should be general agreement among all library directors involved as to the rules and regulations of both kinds of interloans.

In regard interlibrary loan, it is recommended that there should be totally unrestricted interlibrary loan of all materials except such generally restricted materials as reference books, rare books and books from special collections, bound periodicals, current issues of periodicals, books on course reserve, microreproductions, and certain audio-visual software. Secondly, an investigation should be made to see if the techniques currently in use in the SCLS interlibrary loan system are best suited to the needs of the users of the academic libraries.

Reciprocal Borrowing Privileges.

There is at present no uniformity of approach concerning the extension of borrowing privileges to individuals who are not members of the university community. (The statewide library card system which is scheduled to go into effect after the first of the year does not apply to academic libraries at the present time.) For example, among the three Bridgeport area private university libraries, loan privileges range from a three-book courtesy card privilege for any visitor at one library to free loans to any town resident at another library to a deposit system at the third. Students from other colleges, then, are faced with a multiplicity of options and often resort to obtaining material on a friend's card or simply removing what they need, illegally.

It is recommended that a HECUS-LC subcommittee examine the possibilities of a consistent loan policy among the member libraries with particular attention paid to the following points:

1. How can an equitable situation be created among academic libraries whose holdings range from a low of 8400 volumes to a high of 268,314 volumes?

2. Is it possible within a consortium of such disparate libraries to permit direct loan to all students and faculty or is it necessary to require the visitor to obtain prior permission from a reference librarian at his home library?

3. Will it be feasible to create an inter-HECUS direct loan policy that will be compatible with both SCLS and statewide direct loan policies?

Priority of Activities.

	ACTIVITY	PARTICIPATION	TIME-SPAN
1.	Union List of Serials	Academic, Public, Special	1 year
2.	Directory of Subjects	Academic, Public, Special	1 year
3.	Expanded I-L-L Study	Academic, Public, Special	1 year

	ACTIVITY	PARTICIPATION	TIME-SPAN
4.	Reciprocal Borrowing Study	Academic	1 year
5.	Microfilming Agency	Academic, Public, Special	2 years
6.	Union List of A-V Material	Academic, Public	2 years
7.	Communication Devices	Academic, Public, Special	3 years
8.	Central Resource & Storage	Academic, Public, Special	5 years

While almost all of the recommended activities described in this report will eventually involve academic, public, and even special libraries, it is important that the library directors of the HECUS libraries develop collegially an attitude toward intertype cooperation which recognizes the special needs of the academic community. Consequently it is recommended that study groups be formed to consider each of the recommended activities from the academic point of view. The findings of these groups will serve to guide the academic library board members of SCLS in their participation in that organization's project planning.

Meanwhile it is hoped that the entire academic library sector of SCLS will continue to participate fully in the programs designed by the leadership of SCLS to further the development of collections and the expansion of services in all the libraries of the Fairfield County area. Workshops and other means of information dissemination, the delivery system, SCLS interlibrary loan of books and films - all of these cooperative activities have strengthened library service whether public or academic. The importance of creating a HECUS Library Committee is to add another dimension to this cooperative activity so that the academic community of the HECUS institutions can profit from those cooperative library programs of particular value to faculty members and college-level students.

VII. Conclusion.

In his 1970 study Interlibrary Cooperation, Edwin Olson notes

that the "ends of cooperation seem to be to assist the members in

accomplishing their own goals, rather than to move the whole aggregation of

libraries toward substantially different goals."[1]   In other words, only

the means of library service will be changed. One must agree with this

judgment with only slight reservation. An example of change which approaches

a reconstruction of goals is what might eventually occur through the linking

of a two-year community college library with the library of a four-year

university. The new availability of in-depth research materials for those

two-year students capable of advanced investigation into a subject (and we

have all seen examples of that kind of student) implies fulfilling a goal

previously not considered realistic for the two-year community college

library. On the other hand, that same library could make available to

the students of the university certain A-V materials not collected by the

university library because of the goals of that library's acquisition policy.

Basically, however, any changes will be quantitative rather than

qualitative. Books, periodicals, microreproductions, etc. all will be

available in far greater numbers than before. Since it has been found

that even similarly structured libraries tend not to duplicate materials

found in their collections, the students of each of the institutions will

have access to a much wider range of material.

No matter how extensive the collections and services of any regional

system are, there will be frequent need to tap extra-system resources.

HECUS-LC must consider, in almost all of its project explorations, how best

to obtain access to the materials owned by libraries within Connecticut,

especially Yale, and without. In interlibrary loan, for example, if a book

or article is not available within the HECUS/SCLS interlibrary loan program,

should the requesting library be responsible for looking elsewhere or should this be a system process? To continue the example, at Sacred Heart University, the library owns the bibliographic sets which identify and locate materials in major American libraries: the National Union Catalog, the Mansell Pre-'56 Imprints, various union lists of serials. Consequently it is far more efficient for Sacred Heart librarians to request a book whose location is positively identified directly from a holding library than it is to have it searched through the cumbersome, time-consuming system of the Connecticut State Library. While a librarian might recognize the long-term advantages of first using the state system, a faculty member requesting a book will not; he is properly concerned with results, not process. So academic librarians have additional cause to consider alternate ways of gaining access to the Yales and Wesleyans. Such access is not easy to obtain; the "clout" of a consortium might be far more effective than that of any individual library.

The recommendations of the penultimate section of this report, if discussed, modified, accepted, and implemented, will serve to improve particular library services. There may have been created a false impression, however, that these services are not necessarily linked into a true system. In conclusion, therefore, it might be helpful to develop a kind of scenario for future library service, perhaps five or six years off, at a time when full system activity is in progress. While most of the conclusions of this report are detailed from the librarian's point of view, this scenario is user-oriented. It is important to emphasize the user's dependence upon the help of library staff. It is true that the library of the future will utilize far more technological machinery than at the present, but there are sufficient warnings of "future shock" to recognize the continued need for strong interpersonal relations between staff and library users.

USING THE LIBRARY OF THE FUTURE

When John Q. Student, class of 1982, begins to research a topic for a paper (or a cassette report, or a videotape), he will begin his work at his own academic library, in a two-year or four-year institution, public or private. Here he will have immediately available those staff members, books, communication devices which will help him define his goals and perform the initial steps of his research. Not everything he will need to use will be in that library; perhaps the bulk of the materials he needs will come from other libraries and other agencies.

Here is the process of his research:

1. A reference librarian will work with John Q. to help him define his topic, identify his research needs, and lead him to the correct bibliographical starting places.

2. John Q. will search through the appropriate bibliographical tools: subject bibliographies, periodical indexes, media indexes. (Each library in the system will have all the basic bibliographies and indexes.) In another decade or so these tools will be computerized, and the student will query the computer directly through an on-line terminal; he will receive, instantly, a print-out of pertinent book, article, and software references. The reference librarian continues to be of prime importance in helping the student delineate his topic; picture if you will a typical student querying a central computer for listings of everything on, say, Shakespeare.

3. As at the present those books, films, records, etc. which are in his own college library will be immediately available to him. What will be different is the speed with which requests for interlibrary loans of other material will be made through the system operation which might include some of these possibilities:
   a. checking a union catalog at system headquarters via teletype
   b. routing search forms to appropriate libraries in the system
   c. checking a union list of A-V material via teletype
   d. shipping located material within 24 hours
   e. transmitting unfilled requests to other libraries.

4. Those periodical articles needed by John Q. which are in his own library are photocopied at once. The others are located in the Union List of Serials; the attendant teletypes for them; and, at the owning libraries, they are photocopied and either shipped on the delivery vehicle or transmitted over the facsimile duplicator. A central resource library, set up by the system, provides articles from the less common journals, and also serves as the junction point for obtaining articles in journals not owned by system libraries.

To John Q. Student, this kind of library service (much of which is currently available, though with far less efficiency) means that his own concept of the library must change radically. He must see it as a node in a system; he must be instructed in the procedures and capabilities of the system.

While the so-called library of the future has obvious advantages for the student and faculty user, it will become a reality only if supported energetically by librarians and administrators. From the librarian of such a library, its intensified service demands a willingness to participate actively in cooperative activities, to instruct faculty and students in full use of the system, and especially to accept system goals with the same enthusiasm with which the goals of the individual library are accepted. To the modern administrator, support of an area library system will in all likelihood require a financial commitment beyond what is currently being spent for the individual library. While cooperative activity can result in savings by not needing to procure expensive materials available elsewhere, it does imply additional equipment needs and even additional staff since library use may increase dramatically. Most immediately it does demand on the part of administrators a recognition of the need to finance library activities performed off-campus and under the aegis of a consortium rather than the home institution.

The library, defined in terms of traditional physical and organizational limits, is changing. While not yet truly a part of a fully operative system of information exchange, and while only barely scratching the surface of modern technology, the contemporary library, public or academic, has available a vast wealth of recorded information of all kinds: books, tapes, films, etc. The means of retrieving this information are primitive and disorganized, and only a continuous program of designing and testing new ways of linking libraries and transferring materials will result in more efficient service. Perhaps the most important result of this study will not lie in the adoption of any of its specific activity recommendations, but rather in the development of an active, concerned group of library directors who are involved in continuous evaluation of library system planning and activity.

Bibliographical Notes.

Section II.   Library Cooperation: History, Structures, Barriers.

1. Bridgeport Post, Friday, July 27, 1973, p. 1,4.

2. Rutherford D. Rogers and David C. Weber, University Library Administration,
    New York, Wilson, 1971, p. 119 (footnote).

3. Quoted in Library Journal, February 1, 1973, p. 374.

4. Diana D. LeLanoy and Carlos A. Cuadra, Directory of Academic Library
    Consortia, Santa Monica, Calif., System Development Corp., 1971.

★ 5. G. Flint Purdy, "Interrelations among public, school, and academic
    libraries." Library Quarterly, Vol. 39, January 1969, pp. 52-63.

6. Ibid., p. 54.

7. John Mackenzie Cory, "The Network in a Major Metropolitan Center
    (METRO, New York)" Library Quarterly, Vol. 39, January 1969,
    pp. 90-98.

8. Ruth J. Patrick, Guidelines for the Development of Academic Library
    Consortia, Santa Monica, Calif., System Development Corp., 1971.

9. Quoted in David C. Parsley, "MACCI - a story of interinstitutional
    cooperation," Tennessee Librarian, Summer 1971, p. 167.

10. Edwin E. Olson, Interlibrary Cooperation, Washington, Dept. of HEW,
    Office of Education, 1970.

11. Ibid., p. 80.

Section III.   Library Cooperation in Connecticut.

⇗ 1. Connecticut Libraries, Summer 1971, pp. 13-16.

2. Information on SCLS activities and planning are quoted and paraphrased
    from several SCLS documents including Director's reports and the
    1973-74 SCLS contract.

Section IV.   Library Strengths.

The statistics compiled in this section of the study are derived from
questionnaires sent to public and academic library directors and from
the following publications:

American Library Directory, 1972-1973, New York, Bowker, 1972.

Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, Parts A and B, Fall 1971,
    Washington, Dept. of HEW, Office of Education, 1972.

Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, Analytic Report,
Fall 1969, Washington, Dept. of HEW, Office of Education, 1971.

Section V.   Interlibrary Cooperation - Guidelines for the Future.

The opinions expressed in this section are compiled from the HECUS
Academic Library Consortium Questionnaire attached as Appendix C.

Section VII. Conclusion.

1. Edwin E. Olson, Interlibrary Cooperation, Washington, Dept. of HEW,
      Office of Education, 1970, p. x.

Sacred Heart University

OFFICE OF LIBRARIAN

July 23, 1973

To: Directors of Fairfield County Public Libraries

Re: H.E.C.U.S. Study Questionnaire

I have been commissioned by the Higher Education Center for Urban Studies (HECUS) to prepare a series of proposals involving library cooperation among the academic libraries of the HECUS area. An understanding of the strengths of the public libraries of Fairfield County is also essential to the development of these proposals. This questionnaire, which I have tried to keep as brief as possible, will give me the necessary, up-to-date statistics on the public libraries of the communities in which HECUS students live. Should you have any questions about this survey or the study itself, please do not hesitate to contact me. I would appreciate receiving the questionnaire back by August 1, 1973; a stamped, addressed envelope is enclosed. If possible, please provide statistics as of June 30, 1973.

NAME AND MAILING ADDRESS OF LIBRARY   TELEPHONE NUMBER

_____   _____

_____   _____

_____

_____

BRANCH LIBRARIES INCLUDED IN SURVEY

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

1. Total area of library facilities   _____ square feet
2. Total public seating capacity   _____ seats
3. Total volume capacity   _____ volumes
4. Total hours open each week (main library)   _____ hours
5. Holdings: Books (include bound periodicals)   _____ volumes
6. Holdings: Periodical subscriptions   _____ titles
7. Holdings: Microforms   _____
8. Holdings: Films, video tapes, filmstrips, etc.   _____
9. Holdings: Records, tapes, audio cassettes   _____
10. Circulation: Books   _____ volumes
11. Staff, professional (full-time equivalent)   _____
12. Staff, other (full-time equivalent)   _____
13. Finances: salaries & wages $_____
14. Finances: books & periodicals $_____
15. Finances: AV & nonbook material $_____
16. Finances: Binding $_____
17. Finances: Other $_____
18. Population served: _____
19. Please list below the six strongest subject collections in your library; not necessarily the largest but the collections in your opinion best able to serve the needs of the users.

Subject	No. of volumes(est.)
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

20. Are you a member of S.C.L.S. (1973-74)

       Yes_____   No._____

Thank you for your cooperation. It is the goal of H.E.C.U.S. in commissioning this project that the member academic libraries will develop further cooperative programs among themselves and in concert with other area libraries leading to substantial improvement of the existing library resources of the area as well as increased access to them. The report is scheduled for completion in early fall, and copies should be available at that time.

Richard A. Matzek
University Librarian

Enc.

Appendix A

Public Library Questionnaire
Total Results

Question	Survey (18 libraries)	Other (6 libraries)	Total (24)
1. Total area	383,815	88,277*	472,092*
2. Public seating	1,880	432*	2,312*
3. Volume capacity	2,045,033	470,357*	2,515,390*
4. Hours per week	1,001	230*	1,231*
5. Holdings, books	1,700,229	369,119	2,069,348
6. Periodical subscriptions	4,611	1,061*	5,672*
7. Microforms	6,181	1,224*	7,405*
8. Films, filmstrips	3,339	768*	4,107*
9. Audio holdings	37,236	8,564*	45,800*
10. Circulation	3,758,280	902,819	4,661,099
11. Staff, professional	130.7	20*	150.7*
12. Staff, other	346	60*	406*
13. Salaries	$3,452,702	$422,034	$3,874,736
14. Books & periodicals	$728,566	$132,619	$861,185
15. A-V	$75,219	$1,300	$76,519
16. Binding	$27,915	$10,719	$38,634
17. Other	$889,514	$129,264	$1,018,778
18. Population	656,975	147,748	804,723
Total Operating Expenditures (13-17)	$5,173,916	$695,936	$5,869,852

*All asterisked figures are estimates obtained by an analysis of figures available in the American Library Directory, 1972-73 and by extrapolation from survey figures.

Appendix B

HECUS STUDY
ACADEMIC LIBRARY PROFILE

Whenever possible, answers to survey items can be taken from the <u>Fall 1973</u>
<u>College and University Libraries, Higher Education General Information Survey</u>.
All figures should pertain to the end of the 1972-73 academic year.

NAME AND MAILING ADDRESS OF INSTITUTION   TELEPHONE NUMBER

_____   _____

_____   _____

_____

_____

PERSON COMPLETING SURVEY_____   _____
                                        Name   Title

BRANCH LIBRARIES INCLUDED IN SURVEY

_____

_____

_____

_____

I. Facilities

  A. NET ASSIGNABLE AREA (excludes custodial,
     mechanical, and general access areas)   1)_____square feet

  B. SEATING CAPACITY (excludes auditoriums
     and lecture rooms)   2)_____seats

  C. SHELVING CAPACITY:OPTION
     EITHER(a) Total length of shelving   3a)_____feet
       OR   (b) Volume Capacity   3b)_____volumes

  D. SPECIALIZED PUBLIC FACILITIES IN LIBRARY

            Number   Facility

       4._____   Audio-Visual Center

       5._____   Auditorium

       6._____   Classroom

       7._____   Conference Room

       8._____   Documents Room

       9._____   Instructional Materials Center

10._____ Lounge, Public

11·_____ Micropublications Room

12._____ Seminar Room

13._____ Typing Room

14·_____ Other: _____

15._____ Other: _____

16._____ Other: _____

17._____ Other: _____

E. Hours - Regular Fall/Spring Semesters

18. Monday - Thursday _____ to _____

19· Friday _____ to _____

20· Saturday _____ to _____

21. Sunday _____ to _____

22. Total during week _____ hours

23. Do you extend hours for examinations? _____ Number added per week.

F. Use. If attendance figures are available, please fill in this section.

24. Total for year _____

25. Average per day

    M   Tu   W   Th   F   Sa   Sun

    ____   ____   ____   ____   ____   ____   ____

II. LIBRARY MATERIALS

A. Book totals

26a. Total Volumes_____ 26b. Total titles_____

27. Volumes added in 1972-73 _____

B. Subject Strengths. Please list the six strongest broad subject collections in your library; not necessarily the largest, but the collections in your opinion best able to serve the needs of the users.

SUBJECT	NUMBER OF VOLUMES (est.)
28. _____	_____
29. _____	_____
30. _____	_____
31. _____	_____
32. _____	_____
33. _____	_____

C. Periodicals and Other Serials

    34. Current periodical subscriptions   _____titles

    35. Total number of periodical titles   _____titles

    36. Other serials   _____titles

    37. Bound volumes   _____volumes

D. Micropublications

    38. Microfilm reels   _____reels

    39. Units of other microforms   _____units
        (Count each card or fiche separately)

    40. Microform readers   _____

    41. Microform reader-printers   _____

E. Nonprint materials

    42. Motion pictures   _____

    43. Filmstrips   _____

    44. Slides   _____

    45. Video tape reels   _____

    46. Audio recordings   _____

III. Library Use: Please provide whatever figures have been tabulated. Figures for individual libraries will not be published in the study.

A. Books

    47. Total circulation: student,faculty,other   _____

    48. Reserve materials   _____

B. Periodicals

    49. Current issues, if available   _____

    50. Bound volumes, if available   _____

    51. Microforms, if available   _____

C. Audio-Visual

    52. Total circulation of all A-V material   _____

D. Interlibrary Loan

    53. SCLS Borrowings (your patrons)   _____

    54. SCLS Loans (your material)   _____

    55. Other I-L-L Borrowings   _____

    56. Other I-L-L Loans   _____

E. Photocopy

    57. Copies made by public, if available   _____

IV. Library Personnel

A. By Educational Background	Full time	Part time	Total FTE
58. Fifth year or higher degree	_____	_____	_____
59. Bachelor's degree	_____	_____	_____
60. Less than bachelor's degree	_____	_____	_____
61. Totals	_____	_____	_____

B. By classification			
62. Professional librarians	_____	_____	_____
63. Secretarial/Clerical	_____	_____	_____
64. Student hours			_____ hours
65. Other: _____	_____	_____	_____
66. Totals, except student hours	_____	_____	_____

V. Library Operating Expenditures. (These questions are exact duplicates of items 36 through 44 from the Fall 1973 <u>Higher Education General Information Survey</u>, part III - Library Operating Expenditures.

    67. Expenditures for books and other printed materials, including those in microform and excluding periodical subscriptions. $_____

    68. Expenditures for periodical subscriptions $_____

    69. Expenditures for Audio-visual and other non-print materials (excludes materials in microform $_____

    70. Expenditures for binding and rebinding $_____

    71. Total expenditures for salaries and wages of regular, non-student, library staff. $_____

    72. Total salary equivalents of library contributed services staff $_____

    73. Total expenditures for wages of students serving on an hourly basis, charged to the library $_____

    74. Other operating expenditures charged to the library $_____

    75. Total operating expenditures $_____

VI. Miscellaneous Questions

    76. Do you employ a security system Yes_____ No _____
        If yes, guard_____ or electronic_____(or both).

77. Are you currently using any automated systems in the library?
Yes_____ No _____.

If yes, please check in which function you employ automated systems.

Circulation _____   Processing _____

Periodicals _____   Acquisitions _____

Other _____

78. What classification system(s) do you employ
Dewey_____ LC _____

79. Is your card catalog
Dictionary_____ Divided _____
(If divided, how _____)

80. Do you employ, in your circulation system, a separate library
card_____ or a university-wide I.D. _____

81. What is the length of your circulation period?

Two weeks   _____   Three weeks _____
Four weeks   _____   One month   _____
Term   _____   Other   _____

82. Do faculty members have long-term loan privileges? Yes_____ No _____
If yes, how long _____

83. How many hours per week are covered with professional librarian
reference service? _____hours.

84. Do you have a library handbook? Yes_____ No _____
(If yes, would you attach one to this questionnaire?)

85. Do you permit home circulation to individuals not enrolled in or
employed by your institution?

a. Adult residents of your town   Yes_____ No _____
b. Adult residents of other towns   Yes_____ No _____
c. Students from other colleges   Yes_____ No _____
d. High school students   Yes_____ No _____

Please describe briefly any restrictions of service to the above
categories of users:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

86. If you purchase books primarily through one dealer, who is that
dealer? _____

87. Who is your primary periodical agent?_____.

88. Can you estimate what percentage of your book requests originate with
    faculty members_____and what percentage with library staff_____?

89. What bindery do you use for periodicals?_____
    For book repairs?_____

90. In processing books do you

    a. purchase LC cards?   Yes_____ No _____ Occasionally_____
    b. produce your own cards?   Yes_____ No _____ Occasionally_____

    Please briefly describe your system_____

    _____

    _____

    _____

91. Do you provide any formal instruction in use of the library ranging from
    orientation tours to library science coursework.

    Please describe_____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

92. Do your professional librarians have faculty status?
    Yes_____ No _____
    Comment?_____

    _____

    _____

    _____

93. What make of photocopy machine(s) do you have

    Quantity   Make   Model

    _____   _____   _____

    _____   _____   _____

    _____   _____   _____

94. Is there a faculty/student library committee?
    Yes_____ No_____ No.of faculty_____Students_____

95. Are its powers purely advisory to the librarian_____ or does it
    have broader powers of policy determination_____?

96. Do you have any openings on your professional staff at this time?
_____number.

VIII. Institutional Data

A. Enrollment Data (as reported in the College Library
Resources Grant Application, Fiscal Year 1973, Part II,
Section 2, letter C.

97. Full-time students   _____
98. Full-time equivalent of part-time students   _____
99. Total of 97 and 98   _____

B. Financial data (if available)

100. Library operating expenditures shown
as percentage of total institutional operating expenditures_____%.

Appendix B HECUS Academic Library Profile Results

[Responses were received from seven of eight libraries. Whenever possible estimates were made by updating the missing figures from the published Fall 1971 HEW statistics; these estimates may be considered reasonably accurate. The number of respondents is shown under <u>public</u> and <u>total</u> columns.]

		Independent	Public	Total
I.	Facilities		<u>5 est.</u>	<u>8 est.</u>
	1.	119,849	76,484	186,333
	2.	1,466	913	2,379
	3.	778,314	348,000	1,126,314
			<u>4 res.</u>	<u>7 res.</u>
	4.	1	1	2
	5.	1	-	1
	6.	-	-	-
	7.	3	-	3
	8.	-	-	-
	9.	1	-	1
	10.	3	1	4
	11.	1	1	2
	12.	1	1	2
	13.	12	-	12
Group study	14.	2	-	2
Fac. study	15.	13	-	13
Listening	16.	1	-	1
Fine arts	17.	1	-	1

N.B. Two of the responding institutions noted that in 1974 their libraries will occupy new buildings; the above responses apply to existing facilities.

			5 est.	8 est.
II. Materials	22.	274.5	319.0	593.5
	Averages	91.5	63.8	74.2
	23.	16	-	-
	24.		Figures not available	
			5 est.	8 est.
	26a.	463,077	221,617	684,694
	27.	30,673	19,735	50,408
	34.	4,874	1,399	6,273
	35.	5,603	1,577	7,180
	36.		Figures not available	
	37.	50,191	13,805	63,996
	38.	24,236	10,629	34,865
	39.	390,338	111,760	502,098
	40.	33	30	63
	41.	7	6	13

	Independent			Public			Total		
				4 res.			7 res.		
42.	23			686			709		
43.	332			262			594		
44.	3,700			5,720			9,420		
45.	–			15			15		
46.	2,007			1,216			3,223		

III. Use

	Independent			Public			Total		
				3 res.			6 res.		
47.	230,689			22,279			252,968		
48.	35,426			Figures not available					
49.				Figures not available					
50, 51.	26,688			Figures not available					
				2 res.			5 res.		
52.	5,132			4,761			9,893		
				4 res.			7 res.		
53.	102			53			155		
54.	113			23			136		
55.	435			122			557		
56.	159			20			179		

IV. Personnel

	F	P	FTE	F	P	FTE	F	P	FTE
						4 res.			7 res.
58.	18	4	18.85	8	–	8	26	4	26.85
59.	6	3	6.76	4	1	4.5	10	4	11.26
60.	26	13	33.39	5	–	5	31	13	38.39
61.	50	20	49.5	17	1	17.5	67	21	76.5
62.	19	4	19.85	10	1	10.5	29	5	30.35
63.	31	16	39.15	7	–	7	38	16	46.15
64.				Figures not available					
65.				Figures not available					
66.	50	20	59.0	17	1	17.5	67	21	76.5

V. Expenditures

	Independent			Public			Total		
				5 est.			8 est.		
67.	$211,241			$103,866			$315,107		
68.	$98,282			$25,346			$123,628		
69.	$6,366			$8,589			$14,955		
70.	$25,290			$3,926			$29,216		
71.	$397,490			$353,260			$750,750		
72.	–			–			–		
73.	$52,445			$24,032			$76,477		
74.	$103,129			$38,233			$141,362		
75.	$894,243			$557,252			$1,451,495		

VI. Miscellaneous

	Independent			Public			Total		
				4 res.			7 res.		
76.	1 guard, 1 elec.			1 both			4 yes (2 both,		
	1 both			3 no			1 guard, 1 elec.)		
							3 no		
77.	1 - cataloging				4 no			1 - cataloging		
	2 - no						6 - no		

	Independent	Public	Total
78.	2 Dewey 1 LC	3 Dewey 1 LC	5 Dewey 2 LC
79.	2 dictionary 1 divided	2 dictionary 2 divided	4 dictionary 3 divided
80.	2 university 1 special	4 university	6 university 1 special
81.	1 two weeks 1 three-four weeks 1 modified term	3 two weeks 1 three weeks	4 two weeks 2 three weeks 1 mod. term
82.	2 indefinite 1 academic year	2 one month 1 term 1 no extension	2 one month 1 term 2 indef. 1 acad. year 1 no extension
83.	190.5 (63.5 average)	193.5 (48.4 average)	384 (54.9 average)
84.	1 yes 2 no (one in prep.)	2 yes 2 no	3 yes 4 no (1 in prep.)
85.	Incomplete answers.		
86.	2 Abel 1 Abel but changing	2 Key 1 Diminstein 1 Barrett	3 Abel 2 Key 1 Diminstein 1 Barrett
87.	2 Faxon 1 Ebsco	2 Faxon 2 Ebsco	4 Faxon 3 Ebsco
88.	Incomplete answers.		
89.	1 Barnard 2 Bridgeport	1 Hertzberg 1 Bridgeport 1 Artcraft	3 Bridgeport 1 Barnard 1 Hertzberg 1 Artcraft
90.	Incomplete answers.		
91.	Incomplete answers.		
92.	2 yes 1 no	1 yes 2 no 1 partial	3 yes 3 no 1 partial
93.	5 Xerox 2 Olivetti	3 Xerox 3 3M	8 Xerox 2 Olivetti 3 3M

	Independent	Public	Total
94.	1 (5 fac, no stu)	2 (only fac)	3 (only fac)
	1 (6 fac, 1 stu)	2 (with stu)	4 (with stu)
	1 (5 fac, 3 stu)		
95.	3 advisory	3 advisory	6 advisory
		1 policy	1 policy

VIII. Institutional Data

		4 res.	7 res.
97.	8,441	4,406	12,847
98.	4,150	6,482	10,632
99.	12,591	10,888	23,479

Estimated total
of 8 libraries: 28,479

100.   Incomplete response.

Parts I through III of this questionnaire require simple yes/no/no opinion
answers. Parts IV and V use an answer scale ranging from a high of MOST USEFUL
to a low of NO USE. Part VI is a priority assignment form. The questionnaire
is designed for quick completion and tabulation. If, however, you wish to add
your comments, please do so on the back of the form with a reference to the
number of the question.

Almost all of the questions pertaining to types of activities are taken from
two sources: G. Flint Purdy's "Interrelations Among Public, School, and
Academic Libraries" (Library Quarterly, January 1969) and Carlos A. Cuadra
and Ruth J. Patrick: "Survey of Academic Library Consortia in the U.S."
(College and Research Libraries, July 1972)

I. Organization
   A. Separate HECUS library consortium

      1. Should there be some kind of HECUS library consortium?

         1) _____   _____   _____
              Yes   No opinion   No

      2. Should this consortium be highly structured?

         2) _____   _____   _____
              Yes   No opinion   No

         a. If so, with salaried director plus formal joint committee + subcommittees?

         3) _____   _____   _____
              Yes   No opinion   No

         b. No director, but formal joint committee and subcommittees?

         4) _____   _____   _____
              Yes   No opinion   No

      3. Should the consortium be unstructured; meetings but little
         organization and formal continuity?

         5) _____   _____   _____
              Yes   No opinion   No

   B. Continued involvement in S.C.L.S.

      1. Should there be S.C.L.S. involvement with no separate HECUS organization?

         6) _____   _____   _____
              Yes   No opinion   No

      2. Should there be S.C.L.S. involvement plus HECUS organization?

         7) _____   _____   _____
              Yes   No opinion   No

3. Should there be HECUS organization only; <u>no</u> S.C.L.S. involvement?

8) _____   _____   _____
    Yes   No opinion   No

4. Lastly, <u>No</u> HECUS organization; <u>No</u> S.C.L.S. involvement?

9) _____   _____   _____
    Yes   No opinion   No

II. <u>Meetings</u>

A. Frequency. Please check which frequency of meetings would in your opinion be most satisfactory.

10) _____   11)_____   12)_____
    Monthly   2-6 times per year   Annually

B. Personnel at meetings, when appropriate

1. To include top library administrators?

13) _____   _____   _____
    Yes   No opinion   No

2. To include other professional librarians from the academic library staff?

14) _____   _____   _____
    Yes   No opinion   No

3. To include clerical staff?

15) _____   _____   _____
    Yes   No opinion   No

III. <u>Funding</u>. The next four questions pertain both to HECUS and SCLS cooperative efforts. Since you may wish to answer differently for either or both consortia in the area of funding, please use <u>A</u> for HECUS, <u>B</u> for SCLS, and <u>C</u> for both.

Example: The consortium should be supported by federal and other outside funding <u>alone</u>.

____B____   _____   ____A____
    Yes   No opinion   No

A. The consortium should be supported by a combination of institutional and other funds

16) _____   _____   _____
    Yes   No opinion   No

B. The consortium should be supported by federal and other outside funding <u>alone</u>

17) _____   _____   _____
         Yes   No Opinion   Nó

C. The consortium should be supported by institutional funding <u>alone</u>

18) _____   _____   _____
         Yes   No opinion   No

D. Institutional funds should be prorated according to library expenditures

19) _____   _____   _____
         Yes   No opinion   No

IV. Types of Consortium Activities

A. Acquisitions

1. Assigned Subject Specialization

   a. Is it useful to identify subject strengths in each participating library for awareness only?

   20) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
        Most Useful   Very Useful   Useful   Little Use   No Use

   b. Should libraries be assigned subjects for in-depth collection development?

   21) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
            MU   VU   U   LU   NU

2. Joint purchase of material

   a. Should participating libraries jointly purchase expensive materials to be located at one central place or in one library?

   22) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
            MU   VU   U   LU   NU

3. Material notification of intent to purchase

   a. Should participatory libraries notify each other if they intend to subscribe to a periodical?

   23) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
            MU   VU   U   LU   NU

   b. If a publication exceeds an agreed upon minimum, e.g. $50.00?

   24) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
            MU   VU   U   LU   NU

4. Other acquisitions activities

   a. Should catalogs of other libraries be checked prior to purchase?

     25) _____
           MU   VU   U   LU   NU

   b. Should a gift and exchange routine be established?

     26) _____
           MU   VU   U   LU   NU

   c. Should the consortium investigate the advantages and disadvantages of centralized acquisitions?

     27) _____
           MU   VU   U   LU   NU

   d. Should the consortium investigate the advantages and disadvantages of centralized periodicals subscriptions?

     28) _____
           MU   VU   U   LU   NU

B. Circulation

1. Audio-Visual Services

   a. Should there be exchange of films, 16mm and 8mm, and filmstrips?

     29) _____
           MU   VU   U   LU   NU

   b. Should there be exchange of records, tapes and cassettes?

     30) _____
           MU   VU   U   LU   NU

2. Delivery Service

   a. Should there be a inter-library delivery service?

     31) _____
           MU   VU   U   LU   NU

   b. If so, what should the frequency of service be?

     32) _____
         Daily   4 x/week   3 x/week   2 x/week   Weekly

3. Expanded interlibrary loan service

   a. Interlibrary loan among consortia libraries should follow the latest A.L.A. interlibrary loan code explicity.

   33) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
       MU   VU   U   LU   NU

   b. Interlibrary loan should be unrestricted: all publications (except reserve books, rare books, etc.) should be provided to all categories of users.

   34) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
       MU   VU   U   LU   NU

4. Reciprocal borrowing privileges

   a. Should there be unrestricted loans to all consortia users? (E.g. a school I.D. is good at any school.)

   35) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
       MU   VU   U   LU   NU

   b. Should direct loans be limited to faculty and graduate students?

   36) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
       MU   VU   U   LU   NU

   c. Should undergraduates have loan privileges with librarian's permission?

   37) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
       MU   VU   U   LU   NU

   d. Should all loans be made without any attempt to create equity?

   38) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
       MU   VU   U   LU   NUY

   e. Should there be reimbursement for loans in excess of borrowings?

   39) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
       MU   VU   U   LU   NU

C. Reference

1. Bibliographic Activities

   a. Is there value in the establishment of a central bibliographic and reference collection?

   40) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
       MU   VU   U   LU   NU

b. Should a consortium provide abstracting and other bibliographic services?

41) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
        MU   VU   U   LU   NU

c. Should a consortium provide translation services?

42) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
        MU   VU   U   LU   NU

2. Central resource or storage center.

a. Is there need for a last copy storage center?

43) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
        MU'   VU   U   LU   NU

b. Is there need for a periodical storage and retrieval center for infrequently used items?

44) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
        MU   VU   U   LU   NU

3. Joint research projects

a. Do you see a consortium serving as a central agency for sponsoring library centered research?

45) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
        MU   VU   U   LU   NU

4. Orientation of User Programs

a. Is there value in attempting to coordinate the orientation programs of the participating libraries?

46) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
        MU   VU   U   LU   NU

5. Reference Services

a. Is there value in developing a central reference facility for direct line referral of reference questions?

47) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
        MU   VU   U   LU   NU

6. Union catalogs or lists

a. Should a union list of serials be developed and maintained?

48) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
        MU   VU   U   LU   NU

b. Should a union catalog of books be developed and maintained for total
collections?

49) _____   _____   _____   _____   _____
          MU   VU   U   LU   NU

c. For partial collections in specialized areas?

50) _____   _____   _____   _____   _____
          MU   VU   U   LU   NU

d. Should a union list of A-V materials be developed and maintained?

51) _____   _____   _____   _____   _____
          MU   VU   U   LU   NU

e. Would a directory of subject strengths be useful (not a list of books but an
analysis of the depth and quantity of collections)?

52) _____   _____   _____   _____   _____
          MU   VU   U   LU   NU

f. Is the exchange of acquisition lists or cards useful?

53) _____   _____   _____   _____   _____
          MU   VU   U   LU   NU

D. Technical Services

1. Binding Service

a. Is there any advantage to cooperative binding programs?

54) _____   _____   _____   _____   _____
          MU   VU   U   LU   NU

2. Computer Center ·

a. Should participating libraries be able to draw on a central computer
center and a central system development staff?

55) _____   _____   _____   _____   _____
          MU   VU   U   LU   NU

3. Microfilming

a. Should the consortium develop a central microfilming agency?

56) _____   _____   _____   _____   _____
          MU   VU   U   LU   NU

b. Should a planned program of the replacement of bound periodicals with
microforms be considered?

57) _____   _____   _____   _____   _____
          MU   VU   U   LU   NU

4. Photocopy Service

a. Should all photocopies be made without a fee?

58) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
        MU   VU   U   LU   NU

b. Should there be a minimum fee for photocopying, e.g. $1.00?

59) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
        MU   VU   U   LU   NU

c. Should there be a basic per page charge, e.g. 10¢ per page?

60) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
        MU   VU   U   LU   NU

d. Should there be no charge up to XX pp.; then a normal per page charge?

61) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
        MU   VU   U   LU   NU

5. Processing of library materials

a. Should there be a centralized processing service for a consortium?

62) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
        MU   VU   U   LU   NU

b. Should the participating libraries have access to NELINET/OCLC processing?

63) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
        MU   VU   U   LU   NU

c. Should other kinds of cooperation in this area be investigated, e.g. card
   production, searching, etc.?

64) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
        MU   VU   U   LU   NU

6. Special communications service

a. Should a consortium utilize TWX/teletype communication devices?

65) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
        MU   VU   U   LU   NU

b. WATS-line?

66) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
        MU   VU   U   LU   NU

c. Facsimile transmission?

67) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
         MU   VU   U   LU   NU

E. Other Activities

1. Clearinghouse activities.

a. Should a consortium involve itself in information dissemination and
    similar clearinghouse activities?

68) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
         MU   VU   U   LU   NU

2. Personnel training

a. Should a consortium sponsor workshops.

69) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
         MU   VU   U   LU   NU

b. Should there be temporary personnel interchange among participating libraries?

70) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
         MU   VU   U   LU   NU

c. Should the consortium coordinate consultant services?

71) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
         MU   VU   U   LU   NU

3. Recruitment Program
a. Should the consortium be involved in staff recruitment and placement?
72) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
         MU   VU   U   LU   NU

4. Publication program.

a. Should there be a consortium newsletter?

73) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
         MU   VU   U   LU   NU

b. Should the consortium publish special monographic or serial publications?

74) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
         MU   VU   U   LU   NU

V. Relationships with Other Libraries

1. By Type of Library

a. Should academic libraries participate in consortia with public libraries?

75) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
         MU   VU   U   LU   NU

b. With special libraries

76) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
      MU   VU   U   LU   NU

c. With school libraries?

77) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
      MU   VU   U   LU   NU

2. By size of library.

   a. Must all libraries participating in a consortium be of relatively the same size?

   78) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
         MU   VU   U   LU   NU

   b. If libraries participating in a consortium are of different sizes, should
      there be financial compensation for services, e.g. loans in excess of
      borrowings?

   79) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
         MU   VU   U   LU   NU

VI. Activity Priorities. Please assign a numerical priority (1-26) to the twenty-six
     cooperative activities listed below, all of which were identified in the type of
     activities questions. Also, please indicate in the right-hand columns

       1) whether each activity should be restricted to academic libraries or
          should be open to all types of libraries, and
       2) what area(s) the consortium effort should involve.

Example	Acad	All	Co.	State	Natl
4 Union List of Serials		✓	✓	✓	

Priority	Activity	Acad.	All	Co.	State	Natl
_____	Assigned Subject Specialization					
_____	Joint Purchase of Material					
_____	Notice of Intent to Purchase					
_____	Union Catalog of Books					
_____	Union List of Serials					
_____	Union List of A-V Materials					
_____	Dictionary of Subject Strengths					
_____	Exchange of Acquisitions Lists					
_____	Circulation of A-V Material					
_____	Delivery Service					
_____	Expanded Interlibrary Loan					
_____	Reciprocal Borrowing Privileges					
_____	Reference Service					
_____	Central Resource or Storage Center					
_____	Joint Research Projects					

Priority	Activity	Acad.	All	Co.	State	Natl
_____	User Orientation					
_____	Binding Service					
_____	Computer Center					
_____	Microfilming					
_____	Photocopy Service					
_____	Processing Cooperation					
_____	Communications Devices					
_____	Clearing house activities					
_____	Personnel Training					
_____	Recruitment					
_____	Publications					

NAME OF INSTITUTION

_____

PERSON COMPLETING SURVEY

NAME	Title
_____	_____

Appendix C

HECUS ACADEMIC LIBRARY
CONSORTIUM QUESTIONNAIRE

Question Number	Private			Public			Total		
	Yes	No Op.	No	Yes	No Op.	No	Yes	No Op.	No
1.	3	-	-	5	-	-	8	-	-
2.	1	-	2	-	1	4	1	1	6
3.	-	-	3	1	-	4	1	-	7
4.	3	-	-	3	-	2	6	-	2
5.	-	-	3	3	1	1	3	1	4
6.	-	-	3	1	3	1	1	3	4
7.	3	-	-	3	1	1	6	1	1
8.	-	1	2	÷	1	4	-	2	6
9.	-	-	3	-	1	4	-	1	7
10.	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
11.	2	-	-	5	-	-	7	-	-
12.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13.	3	-	-	5	-	-	8	-	-
14.	4	-	-	3	1	1	6	1	1
15.	1	1	1	-	1	4	1	2	5
16. HECUS	3	-	-	2	1	2	5	1	2
17. HECUS	-	-	3	3	1	1	3	1	4
18. HECUS	-	-	3	1	-	4	1	-	7
19. HECUS	3	-	-	2	2	1	5	2	1
16. SCLS	3	-	-	2	-	2	5	1	2
17. SCLS	-	-	3	2	1	2	2	1	5
18. SCLS	-	-	3	1	-	4	1	-	7
19. SCLS	2	-	1	3	1	1	5	1	2

Question Number	Private					Public					Total				
	MU	VU	U	LU	NU	MU	VU	U	LU	NU	MU	VU	U	LU	NU
20.	1	1	-	1	-	1	1	2	1	-	2	2	2	2	-
21.	-	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	3
22.	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	3	2	-	2	-	4
23.	2	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	3	1
24.	2	-	1	-	-	1	-	2	1	1	3	-	3	1	1
25.	-	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	2	2	1	-	-	3	4
26.	1	2	-	-	-	1	-	3	-	1	2	2	3	-	1
27.	1	-	-	2	-	-	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	3	1
28.	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	3	2	1	-	1	4	2
29.	-	1	-	1	1	-	2	2	-	1	-	3	2	1	2
30.	-	1	-	1	1	-	2	2	-	1	-	3	2	1	2
31.	2	-	-	1	-	1	-	3	1	-	3	-	3	2	-
32.	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	2	-	2	3	1
33.	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	2	-	1	1	1	3	1	2
34.	2	1	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	2	2	3	1	-	2
35.	-	-	1	1	1	2	1	1	-	1	2	1	2	1	2
36.	-	-	-	1	2	1	1	-	-	3	1	1	-	1	5
37.	1	-	-	1	1	2	1	2	-	-	3	1	2	1	1
38.	-	-	-	1	2	-	1	1	1	2	-	1	1	2	4
39.	2	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	2	2	3	-	1	2	2
40.	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	1	3	1	-	-	1	5	2

Question Number	Private					Public					Total				
	MU	VU	U	LU	NU	MU	VU	U	LU	NU	MU	VU	U	LU	NU
41.	-	-	-	2	1	-	1	3	-	1	-	1	3	2	2
42.	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	2	1	2	-	-	2	3	3
43.	1	-	-	-	2	1	-	4	-	-	2	-	4	-	2
44.	1	-	-	-	2	1	1	3	-	-	2	1	3	-	2
45.	-	1	-	1	1	1	2	1	-	1	1	3	1	1	2
46.	-	-	-	2	1	1	-	1	1	2	1	-	1	3	3
47.	-	-	-	2	1	1	1	2	-	1	1	1	2	2	2
48.	3	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	-	1	4	2	1	-	1
49.	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	2	-	2	2	1	3	-	2
50.	1	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	4	1	3	-	-	4
51.	2	-	1	-	-	1	1	2	-	1	3	1	3	-	1
52.	2	-	1	-	-	1	2	2	-	-	3	2	3	-	-
53.	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	2	2	1	1	1	3	2
54.	1	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	1	3	2	-	-	3	3
55.	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	3	2	-	2	1	3
56.	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	3	-	1	2	1	4	-	1
57.	1	-	2	-	-	1	1	3	-	-	2	1	5	-	-
58.	-	-	-	-	3	2	-	1	-	2	2	-	1	-	5
59.	1	-	-	1	1	1	-	2	-	2	2	-	2	1	3
60.	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	2	1	1	2	1	3	1	1
61.	1	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	3	1	1	1	1	4
62.	-	-	1	1	1	-	1	1	-	3	-	1	2	1	4
63.	1	1	1	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1
64.	1	-	-	2	-	1	1	1	-	2	2	1	1	2	2
65.	-	1	1	-	1	1	1	2	-	1	1	2	3	-	2
66.	-	1	1	-	1	2	1	1	-	1	2	2	2	-	2
67.	-	1	1	1	-	1	1	1	-	2	1	2	2	1	2
68.	-	1	-	1	1	1	-	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2
69.	1	1	-	-	1	1	1	3	-	-	2	2	3	-	1
70.	-	-	1	1	1	-	1	1	-	3	-	1	2	1	4
71.	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	3	-	1	2	-	4	1	1
72.	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	2	-	3	-	-	3	1	4
73.	-	-	2	-	1	1	1	3	-	-	1	1	5	-	1
74.	-	-	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	4	1	-	-	2	5
75.	1	1	-	1	-	1	2	1	1	-	2	3	1	2	-
76.	1	1	-	1	-	1	2	2	-	-	2	3	2	1	-
77.	-	-	-	2	1	1	1	2	-	1	1	1	2	2	2
78.	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	4	-	1	-	2	5
79.	2	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	2	2	3	-	1	2	2

VI. <u>Activity Priorities.</u>

Number	Private	Rank	Public	Rank	Total	Rank
1.	47	16	87	20	134	19
2.	54	21	97	23	151	24
3.	34	11	104	26	138	20
4.	47	17	69	16	116	15
5.	9	1	53	5	62	3
6.	37	12	55	6	92	11
7.	32	7	55	7	87	7
8.	32	8	82	19	114	14
9.	42	15	78	17	130	17
10.	22	3	56	9	78	5
11.	11	2	46	4	57	2
12.	29	5	58	12	87	8
13.	33	10	13	1	46	1
14.	29	6	56	10	85	6
15.	48	18	42	2	90	10
16.	57	23	81	18	138	21
17.	58	24	99	24	157	25
18.	41	14	63	15	104	13
19.	32	9	55	8	87	9
20.	23	4	42	3	65	4
21.	54	22	62	14	116	16
22.	39	13	57	11	96	12
23.	48	19	96	22	144	22
24.	48	20	99	25	147	23
25.	68	25	89	21	157	26
26.	69	26	61	13	130	18

Activities in order of rank (total respondents: eight).

1.	Reference service	46
2.	Expanded interlibrary loan	57
3.	Union list of serials	62
4.	Photocopy service	65
5.	Delivery service	78
6.	Central resource & storage	85
7.	Directory of subject strengths	87
8.	Reciprocal borrowing privileges	87
9.	Microfilming	87
10.	Joint research projects	90
11.	Union list of A-V materials	92
12.	Communications devices	96
13.	Computer center	104
14.	Exchange of acquisitions lists	114
15.	Union catalog of books	116
16.	Processing cooperation	116
17.	Circulation of A-V material	130
18.	Publications	130
19.	Assigned subject specialization	134
20.	Notice of intent to purchase	138
21.	User orientation	138
22.	Clearing house activities	144
23.	Personnel training	147

PUBLIC LIBRARY GRANT

(Accepted by the Commission for Higher Education)

DATE OF ACCEPTANCE: July 27, 19..

GENERAL PURPOSE: Coordination of library acquisitions in the area of

periodicals for use by students of public institutions in area.

AMOUNT: $8,000.00.

DETAIL OF PROJECT: The directors of the three private institutions involved

(University of Bridgeport, Fairfield University, and Sacred Heart University

libraries) have developed a program for the utilization of this grant which

will be presented to the total group of ...... library directors on October

.., 1971.

The design of the project to date consists of the development of com-

puter print-outs of the periodicals holdings of the three private institution

libraries by Wilson periodical index titles. In other words, a list of

the titles indexed in, for example, Readers' Guide will be prepared showing

the holdings of each of the three private institution libraries of these

titles. Other Wilson indexes for which separate lists may be prepared are:

    Social Sciences and Humanities Index
    Education Index
    Business Periodicals Index
    Applied Science and Technology Index
    Art Index
    Biological and Agricultural Index
    Library Literature

Approximately three-fourths of the grant will be used to purchase

microfilm runs of needed periodicals. Upon completion of the purchase

program, the finalized lists will be run off, duplicated, and distributed

to the participating librarian. Free photocopies will be provided up to a

maximum of one page for each dollar allotted each private institution library

for purchase of microfilm.

Appendix D   PUBLIC LAW 140 GRANT

                    (Accepted by the Commission for Higher Education)

DATE OF ACCEPTANCE: July 27, 1973.

GENERAL PURPOSE: Coordination of library acquisitions in the area of

    periodicals for use by students of public institutions in area.

AMOUNT: $8,000.00.

DETAIL OF PROJECT: The directors of the three private institutions involved

(University of Bridgeport, Fairfield University, and Sacred Heart University

libraries) have developed a program for the utilization of this grant which

will be presented to the total group of HECUS library directors on October

23, 1973.

    The design of the project to date consists of the development of com-

puter print-outs of the periodicals holdings of the three private institution

libraries by Wilson periodical index titles. In other words, a list of

the titles indexed in, for example, Readers' Guide will be prepared showing

the holdings of each of the three private institution libraries of those

titles. Other Wilson indexes for which separate lists may be prepared are:

    Social Sciences and Humanities Index
    Education Index
    Business Periodicals Index
    Applied Science and Technology Index
    Art Index
    Biological and Agricultural Index
    Library Literature

Approximately three-fourths of the grant will be used to purchase

microfilm runs of needed periodicals. Upon completion of the purchase

program, the finalized lists will be run off, duplicated, and distributed

to the participating libraries. Free photocopies will be provided up to a

maximum of one page for each dollar allotted each private institution library

for purchase of microfilm.

ANTICIPATED RESULTS: A student at any of the five public institutions of higher learning in HECUS will be able to obtain free photocopies of needed periodical articles from magazines indexed in the basic periodical indexes.

He will simply locate a needed article in a Wilson periodical index and check to see if his own library owns it. If not he will check the holdings list located adjacent to the index to see if UB, FU or SHU libraries own it. If one of the three libraries owns the needed title, he will fill out a simple photocopy request form which will be sent on the SCLS truck. The article will be photocopied free of charge by the private academic library (until the maximum number of pages at the rate of one page per dollar spent for materials purchased is reached). The article will be shipped on the next truck.

This program is intended to be <u>user-oriented</u> so that the individual student can make such a request with a minimum of assistance. The purpose behind producing union lists restricted to one periodical index is so that the user can proceed logically and quickly from periodical index to union list to interlibrary loan routine. A total union list of serials can eventually be produced using much of the information processed into the computer in this PL 140 program.