This study was funded by the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) to enable the Illinois School Library Media Association (ISLMA) to plan the automation of the state's school libraries. The research was intended to identify current national programs of interest to ISLMA, identify current automation programs within Illinois library systems, and define automation options available to ISLMA. School librarians in 37 states were surveyed to reveal the extent of existing automation and resource sharing in their libraries; three states--New York, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin--described programs involving a majority of the school libraries in the state. It was discovered that several pre-existing programs in Illinois--ILLINET Online, various system databases, Chicago Schools Project Inform--offer a good foundation for expanding access to school holdings. In addition, data were gathered on the wide variety of vendor technologies and product costs. On the basis of this research recommendations were made to the ISLMA which include the continued promotion of resource sharing and SILO (Serials of Illinois Libraries Online), developing awareness of telecommunications technology, utilization of the research material and statistical data collected by the survey, development of statewide guidelines for school automation, and the continuation of more grant-funded proposals and projects. Appended materials include copies of the survey questionnaire and forms, an automation product vendor list, and retrospective conversion costs. The special report provides a summary of the survey and its findings. (52 references) (MAB)
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**ii.**
Introduction

The following research is a result of LSCA funding provided by the Illinois State Library to the Illinois School Library Media Association (ISLMA) for planning automation of school libraries in the state of Illinois. Information Organizers (IO) was assigned responsibility for identifying current national programs of interest to ISLMA, identifying current automation programs within Illinois library systems, and defining automation options available to ISLMA as a result of the information generated through the research process.

Key individuals who assisted in this research include: Carol Morrison, Project Director and Information Network Coordinator of the DuPage Library System; Nancy Bloomstrand, ISLMA President/Rockford Schools; Joyce Karon, Barrington Community District #220; Kay Maynard, Fairfield Community High School; Charles Harmon, American Library Association Headquarters Librarian; Mary Hauge, West Aurora Schools; Don Adcock, American Association of School Libraries; and Margaret Goodlin, State Library of Pennsylvania. The research conducted among school library association leaders will be complemented by the survey, The Report on Library Cooperation, 1989, compiled and edited by Jean E. Wilkens, Illinois State Library Consultant, and published by the Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies (ASCLA) in June 1990.

The research process has been influenced by this consultant's 20 years of professional experience in a variety of school, academic and special library settings. This experience has occurred in libraries in diverse rural/urban areas with various funding and staffing levels. Because of the great disparities which occur between school libraries within the state, the options identified for school libraries in this report are targeted to the one-person library with modest regular funds. The "average" school librarian manages a library of about 10-12,000 volumes, has no paid support staff, does not have direct access to either a phone or copy machine, has an Apple computer for student instructional purposes, and has an annual materials budget of $4,000 or less. The options identified must be evaluated in light of these assumptions of the "average" school library.
Review of Relevant Literature

Resource Sharing and Technology

Immroth (1984) in her article, "Technology and Network Participation," indicates that a danger to be avoided for school library media specialists is creation of a unique local system which would isolate the local school library media center rather than connect it to the broader resources available. A network, according to Immroth (1984:27), is composed of "...two or more organizations engaged in a common pattern of information exchange through communications links, for some common objectives."

Immroth cites examples of network participation in the states of Indiana, New York and Ohio which stimulated school library media center automation. Immroth (1984:36-37) states: "The question is not whether school library media centers can afford to be involved in automation and networking; the question is, Can school library media specialists afford not to be involved?"

The benefits of network participation and automation to the school librarians in the three states described by Immroth included:

1) Positive attitudes toward the concepts of networking and automation
2) Interlibrary loan, delivery systems, reference services and development of union catalogs perceived as the network services of most importance for quality school library media programs
3) Increased resource sharing
4) Greater awareness of services available to students and teachers
5) Reduction in clerical tasks performed by school library media specialists as they gained access to centralized cataloging records.

The question faced by the Illinois School Library Media Association (ISLMA) is not whether to automate but how to most cost-effectively connect school library media centers to the broader range of resources in Illinois and the U.S. for the benefit of students and teachers within their local school districts and for the benefit of the larger library community.
Based on the experiences of other states, ISLMA networking will promote the automation of local school library collections, lead to the development of new library services and collections, and prepare students for the information society of the future. The question is how should this process occur and how it is best accomplished within the financial resources available in the state of Illinois.

Factors/Benefits to Consider in Planning for Automation

Van Orden and Wilkes (1989), in a recent survey of school library media centers that participated in networks, showed that nearly half used OCLC, often through a statewide network. Just under a third reported that they used a local network to communicate within their school districts. School districts benefited from newsletters, directories, training materials and access to online databases.

The Texas Association of School Libraries (TASL) issued a report on School Library Membership in Multitype Systems and noted these possible benefits of network participation for a school library media center:

(1) patron access to a wider array of resources;
(2) interaction with other types of libraries;
(3) access to continuing education and specialized training;
(4) reduction in isolation of personnel;
(5) more extensive use of existing resources;
(6) speed and accuracy in interlibrary loan;
(7) increased staff job satisfaction;
(8) improved public image;
(9) high quality and uniformity of cataloging;
(10) opportunity for students to develop information gathering and communication skills;
(11) opportunity for students to access other information databases;
(12) opportunity for the administrator and school staff to access information in external databases;
(13) relief of school librarians from routine processing tasks, allowing them more time with students; and
(14) provision of access to information services to those not served by other libraries. (Immroth, 1987:64)
Barriers to participation of school library media centers in networks as described by Van Orden and Wilkes (1989) include lack of administrative support or understanding of networking, lack of available funding, and lack of computer equipment or telecommunications equipment. Immroth (1987) notes that one drawback or disadvantage of network membership is increased staff time in "one person" libraries. A separate study by Miller and Moran (1987) has determined that 48% of all media centers do not have telephones.

Such findings illustrate the need for school media specialists to communicate to school administrators the necessity of school librarian networking via telephone and/or computer to acquire information about other school library programs, needed educational materials and outside speakers. The total school curriculum can be enhanced through the development of the school library media center program via networking and automation.

Case Studies and Impact of Pilot Projects on School Libraries

1) New York State School Library Systems (N=46)

Twelve pilot projects began in 1979-80
Total expenditures for these projects over a five-year period was nearly $4 million
Gained permanent status on July 1, 1985

(a) Membership
695 public school districts participate out of 718 (97% participation)
387 non-public schools are also members
3289 school buildings reached

(b) Interlibrary Loan
Reached a total of 459,109 items in the 1988-89 school year
In 1986-87 the total loaned was 233,565
In a two year period, ILL increased 225,544 or 96.6%. The total number of ILLs nearly doubled.
Of the 459,109 items shared, 221,302 items were loaned to the schools in 1988-89.
(c) Database Searches
This service is currently offered by 42 of the 46 school library systems to faculty and administrators as a no-cost reference service. The number of searches increased from 1515 in 1986-87 to 3425 in 1988-89, an increase of 1910 searches or 126% in two years. Access to ERIC is made available through DIALOG and BRS.

(d) Database Growth
The number of school library system records (holdings) converted into machine readable format rose from 2,552,581 in 1986-87 to 4,540,695 in 1988-89 for an increase of 1,988,114 or 77.9%. Sources of funding for this conversion came from LSCA Title III and state Regional Database funds within their respective regions for retrospective conversion.

(e) Special Programs/End Products of School Library Systems in New York--
Homework Hotline
Continuing education for school library media specialist
Library-on-Call for disabled/home-bound Resources guides
Bibliographic instruction guides
Newsletters
Microfiche union catalogs
Computer-based union catalogs in MARC format
Cooperative Collection Development

2) Access Pennsylvania

(a) First released in September 1986, the compact disc union catalog represented holdings of over 100 libraries and agencies and included one university on one compact disc.
(b) The 1989 Access Pennsylvania Statewide database, which consists of 4 compact discs and nearly 10 million records, now permits Pennsylvania students access to the card catalogs of 457 libraries in the State from a computer in their library and allows students to arrange to have any of these resources delivered through an interlibrary loan network. The 1990 edition of the catalog will contain more than 521 libraries. Over 640 sites in Pennsylvania are accessing the database.

(c) OPAC Search Capabilities
Library users can search the database on compact discs by title, author, subject, anyword, location, type of material, or a combination of these. Searches can also be performed using Boolean logic and truncation.

(d) Resource Sharing Capabilities/Delivery
There are 36 local consortia which participating libraries are required to join. A technical support center provides training, telephone support, equipment, database maintenance and new product information. The 1989 version of Access PA includes a built-in interlibrary loan request form which can be sent by the librarian through telefacsimile, electronic mail or surface mail.

The workstation configuration consists of an IBM-compatible PC (640K) with hard drive (20MB fixed), printer, 2 CD-ROM drives and modem. A telecommunications package is required for electronic mail. Schools are also required to have an online circulation system (such as Circulation Plus). Capital outlay by the schools during the first two years averaged close to $9000. (Epler, 1988:53) Costs for retrospective conversion to MARC through Brodart has been $.39 per record with data entry by Brodart.
(3) New Jersey

(a) The New Jersey Library Network is a multitype, regional, cooperative network. There are six regional library cooperatives which were formed in 1984.

(b) An OCLC Access Center is provided for all libraries not subscribing to the OCLC-ILL subsystem. Non-OCLC libraries call a toll-free number, 1-800-624-2875.

(c) Region I has included 23 school libraries in their CD-ROM database. The Northwest Union Catalog and Interlibrary Loan System (NUCILS) is a product of Auto-Graphics Impact. Point-to-point bulletin board system is available for ILL requests. OCLC just announced at ALA Mid-Winter an agreement with Auto-Graphics Impact to provide a system called SharePAC. (Price information available)

(d) In 1990/91, at least 11 school libraries will test Group Access via OCLC.

4) Wisconsin (WISCAT)

(a) Over 300 school libraries have converted to MARC records using a combination of LSCA funds and local funds.

(b) These libraries agree to share resources and keep their records up-to-date as they voluntarily agree to participate in WISCAT.

(c) MITINET, developed jointly by the Wisconsin Division for Library Services and Information Transform, Inc., is a program which allows a library to convert its' titles into the MARC format.
As of June 1988, WISCAT contained 3.25 million titles and almost 14.5 million holdings from 564 contributing libraries. A majority of the titles (52.5%) list only one holding library and 68% of the titles list only one or two holding libraries. WISCAT is distributed to all libraries contributing their titles and holdings to the catalog.

Once a library has its titles converted into the MARC format and merged into WISCAT, its titles can be extracted from WISCAT for generating local or area-wide COM or CD-ROM catalogs. Computer tapes of a library's titles in the MARC format can be obtained for use in automated circulation systems, online catalogs, or for other automated library functions.

The Wisconsin Division for Library Services provides MITINET, a user's manual, WISCAT and the LC microfiche catalogs, on-site training and telephone support.

Florida and CLSI

"Because online catalogs show the circulation item status, permit immediate updating, permit low-cost maintenance at a central site, and can be customized, there is an advantage to their functions over CD-ROM based systems," claims John Snook, Southeastern Region Sales Representative/Federal Installations Representative for CLSI. (Phone Number: 301-220-2371)

Fifty-three schools in Pasco County, Florida are involved in a CLSI project over a three-year period at a cost of $1.3 million.
(c) The project involves the use of both the CLSI circulation system and CD-ROM based PACs. Three new schools, without card catalogs, will use CD-ROM PACS initially for access to holdings.

(d) The Pasco County schools database will be centrally administered, but the regional focus will reduce telecommunications charges.

(e) No PC-maintenance will be required.

(f) Follett is working with 3 schools to develop the collection and provide MARC records for holdings.

(g) Conversion is being done by CLSI, using Bibliofile, or is being done manually in some of the schools.

(h) A host CPU and branch CPUs are being planned for the project.

Curriculum needs and resource sharing

These pilot projects and the resulting databases created show the need for training students in techniques of online search. Reduced group access rates to online services are available in a number of states (CLASS, Bibliographic Center for Research, Michigan, Missouri Library Network Corporation). These services broaden access to periodical literature, government reports, and ready-reference sources for school libraries. A combination of book and nonbook materials are required for meeting the total needs of students and teachers. Identification of local library holdings will allow cooperative collection development and better utilization of materials held in a region regardless of the type of library (school, public, academic or special). Students need to be exposed to the types of libraries and the specialized resources they provide for future personal growth and career development.
Survey of School Library Media Leaders in the U.S.  
(November 1989)

Methodology

A two page survey was developed (see Appendix) to determine the types of school library automation programs in other states. The ALA Handbook of Organization and a list of the school library association leaders attending the ALA Conference in June 1969 were used to construct a mailing list.

The survey was mailed to school library association leaders in 50 states in October 1989. A total of 121 surveys were mailed first class with self-addressed response envelopes. To insure a high return rate, two follow-up postcards were mailed. The first postcard was sent two weeks after the survey was mailed to all 121 individuals at the time of the survey receipt deadline (October 16, 1989). The second postcard was sent six weeks (November 15, 1989) later to those states that had not replied.

Survey Results

By January 1990, 37 states (N=37) had responded to the ISLMA survey. This represents a response rate of 72.4%. Chart 1 summarizes the breakdown of the state response. Of the fifty states, 51 percent (N=26) of the responding school library media association leaders indicate that school library resource sharing is occurring within their state.

Those states that have automated have "rave reviews" about automation and resource sharing. Words and statements used by school library media leaders on the surveys to describe automation and resource sharing included: "Superb," "Excellent," "Great idea," "Needs a Boost," "It's very useful." Many state leaders noted the barriers to automation, including money, and communication between different levels of government and libraries. Wisconsin is running workshops throughout the state on the topic of automation and resource sharing. The high response rate and favorable comments from the other states and their interest in receiving the results of this survey suggest that the Illinois School Library Media Association should "Go for it!" Pilot projects, testing out the latest in cost-effective technology, will develop ILLINET further for all.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Responded to Survey</th>
<th>Sch Library Resource Sharing</th>
<th>System(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama (AL)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Alaska Library Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska (AK)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Multi-type coop lib systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona (AZ)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Varies by region of state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas (AR)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Varies by region of state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California (CA)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Varies by region of state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado (CO)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Varies by region of state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut (CT)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Varies by region of state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware (DE)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Pilot projects underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia (DC)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>School Library Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida (FL)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No statewide multi-type coop org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia (GA)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Varies by library system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii (HI)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Varies by region of state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho (ID)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Kentucky Library Network 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois (IL)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>M-Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana (IN)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>M-Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa (IA)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>M-Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas (KS)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>M-Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky (KY)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Planning underway/New Directions TF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana (LA)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Regional benefits are being planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine (ME)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>State has toll free no/Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland (MD)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Access PA CD-ROM/LIN-TEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts (MA)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SC Library Network/Pilot stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan (MI)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SD Library Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota (MN)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>State has toll free no/Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi (MS)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Access PA CD-ROM/LIN-TEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri (MO)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SC Library Network/Pilot stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana (MT)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SD Library Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska (NE)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Start-up regional networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada (NV)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Provo, UT system/State has none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire (NH)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DOL/UVM Access Ctr/VT Res Shar Syst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey (NJ)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pilot projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico (NM)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>WL LaserCat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York (NY)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83 voc-tech schools linked in 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina (NC)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>WISCat/305 schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota (ND)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GEAC Wyoming had no schools in 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio (OH)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GEAC Wyoming had no schools in 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma (OK)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GEAC Wyoming had no schools in 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon (OR)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GEAC Wyoming had no schools in 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania (PA)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GEAC Wyoming had no schools in 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island (RI)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GEAC Wyoming had no schools in 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina (SC)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GEAC Wyoming had no schools in 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota (SD)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GEAC Wyoming had no schools in 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee (TN)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GEAC Wyoming had no schools in 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas (TX)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GEAC Wyoming had no schools in 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah (UT)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GEAC Wyoming had no schools in 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont (VT)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GEAC Wyoming had no schools in 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia (VA)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>GEAC Wyoming had no schools in 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington (WA)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>GEAC Wyoming had no schools in 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia (WV)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>GEAC Wyoming had no schools in 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin (WI)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GEAC Wyoming had no schools in 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming (WY)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>GEAC Wyoming had no schools in 1986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total States = 51

Respondent Rate: 72.50% 51%
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Useful Ideas Gleaned from Other States
Noted in case studies of New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Florida

The types of systems being used in the various states and programs developed include:

New Jersey
- AutoGraphics Impact CD-ROM
- Compuserve for ILL and Electronic Bulletin Board
- OCLC/Interlibrary Loan Access Center
- Multitype systems

New York
- Union catalogs on CD-ROM and microfiche
- MARC records
- Cooperative collection development
- BRS and DIALOG database search centers
- School library systems

Pennsylvania
- LePAC CD-ROM (Brodart)
- BRS and DIALOG database searching
- Technical support center
- ILL electronic mail via LePAC LANs

Chart 2 is a summary of key components of the programs in various key states. Vendor packets compiled as the second part of the research reveal other pilot projects underway in the various states.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Method of Conversion</th>
<th>End-Product(s)</th>
<th>Who Total $ of Contact Person(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>WLN</td>
<td>Microfiche CD-ROM LaserCat</td>
<td>580 libs ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On-line catalog</td>
<td>Ruth Jean Shaw 907-279-2409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Betty Jo Morse 907-261-2977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Bibliofile</td>
<td>Circulation Follett</td>
<td>17 voc- tech schls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On-line catalog</td>
<td>Suramto Stark 203-264-859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charles White 203-638-4110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>CLSI</td>
<td>On-line catalog</td>
<td>Pasco, Cty Schls $1.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CD-ROM</td>
<td>John Snook, CLSI 301-220-2371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Bibliofile CMS</td>
<td>Microfiche Printed union cat</td>
<td>40 schl libs $160,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Francine Grudzras 808-732-1402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Illinet Online</td>
<td>Dial access</td>
<td>800 libs $22.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bernard Sloan 217-244-7953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mal.</td>
<td>OCLC</td>
<td>CD-ROM AutoGraphs</td>
<td>164 libs ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RLIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Karl Reiser 207-581-1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marcive Bibiliofile</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jody Gehrig 702-889-3136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>LaserQuest</td>
<td>CD-ROM LaserQuest</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Mattie 518-474-7890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>UTLAS OCLC</td>
<td>Microfiche Computer-based union catalogs DIALOG</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.4M+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>OCLC/Auto-Graphics</td>
<td>CD-ROM Microfiche CompuServe</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Martinez 201-273-4041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCLC Center</td>
<td>Toll-free no.</td>
<td>1-800-624-2875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Bibliofile Mitinet</td>
<td>Follett Circ</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eric Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Brodart</td>
<td>CD-ROM DIALOG/BRS</td>
<td>4471 liba $1.4M+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret Goodlin 717-785-6414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Unisys PALS</td>
<td>Online catalog Dial access</td>
<td>1081 liba 68sch liba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Kolbe 605-775-3131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online catalog LAN</td>
<td>7 sch liba $25,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Karen Berner 801-374-4970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>WLN</td>
<td>LaserCat</td>
<td>9 ha $109,520+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy Zussy 206-753-5590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Mitinet</td>
<td>CD-ROM</td>
<td>564 liba all types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Microfiche</td>
<td>Mary Clark 608-221-6166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helen Adams 715-677-4541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Highlights of Vendor Products

Vendor survey conducted in Fall 1989

The second aspect of the research was to define available state-of-the-art automation products for school libraries. A list of over fifty vendors was compiled. A vendor was defined for this research as a commercial for-profit company producing library automation products or a library system or network which provides automation products at reduced price for individual libraries. The final list of vendors of interest to ISLMA is found in the Appendix.

Follow-up phone calls were made to vendors with products of broad interest. CLSI, OCLC, Brodart and Autographics Impact were contacted by phone for additional information about their products and pilot projects.

Through phone calls to reference database jobbers (e.g., BRS), it was determined that state libraries outside Illinois can market a broader range of products and services. The Information Services Cooperative of Illinois (College of Lake County) offers services to over 50 libraries at reduced prices (e.g., DIALOG, BRS, Wilsonline, CD-ROM software and drives).

The products and vendors of interest to ISLMA should include:
- Illinois Online
- OCLC SharePAC and Epic Services / OCLC Group Access
- OCLC Retrospective Conversion Services.

OCLC and AutoGraphics Impact, a CD-ROM vendor, entered into an agreement in January 1990 to develop SharePAC. Both vendors are leaders in the library automation field and offer experience with centralized cataloging, interlibrary loan, reference and patron access catalogs (PAC). The DuPage Library System recently utilized OCLC for tape-to-tape retrospective conversion at a cost of $.33 per record. The hit-rate expected from OCLC would reduce local cataloging efforts in one-librarian school library media programs.
Survey of Library Systems in Illinois

The vendor survey conducted in Fall 1989 produced Chart 3 which summarizes the status of Illinois library system automation. The chart clearly reveals the CLSI focus of library systems in Illinois, but several systems are considering a change from CLSI due to the outdated technology and to a lack of flexibility for local libraries in its circulation system.

The advantage of automation by regions has been the ability of all types of libraries to dial-in to the host computers at the systems and determine the holdings of other libraries for interlibrary loan and cataloging purposes. The Appendix has a sample policy and procedures information from the Suburban Library System (SLS) which reflects library system level concern with expanding access to resources for all types of libraries.

Each library system offers training in the use of its system search strategies. Chart 3 provides a listing of these key resource people throughout the state of Illinois. These automation consultants are available to individual libraries within their service areas.

Illinois Products of Interest

Illinois Online

Since April 1990, Illinois librarians who received basic training on Illinois Online can access the LCS libraries directly for borrowing of interlibrary loan materials. Bernard Sloan, Manager of ILSCO, at the Illinois White House Conference on Libraries, commented on the issues faced by Illinois Online in providing additional services to Illinois libraries. Sloan (1990) also has noted the importance of database maintenance for shared catalogs.

Quality assurance issues such as database maintenance, avoidance of duplicate records and use of records already in IO would need to be worked out on a policy and technical level before the system is expanded further. ILSCO is planning the addition of current awareness reference databases to IO in 1990-91. School library participation and leadership on the ILSCO Long Range Planning Committee is essential for the introduction of new products and techniques. For example, the ILSCO Long Range Plan has CD-ROM only under investigation. ISLMA could play a significant leadership role through its own planning process and pilot projects in Illinois by introducing CD-ROM PACs into school libraries at various levels of automation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library System</th>
<th>Computer System</th>
<th>System Contact</th>
<th>School Library Contact</th>
<th>Responded to Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bur Oak</td>
<td>CLSI LIBS 100</td>
<td>Mary Ann Atkins</td>
<td>815-729-3545</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorewood, IL</td>
<td>Gaylord SuperCat</td>
<td>815-723-6524</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>UTLAS</td>
<td>Ulo Ormiste</td>
<td>312-736-7600</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>OCLC LS/2</td>
<td>Joe Harris</td>
<td>618-842-2679</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flora, IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuPage</td>
<td>CLSI</td>
<td>Sandra Donohue</td>
<td>708-232-8457</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva, IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Online</td>
<td>LCS/IBM 3081</td>
<td>Kristine Hammerstrand</td>
<td>217-244-7593</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbana, IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaskaskia Automated</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy Gulick</td>
<td>618-239-4220</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System, Smithton, IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Trails</td>
<td>CLSI</td>
<td>Anne Wendler</td>
<td>217-352-0047</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champaign, IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Illinois</td>
<td>CLSI</td>
<td>Rita McCredy</td>
<td>815-229-0330</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockford, IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Suburban/</td>
<td>CLSI</td>
<td>Richard Schurman</td>
<td>708-459-1500</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Computer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joyce Karon</td>
<td>708-381-1812</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Wheeling, IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Sharing</td>
<td>UTLAS</td>
<td>Barbara J McNally</td>
<td>309-694-5965</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance of West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Peoria, IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Prairie</td>
<td>CLSI</td>
<td>Paul Johnson</td>
<td>217-429-2586</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decatur, IL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy Elder</td>
<td>217-728-8311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee</td>
<td>OCLC LS/2</td>
<td>Deborah S. Rodgers</td>
<td>618-985-3711</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carterville, IL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kathryn Greenwood</td>
<td>618-724-2611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starved Rock</td>
<td>CLSI</td>
<td>Martha Pitchford</td>
<td>815-633-8561</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa, IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>CLSI/SLAN</td>
<td>Joan Spencer</td>
<td>708-325-6640</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr Ridge, IL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joan Murphy</td>
<td>708-599-7200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rayalco

Barrington Schools, Riverside-Brookfield and Lockport use a product developed by Rayalco. The system features include:

- Serials check-in
- Textbook system
- AV equipment scheduling
- Circulation system
- Union catalog
- Inventory with wand
- Film booking
- Bulb inventory
- Library accounting
- MARC conversion package.

The system is a Digital Equipment Corporation (DEC) mini-based system. The search capabilities of the system are excellent, and the retrospective conversion at Barrington Schools under the direction of Joyce Karon has been cost effective using available cataloging from Baker and Taylor and trained student help.

Follett

The survey conducted by the University of Illinois, Library Research Center in Winter 1989-90, showed the strength of Circulation Plus and Follett in the state of Illinois. Charts 4 and 5 show the responses of school media specialists to the vendors and products they currently use. Follett and Circulation Plus is clearly the company and system of greatest use for circulation purposes in the state of Illinois. Clearly, any system developed will need to interface with this vendor and product.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendors</th>
<th>N Cited</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bibliofile</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLSI</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Research</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Trek</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynex</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follett</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAC/Infotrac</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molli</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCLC</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rayalco</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnebago</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 5
Total Responses to Question 4 ISLMA Survey
N=2984 Responses     Cases=989

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Responses (N)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apple Works</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation Plus (Follett)</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick Card (Follett)</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCLC</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overdue Writer</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card Prep</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinct District System</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnebago</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Trek</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalog Card/Label Writer</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avant Cards</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS File</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rayalco Super Cat</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molli</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple (?)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Own Program</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalog Plus (Follett)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW Database-Spreadsheet</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhouse</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliofile</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Trak</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac School Library</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2984</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternatives

Funding Sources

Based on the survey of the literature and results of the ISLMA survey to other states, it will be necessary for Illinois school libraries to seek a number of funding alternatives. Many states have used LSCA Title III grants for funds. The Departments of Education in a number of states have developed grant programs for hardware purchases and conversion of collections into MARC records.

ISLMA should consider a program encouraging the use of the per capita grants available to school libraries in 1990-91. If funded fully at $.75/pupil, a March 1989 projection showed $1,151,400 available to school libraries annually. Use of local funds with the approval of the school board is necessary to expand access.

Private foundations are another source of potential funds. Ferguson (1987) summarized a number of electronic document delivery pilot projects supported by the Fred Meyer Charitable Trust in the northwest. A major Illinois or midwest foundation could be interested in a large scale automation project providing information access, both technology and training, to teachers and students.

Levels of Automation for Resource Sharing: A Model

A model of resource sharing for Illinois school library media programs needs to be developed by ISLMA. To facilitate this process, Information Organizers proposes these levels of automation:

1) Basic Level I automation--Local lending and exchange between schools, publics, academics and special libraries

(a) Basic technology for information access
(1) Telephone Installation in centers without phone lines
   1 phone line minimum
   Cost=$100 installation/$30 per month
(2) Copy machine
   personal copier at minimum
   $1000 first year for machine, supplies, paper, repairs
   $200 budget annually for supplies, etc.
b) Toll-free number centralized for state of Illinois for OCLC interlibrary loan/ILL phone requests

c) Acquire access to local system and Illinois Online system via modem and IBM-compatible microcomputer. IBM-compatibility is preferred so that school libraries can better prepare for future automation options. Since schools are Apple computer focused as shown by the heavy use of Appleworks, IBMs can be more easily limited to library use.

d) Minimum identification of holdings in school--Serials
Participate in SILO (Annual cost $30)

2) Moderate Level 2 automation--Regional focus

a) Facsimile Equipment--
$1200 for mid-size model
separate phone line required ($100)
monthly estimated bill=$30

b) Microcomputer/Modem Access to IO/System Clusters
IO nodes
System nodes for dial access--use for retrocon/ILL

c) Retrospective Conversion of libraries interested in participating in resource sharing using MARC records
1) States may obtain systems and send around state to assist e.g., Bibliofile on Wheels
2) MITINET option for local maintenance
3) Vendor options for initial retro con
d) Load MARC records of schools with converted collections onto IO online

e) Explore ISLMA group buy options with a network like ISCI or MLNC
Redefine ILLINET legally to allow for marketing perspective

f) Development of Local Area Network (LAN)
A LAN is generally defined as "...a network of interconnected personal computers with an operating system and hardware that permit sharing of data and peripherals." (Mandelbaum, 1989:196)
More than 30 small libraries for the blind and physically handicapped are operating "state of the art" local area networks (LANs) using a custom system developed by the National Library Service (NLS) for the Blind and Physically Handicapped of the Library of Congress. The basic system configuration is a central database on a local area network (LAN) file server accessed by multiple workstations. This system is similar to the system configuration for ILL supported by Brodart in its LePAC product. Utah libraries are using a LAN for resource sharing. Interconnect Project for NSLS, SLS and DLS is underway with InfoSoft, Inc. working as the consultant to the systems.

g) Make IBM-PCs with internal CD-ROMs and secured disc drives available for reference use. Ebsco has a workstation for $2999 which includes a IBM-PC 286 clone, color monitor and dot-matrix printer. This system can also be used for other applications. LePAC can have a menu set-up to allow a user access to both LePAC and other applications (e.g., Wordperfect, Lotus 1-2-3) (Fogarty, 1990).
3. State of the Art
   Level III Automation--National Focus

   a) Development of OPAC Catalogs on CD-ROM
      Access Pennsylvania & Brodart
      Auto-Graphics Impact/OCLC SharePAC
      MaineCat/New Jersey
      OCLC Epic Service--US Network

   b) Use of Online Database Vendors/Critical
      Thinking Skills Development
      CompuServe
      Knowledge Index
      Dialog
      BRS After Dark
      CD-ROM options--unlimited local usage

   c) Document Delivery issues/costs
      Vendors as back-up to ILLINET
      Example: University Microfilm
      International (UMI)
      Article Clearinghouse
Concerns and Directions for ISLMA Consideration in Planning for the Automation of Illinois School Libraries

Concerns

1) Communication Issues
   
a) Lack of telephones at building level
   
b) Need for development of administrative support
      Educate administrators concerning the need for automation and labor-intensive nature
      of project/Short-run vs. long-term benefits
      ISLMA out-reach to school administration associations within State of Illinois
   
c) Attitudinal barriers--
      School library media specialist feelings of the project being imposed from above by
      Illinois State Library/University of Illinois will need to be addressed
      Demonstrate benefits of IO to students/teachers

2) Personnel/Training Issues
   
a) Most school libraries are one-person libraries
      Find the "easiest" method of conversion so library media specialists can get on with
      business of serving students and teachers from a public service perspective
      Start with periodical conversion via SILO
      Move to book conversion
      Regional training sessions in retrospective conversion (e.g., Why MARC??)
   
b) Identification of regional experts in use of Illinois Online to facilitate problem solving
   
c) Toll-free number for technical assistance at state-level for advanced questions
3) - Vendor Issues for Retrospective Conversion

   a) Vendor reliability in delivering the end-product

   b) Vendor cost
      Negotiate group-buy contracts to reduce costs
      Licensing possible to have "mobile" UTLAS or
      Bibliophile work stations move from school
      building to school building within state
      Evaluate cost per title (OCLC starts at $.85/
      Brodart at $.40) for MARC records
      What hit rate is expected? UTLAS has largest
      database available and was used in New York

   c) Fit of product with circulation systems and
      online catalogs currently in use

   d) Conversion possible using Illinois Online??

   e) Conversion possible using System databases??

   f) Updating of database after conversion
      Maintaining accuracy of database
      Use of standard software within state?
      (e.g., MITINET, Addison Public Library)
      Is CD-ROM okay? Or is an online system
      with circulation status (on shelf vs.
      circulation vs. on order) and ability
      to update required?

4) - Resource Sharing Development Issues

   a) Development of policies of resource sharing
      at building or district level

   b) Evolutionary nature of resource sharing--
      Start with SILO involvement and use of FAX
      for document delivery of magazine articles
      Immediate results of resource sharing seen
      for the school's own clientele

   c) Make pilot projects multi-type in nature
      if funding is available/Strength of Illinois
5) Technology Issues

a) Is a telephone, computer and modem with appropriate software available for school library administrative purposes?

b) Is FAX available? Second phone line required. Will the administration pick up costs?

c) Is a copier available in library? Resource sharing made more difficult if not available in library.

6) Interaction with Other States

a) Missouri Library Network Corporation
    Bur Oak Library System offers reduced rates to members through a membership in MLNC for equipment, online services
    Examine options available through Missouri, Michigan or Bibliographic Center for Research (Colorado), Information Services Cooperative of Illinois (College of Lake County)

b) Network with Wisconsin to learn more about their efforts
    MITINET used for automation of schools

c) Review results of national survey of vendors and school library leaders from November 1989
    Available information takes up 2 3-inch binders/3 feet of file drawers/Demos available
Directions for ISLMA

ISLMA must work on developing pilot project guidelines and a model appropriate to its needs. Developing a project which incorporates CD-ROM as a storage medium and permits students direct hands-on interaction with a work station is the most desirable and cost-effective alternative possible. The CD-ROM as a publishing medium reduces the per copy cost of a union list when a large number of libraries are participating and/or purchasing copies. Autographics Impact pricing shows that the per copy cost of a CD-ROM disc is $15.00 per copy after 25 copies are produced.

All steps employed by a library to prepare collections for automation for other internal library functions remain the same for resource sharing/networking. Retrospective conversion of collections is required to link with any other libraries in a comprehensive Illinois Online environment. Policies and guidelines are necessary for instruction in the use of the new technology by students and teachers. Because of the scope of future ISLMA projects, group buy of equipment, software and retrospective conversion services is a good prospect for cost savings.

ISLMA can look to guidelines for pilot projects from other states. Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Texas, and Wisconsin have available information regarding Requests for Information, Vendor Specifications, Training, Technical Support and Criteria for Participating Libraries (Immroth, 1987). This final report and the resource file compiled from vendors and other states by Information Organizers is a valuable resource for ISLMA to deploy in meeting its goals of serving students and teachers through networking and automation.
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CD-ROM
Advantages and Product Announcements
The Advantages of a CD-ROM Public Access Catalog over PACs built on other types of technology

For some libraries, CD-ROM public access catalogs are:
1) a transitional catalog
2) an affordable and practical alternative to an online public access catalog.

Definition of a CD-ROM catalog--
"...a MARC-based compilation of bibliographic records distributed on CD-ROM, with accompanying software enabling it to perform some or all of the following functions--
1) local public access catalog
2) union catalog in support of ILL
3) reference database of bibliographic information
4) resource data file for extraction of records to be used in retrospective conversion, card production and ongoing additions to a local online data base

Key issues in CD-ROM catalog considerations

1) selection criteria
   functionality
   pricing
   vendor support

2) number of work stations

3) service
   space
   environment
   staffing

4) marketing to users

5) local updatability via hard disk systems
   General Research Corporation (Laser Quest)
   Library Corporation
   Marcive/PAC

6) added value
   General Research Corporation has a library map showing location of item
Benefits of CD-ROM catalogs

1) offers more for the $$, both initial and ongoing
2) greater flexibility than current online approaches
3) easier to use with features judged too difficult to implement efficiently in an online system
4) single-user
5) less risky than online systems
6) one can create and use a CD-ROM catalog on a trial basis without committing an extraordinary amount of money to the effort--Safe Investment
   a) the hardware is generic and can be redirected to other uses
   b) costs of and effort in creating a CD-ROM catalog (extraction, merge and de-dupe, authority processing) are directly transferrable to other catalog approaches should CD-ROM turn out to be unsatisfactory
7) cost is largely fixed, known and controllable
8) groups of libraries will find CD-ROM catalogs attractive because they allow even the smallest institutions to save $$ through sharing the costs of a combined catalog
9) currently only six vendors in the field
10) groups of libraries with incompatible online systems may opt for a CD-ROM union catalog as the lingua franca of cooperation among them
11) libraries with a need for online circulation as well as for an online public access catalog and with insufficient funding for both may be attracted to the CD-ILS (compact disc-integrated library system)

Buying CD-ROM catalog services is no different from buying software development services, bibliographic data base processing services, or extensive printing and publishing services.

Retrieval software runs exclusively on IBM-compatible computer hardware.

Updates--certain systems are allowing for supplemental file capability to compensate for the static, read-only character of the CD-ROM disc. Hard-disk drive data file is chained logically to the data on the CD-ROM.
Special features of CD-ROM systems--

1) Displays (new/notes bulletin board)

2) Scoping (limit)
   by location, date, format, language, etc.
   defaults

3) Screen display
   MARC
   card catalog
   abbreviated

4) Searching
   heading vs. keyword
   cross references
   heading (i.e., assigned subjects and names)
   keyword (gives flexibility access to title,
             geographic searches, keyword truncation)

Location scoping is helpful in a union catalog situation.

Connectivity--A variety of linkages between CD-ROM catalogs
and other systems may be desirable in a given situation.

Queuing requests to a network CD-ROM server....

Institutions with a LAN in place will likely want to
use it to provide catalog access to everyone on
the network.

Interlibrary loan messaging approaches are essential as a
mechanism for resource sharing. The two systems that have
this feature are Brodart's LePac (Access PA) and Auto-
Graphics Impact (MaineCAT and NJ).

See the summary chart of the features of the six vendors
in the market as of early 1989.

Basic system requirements of a CD-ROM workstation are:

IBM/XT or compatible
640KB of random access memory
1 diskette drive
monochrome monitor
hard disk drive required for ILL module
printer
modem
CD-ROM drive
DUBLIN, Ohio, Jan. 6, 1990—Auto-Graphics and OCLC have agreed to develop SharePAC, a new resource-sharing tool that will provide links between Auto-Graphics' IMPACT™ CD-ROM public access library catalog system and OCLC's online Interlibrary Loan (ILL) Subsystem.

SharePAC will allow sharing of bibliographic information, locations, and materials among groups of libraries, and provide direct interlibrary loan access to the 20 million bibliographic records in the OCLC Online Union Catalog.

Libraries that participate in OCLC Union Lists or Group Access arrangements and are users of Auto-Graphics IMPACT patron access CD-ROM catalogs will be able to use SharePAC to create interlibrary loan requests offline, send batched requests for transmission and tracking to the OCLC ILL Subsystem, and process incoming requests. For desired items not found in the group's CD-ROM catalog, direct access to the OCLC Interlibrary Loan Subsystem is available.

Union databases on compact discs will be built using Auto-Graphics' and OCLC's tape processing capabilities. Auto-Graphics' IMPACT will be the retrieval system for searching the database, with software developed by Auto-Graphics for offline creation and management of ILL requests and for establishing the telecommunications interface to the OCLC ILL Subsystem.

(more)
Robert S. Cope, Auto-Graphics' President, said, "With the benefits of OCLC's online ILL Subsystem, this new product will add tremendous value to the IMPACT catalog station. We are happy to be able to offer a direct link to the largest ILL resource in the U.S."

"SharePAC will provide groups of libraries participating in OCLC and using compact disc databases with increased flexibility and access to the larger world of materials available to patrons through interlibrary loan," said Tom Sanville, OCLC Vice President, Marketing.

SharePAC will be available through OCLC and its regional affiliated networks, with networks providing product support.

Auto-Graphics is a primary producer of local and union catalogs on COM and CD-ROM.

OCLC is a nonprofit computer library service and research organization whose computer network and products link more than 10,000 libraries in 38 countries.
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Retrospective Conversion Costs
Retrospective Conversion Options for School Library Media Centers

### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Database Records Searched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brodart Automation</td>
<td>.50-.90 per record depending on level of editing/condition of shelf list</td>
<td>9-10 million LC, GPO, CONSER, and selected customers' files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalog Card Corp.</td>
<td>.46 per record; .03 per bar code</td>
<td>2-3 million LC; Sears/Dewey 400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follett Library Software</td>
<td>.23-.30 for circulation record; $500 for up to 5,000 catalog records, including bar code</td>
<td>2-3 million LC with some Follett catalog enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Corp.</td>
<td>.46 per record; .03 per bar code (school price)</td>
<td>2-3 million LC; Sears/Dewey 400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcive, Inc</td>
<td>.15-.33 per record; .02 per bar code, includes authority processing</td>
<td>4-6 million LC, GPO, Nat. Lib. of Canada, and NLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCLC</td>
<td>.90-1.00 per record depending on level of editing/condition of shelf list</td>
<td>20 million LC, GPO, Nat. Lib of Canada, NLM, and members' contributed records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTLAS Corp.</td>
<td>1.00 per record depending on level of editing/condition of shelf list</td>
<td>54 million LC, Nat. Lib of Canada, UK MARC, GPO, REMARC, and members' contributed records (includes duplicates)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Software</th>
<th>Hardware</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Database Records Searched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brodart Automation</td>
<td>Micro-Check</td>
<td>IBM, Apple</td>
<td>$.10 per record + $15 per disk or $150 per month</td>
<td>2.5-3 million LC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcive, Inc.</td>
<td>Cataloging Input System</td>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>$149 for software + .17 per record</td>
<td>4.6 million LC, GPO, Nat. Library of Canada, and NLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCLC</td>
<td>Micro-Con</td>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>.29 per record for members; .315 per record for nonmembers</td>
<td>20 million LC, GPO, Nat. Library of Canada, NLM, and members' contributed records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTLAS Corp.</td>
<td>M100</td>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>.20 per LC record; .40 per contributor record</td>
<td>54 million LC, GPO, Nat. Library of Canada, NLM, UK MARC, REMARC, and members' contributed records (including duplicates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTLAS Corp.</td>
<td>DISCON (Compact Disk)</td>
<td>IBM and CD player</td>
<td>$800 monthly rental, $680 monthly rental if used more than a year, and 20 per record</td>
<td>6 million LC, REMARC brief records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Software</th>
<th>Hardware</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Database Records Searched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Research Corp.</td>
<td>LASER Quest</td>
<td>IBM and CD player</td>
<td>Prices quoted to individual libraries only</td>
<td>6 million LC and members' contributed records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Transform</td>
<td>MITINET/ marc</td>
<td>IBM, Apple, (Mac in development)</td>
<td>$795 Version 2</td>
<td>Interfaces with a number of microcomputer catalog systems, BIBLIOFILE CD, etc. Creates MARC records from data in shelf list or material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Corp.</td>
<td>BIBLIOFILE</td>
<td>IBM and CD player</td>
<td>LC $2,250 first year, $1,090 subsequent years for quarterly updates. Sears/Dewey $850 per year</td>
<td>2-3 million LC; Sears/Dewey 400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCLC</td>
<td>CAT CD 450</td>
<td>IBM and CD player</td>
<td>$495 annual subscription for members; compact disk with name and subject authorities available for nonmembers</td>
<td>5 million LC + general subset of contributed records (records for schools and other subsets available)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Library Network</td>
<td>LASER CAT</td>
<td>IBM and CD player</td>
<td>$975 school subscription first year, $825 subsequent years; .40 to add holdings to WLN</td>
<td>2-7 million LC + contributors' records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison prepared by Catherine Murphy (Prices confirmed on October 1, 1989).


All of the vendors listed at the end of this article have Library of Congress MARC records which number about 2 1/2 to 3 million records. GPO (Government Printing Office), National Library of Canada, CONSER, and contributors' catalog records may also be added to the database. OCLC has the largest database of unique catalog records, including LC and standard databases as well as contributors' records, a total of 20 million. The Brodart database has 9 to 10 million records. UTLAS has 54 million records, but these include duplicates; UTLAS is the only vendor to also provide pre-1968 LC records (REMARK).
Survey and Forms
Used in ISLMA Research
1989
September 1989

Dear School Library Media Association Leader:

The Illinois State Library recently awarded the Illinois School Library Media Association (ISLMA) a Library Services and Construction Act grant for a one-year period to support the research project, School Partners in ILLINET. School Partners in ILLINET will explore the automation options open to Illinois school library media centers for the enhancement of resource sharing within the state. As the research consultant on this project, it is my expectation that knowledgeable school library media association leaders from other states can contribute significantly to our efforts in Illinois.

To better understand available automation and resource sharing options, ISLMA is seeking your direct input on the status of school library automation within your state. We want to learn from your experiences as they apply to such factors as cost, products, maintenance of and user satisfaction with the resource network.

The enclosed questionnaire is important in our long-range planning for school library automation and resource sharing in Illinois. To help provide us with a full picture of automation in your state, we ask that you complete the enclosed survey and return it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope by October 16, 1989.

The results of School Partners in ILLINET will be made available in abstract form at the conclusion of the one-year project. If you have questions about the project or survey, please contact me. ISLMA values your insights and your support of the project by answering and returning the enclosed survey to Information Organizers of the Fox Valley.

Sincerely,

Mary M. Howrey
Project Research Consultant
Information Organizers of the Fox Valley, Inc.
219 April Lane
North Aurora, Illinois 60542
312-896-5837
The Illinois School Library Media Association is interested in learning about school library automation and resource sharing in your state. Any information you can provide us about the retrospective conversion process, costs, system end-products, system maintenance, end-user satisfaction and effects on your local school library media program will help us prepare recommendations for the State of Illinois.

Please answer the survey questions as completely as possible with the knowledge that your responses will be kept strictly confidential. The 15-minute survey can be completed and returned by October 16, 1989 in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope to: Mary Howrey, Information Organizers of the Fox Valley, Inc., 219 April Lane, North Aurora, Illinois, 60542.

1) Are school library media centers participating in a state-wide or regional resource network? YES NO
   If YES, what is the name of the resource network:

   ____________________________________________________________________

   How many schools are involved in the resource network? ___
   How many total libraries participate? ___
   How large is the database? # of Records ___
   The rate of title duplication in the database is ___% 

   For schools to participate in the resource network, the current costs of involvement are:
   Cost of retrospective conversion per item $ ___
   Start-up costs (e.g., equipment) ___
   Annual maintenance costs per item $ ___
   Other costs (e.g., telephone): __________________________

   How were schools selected for participation in the network?

   Who provided funding for the school library media center automation effort in the state or regional network?

   How is the database maintained? What motivates participants to keep the database current?

   What network products have been made available to end-users? (Check those that apply)
   ( ) CD-ROM
   ( ) On-line catalog with dial access
   ( ) Microfiche union catalog
   ( ) Printed union catalog
   ( ) Other: __________________________

   -continued on back-
How has state-wide or regional library automation impacted your local school library media program? (Check those that apply)

( ) Not at all
( ) Increased local circulation by _____%
( ) Increased total local circulation by #_______
( ) Improved quality of cataloging information
( ) Improved local teaching/student curriculum support
( ) Increased interlibrary loan activity by ____%
( ) Increased total interlibrary loans by #_______
( ) Improved cooperative collection development
( ) Other:_________________________________

Rate the statewide database in terms of its:
(Circle the ratings that apply)
Accessibility to a variety of materials: High Moderate Low NA
Accuracy: High Moderate Low NA
Amount of use by students/teachers: High Moderate Low NA
Cost: High Moderate Low NA
Currency: High Moderate Low NA
Ease of use: High Moderate Low NA
Flexibility of search: High Moderate Low NA

Are you satisfied with the network and its endproducts?
YES  NO
If NO, what improvements are needed to insure user satisfaction?

2) Who should we contact for further information about your state or regional resource network?
Name:
Address:
Phone:

Are publications available which describe the network? YES  NO
If YES, please provide the name and source of the publication, or attach if available:
Title of Publication:
Source of Publication:
Date:

3) Other key informants about school library media automation and resource sharing in your state or region are:
Name:  Name:
Address:  Address:
Phone:  Phone:

4) General comments you have about school library media automation and resource sharing in your state:

5) Are you interested in seeing an abstract of the results of School Partners in ILLINET in Summer 1990? YES  NO
Dear Library Automation Vendor:

The Illinois State Library recently awarded the Illinois School Library Media Association (ISLMA) a Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) Grant for a one-year period to support the research project, School Partners in ILLINET. School Partners in ILLINET is a two phase project. The first phase involves identifying what other states have done in linking school libraries for resource sharing. The second phase results in defining technological options open to ISLMA. This second phase is where you, a library automation vendor, can contribute significantly to our understanding.

To facilitate our knowledge of available vendor services and hardware, we ask that you complete the enclosed survey and return it by October 16, 1989 to: Information Organizers of the Fox Valley, Inc. Please route us any literature, demos or endorsements which will allow us to evaluate your services and products and their usefulness for resource sharing.

If you have questions about School Partners in ILLINET or want to elaborate on your services and hardware, call me at 312-896-5837. An answering machine will take any messages or questions you need answered. Your interest in School Partners in ILLINET will make Illinois a leader in school library networking and resource sharing.

Sincerely,

Mary M. Howrey
Project Consultant
The Illinois School Library Media Association is interested in learning about your automation services and systems which would foster school library networking and resource sharing in the State of Illinois. Any information you can provide us about types of services available, costs, system end-product options, system maintenance and operational costs will help us prepare recommendations for the State of Illinois.

Please answer the survey questions as completely as possible and provide us with printed information about your services and system. The enclosed survey can be completed and mailed by October 16, 1989 to: Mary Howrey, Information Organizers of the Fox Valley, Inc., 219 April Lane, North Aurora, Illinois, 60542.

Name of system(s) available for school library automation:

Name of key contact person for further information:
Name__________________________ Phone____________________

Services offered include: (Check those that apply)

( ) Retrospective Conversion Cost per title $____
( ) Online Card Catalog Production Cost per title $____
( ) Search charges for Holdings Info Cost per title $___
( ) CD ROM Union Catalog Production Cost per title $____
( ) Dial Access to Union Catalog Cost per hour $_____ 
( ) Monthly charges for Dial Access port $____
( ) Annual user charges/Maintenance fees $____
( ) Microfiche Union Catalog Production Cost per title $__
( ) Other:________________________________Cost____
( ) Other:________________________________Cost____
(continued on back)
Hardware options for the system include:

( ) Microcomputer Hardware brands__________________________
    Floppy drive ( ) Hard drive ( ) Capacity____K

( ) Mainframe system Hardware brands__________________________

( ) CD ROM drive

( ) Modem-dial access port ( ) Local area network

( ) Microfiche reader or reader/printer

( ) Other:___________________________________________________

Estimated start-up costs for your system are: $____ _______

Included in start-up costs are:

How is the system updated?

What are the annual costs of maintenance and updating?

School library media centers currently using your automated system or services include: (Please attach a list if available)

School Name________________________ State________

Contact Person______________________ Phone________

What is the resource sharing potential of your system?

Please send relevant printed literature, demos or products which demonstrate the value of your system to Information Organizers of the Fox Valley, Inc.
School Partners in ILLINET REMINDER
Date: ______________

**The ISLMA School Partners in ILLINET Project is underway, and the completed surveys are arriving each day! But we want to insure a 100% return rate, so we are sending you this "memory jogger" just in case the survey has not yet been completed and returned to: Information Organizers of the Fox Valley, Inc., 219 April Lane, North Aurora, IL, 60542. If you misplaced the survey, call 312-896-5837 for a replacement copy.**

**If you have returned the survey or plan to do so, THANK YOU for your cooperation in assisting ISLMA with defining Illinois school library automation and resource sharing options.**

Sincerely, Mary Howrey, Project Consultant
TO: SUPERINTENDENTS, ILLINOIS SCHOOL DISTRICTS

We are seeking your assistance in gathering base line data on the current status of automation in school libraries in Illinois.

The brief questionnaire which follows is the first systematic effort to compile a statewide picture which will assist us in developing viable options for school library automation. This survey is part of a Grant Project titled “School Partners in ILLINET” which was developed by the Illinois School Library Media Association. Funding for this grant was provided from the Illinois State Library, a Division of the Office of the Secretary of State, using Federal Library Services and Construction Act funding. The questionnaire was designed by the Library Research Center at the University of Illinois, with the help of an ISLMA Committee consulting with the State Library and the Illinois State Board of Education.

We believe this is an especially exciting project because it will extend a world of resources to all students in Illinois while also allowing more effective utilization of school library materials. We urge you to be sure that the questionnaire reaches the appropriate library staff in your district and that it is returned by the District to the Library Research Center by November 30.

Nancy Bloomstrand
President
Illinois School Library Media Association

Further information on this project is available from the following members of the ISLMA “School Partners in ILLINET” Committee:

Don Adcock, American Association of School Librarians, Chicago, IL
Meg Gibbs, Thornwood High School, South Holland, IL
Dale Guthrie, Salem Community High School, Salem, IL
Joyce Karon, Barrington District 220, Barrington, IL
Kay Maynard, Fairfield Community High School, Fairfield, IL
Carol Morrison, DuPage Library System, Geneva, IL
Joan Roeder, East Peoria District 86, East Peoria, IL
To explore options for linking school libraries to existing Illinois networks, the Illinois School Library Media Association has launched a project titled "School Partners in ILLINET," financed by a grant of LSCA Title III funds and administered by the Illinois State Library. Information that you give us should pertain to your school library only.

Name of School: ____________________________

District Number: ____________ Grades Served: ____________

1. Is your school library collection located in one place in your building?
   _____ yes  (If yes, answer questions 1A-1D)
   _____ no   (If no, go to question 2)

If yes,
   A. At the end of the school year 1988-89, please indicate:
     [ESTIMATE IF NECESSARY]
     1. Number of books/volumes held
        ____________________
     2. Number of book titles held, if known
        ____________________
     3. Number of books/volumes added in 1988-89
        (included in above total)
        ____________________
     4. Number of books/volumes withdrawn in 1988-89
        ____________________
     5. Number of audiovisual items held
        ____________________
     6. Number of audiovisual items added in 1988-89
        ____________________
     7. Number of audiovisual items withdrawn in 1988-89
        ____________________
     8. Number of current magazine subscriptions housed in the library
        a. for teachers/professionals
        ____________________
        b. for students
        ____________________

   B. What percentage of your books/volumes are cataloged?
      [ESTIMATE AS NECESSARY]
      ______________ %

   C. What percentage of your audiovisual items are cataloged?
      [ESTIMATE AS NECESSARY]
      ______________ %

   D. Does your cataloging include
      1. ISBN (International Standard Book Number)?
         _____ yes  _____ yes, for some  _____ no
      2. LCCN (Library of Congress Catalog Number)?
         _____ yes  _____ yes, for some  _____ no
2. If your collection is dispersed in several locations, do you have a centralized card catalog?
   ____ yes  ____ no

3. Are some of your catalog/bibliographic records currently available in machine-readable form?
   ____ yes (If yes, answer questions 8A-C)
   ____ no
   
   A. If yes, are those records: [CHECK ONE]
      ____ Full MARC (Machine-Readable Cataloging)
      ____ Partial or short MARC
      ____ Not in MARC format

   B. What percent of your records were in machine-readable form at the end of the 1988-89 school year? [ESTIMATE IF NECESSARY] ________%

   C. Are any of these records part of a database outside your school district?
      ____ yes  ____ in part  ____ no

      If in part, ____________% of records in outside databases.

4. Which of the following functions are at least partially automated in your library? (IF YES, LIST PRODUCT NAME)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHECK ONE FOR EACH ITEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataloging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overdues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Public Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serials Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Location Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Does your library staff have access to a computer for any of those library functions specified in question 4?
   _____ yes (If yes, answer questions 6 and 7)
   _____ no

6. Is this computer(s) a mainframe computer or minicomputer?
   _____ yes (Please specify brand ______________________)
   _____ no
   If yes,
   A. Is the computer accessed through a modem?
      _____ yes  _____ no
   B. Who owns or has jurisdiction over the computer? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]
      _____ your school building or your library
      _____ your school district
      _____ another library
      _____ your library system
      _____ other (Please specify ____________________________)

7. Does the library have an in-house personal computer (pc) or microcomputer?
   _____ yes  _____ no
   If yes,
   A. Please indicate the type of computer. [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]
      _____ IBM PC or compatible
      _____ Macintosh
      _____ other Apple computer (e.g. Apple II, Apple IIgs)
   B. Are any of these computers part of a local area network (LAN)?
      _____ yes  _____ no

8. Please describe your library's telephone service. [CHECK ONE]
   _____ library has a direct outside line
   _____ library has an extension through main office switchboard
   _____ use phone at another site in the building

   Please give the phone number ____________________________

Thank you for responding. Return surveys by November 30th, to the Library Research Center, 420 David Kinley Hall, 1407 W. Gregory, Urbana, Illinois 61801.
PARTNERS IN ILLINET
SPECIAL REPORT
ILLINOIS SCHOOL LIBRARY MEDIA ASSOCIATION

FALL 1990

CAROL MORRISON, CHAIR

I. THE GOAL

This project was born of frustration at the first ISLMA Conference in October, 1988.

In the midst of a conference program filled with the promises of automation, there was nothing to answer the needs of Illinois school libraries for statewide resource sharing. The hope for state funds for school libraries was in the air, the potential of FAX was becoming a reality, and some schools were already planning for online catalogs. However, no one seemed to be addressing the concept of sharing school library resources.

Those school librarians who had experienced the benefits of access to academic, public, and special library collections found this void overwhelming. The great strength of the Illinois Library Network seemed just beyond the reach of schools. Without a means of offering access to their collections, school libraries could never share their resources with each other or contribute their strengths to other libraries in the state. They could never be full partners in ILLINET.

Our goal became clear. We need to "develop viable options for providing all Illinois libraries with bibliographic access to school library resources in Illinois."

II. THE PROJECT

A project proposal was sent to the Illinois State Library, and in June, 1989, it was approved with a $10,250.00 grant of Library Services and Construction Act funds. We planned to survey Illinois schools to determine the extent of existing library automation and to research projects undertaken by other states.

We contracted with the Library Research Center at the University of Illinois to handle the survey, with Information Organizers to do the background research and with Rayalco to analyze the results of both.

The next few months were busy ones as we designed the questionnaire, found ways to send it to the "library person" in each school, sought additional funding to include private and parochial schools (later we received a $250.00 grant from VOYA/YASD to be used during 1990/91), encouraged school librarians to respond and then helped with tabulating the many variations on responses received.

III. RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

Probably the most amazing result was the fact that we heard from 85% of the public schools in the state! School librarians are definitely interested in automation.

Because some responses covered a whole district instead of a single building, the statistical analysis was based on the 1,894 responses from single buildings. These represent a significant sample of 49% of all surveys mailed.

SOME HIGHLIGHTS

- Card production is currently the most common type of school library automation with 31% (593 schools) having one or another of 57 different products in place.

- Only 1% (21 schools) have online public access catalogs with those 21 schools using 19 different products.

- Over 58% have a personal computer in the library with Apple products being the most common.

- Over 56% (1056 schools) have no phone in the library.

- Together, the 49% of the schools included in the tabulation have over 15 million books and add over half a million more each year.

- Almost 13% of the schools have some part of their inventory in machine readable form, about 9% have this inventory in MARC format. Only 3% (49 schools) have as much as 90% of their holdings in machine readable form.
In short, there's strong interest in school library automation but not much in place yet. This is a real "window of opportunity" for statewide leadership.

IV. RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH

Of the 37 states responding to the questionnaire, 26 (including Illinois) reported some type of resource sharing which includes schools. Three states (New York, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin) described programs involving a majority of the school libraries in the state. New York produced a microfiche catalog, Pennsylvania produced a CD-ROM catalog and Wisconsin produced both.

Several Illinois programs offer a possible foundation for expanding access to school holdings. These include ILLINET Online, the various system databases and Chicago Schools Project Inform.

A wide variety of vendors offer products which could be used in developing statewide access to school holdings. Their technologies and their costs vary greatly. The project produced a wealth of data on vendors and their programs which could be useful to any librarian who was considering automation.

V. FINANCIAL DATA

A. The LSCA Grant of $10,250 was expended as follows:
   - Library Research Center: $4,764.00
   - Technology Consultant: 4,500.00
   - Research Consultant: 986.00
   Total: $10,250.00

B. ISLMA funds were expended as follows:
   - Research Consultant (fee): $514.00
   - Research Consultant expenses: 474.26
   - Postage: 664.52
   - Printing: 599.00
   - Supplies (including envelopes): 440.59
   - Telephone: 54.27
   - Committee travel: 301.70
   Total: $3,048.44

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS TO ISLMA

A. Continue to promote resource sharing. Many librarians and most administrators are not aware of its potential. Learning to utilize existing programs is a vital first step. Understanding the importance of AACR II cataloging and MARC format is also crucial.

B. Promote SILO. (Serials of Illinois Libraries Online). This is a relatively inexpensive way to get involved in an important aspect of resource sharing.

C. Develop awareness of telecommunications technology. Remote delivery of televised classes is becoming more common. Some of this same technology could be used for library resource sharing. Telecommunications may also offer a way around the limited telephone access in school libraries.

D. Utilize the research material collected. This includes much that could be helpful for workshops and for individuals considering automation.

E. Utilize statistical data collected by the survey. The Library Research Center is willing to run survey statistics by school district, by county or by educational region for a small fee. ISLMA might offer this information to those who could use it for local planning.

F. Encourage development of statewide guidelines for school automation. Basic standards exist for converting library records to machine readable format and for providing remote access to bibliographic databases. ISLMA should urge development and promotion of a statement which would emphasize the need for schools to observe these standards. A joint endorsement of such a statement by ISBE and ISL would be a good first step toward a statewide "plan."

G. Explore additional possibilities for grant-funded projects. ISLMA should consider developing more grant proposals or encouraging other agencies to do so. Among the immediate possibilities are:
   1. A regional project to support inclusion of schools in a library system database.
   2. A project to encourage retrospective conversion to MARC format.
   3. A project to encourage school libraries to enter their serials holdings in SILO.
   4. A continuing education project to raise awareness of the value of resource sharing in school library programs.
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