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ABSTRACT: In the past year UMCEES and TAMUG have had to convert from our local library automation programs to those of our main campus. In my case from Circplus (a microcomputer system) Follett to the CARL system, and Natalie from Dynix to NOTIS. We both have that "small fish in the big pond" feel as part of major University systems, and both are at a significant geographic distance from the main campus. Issues addressed are history, methods, ease and cost of conversion as well as pros and cons of being part of much larger systems.

History: The Univ. of Md., C.E.E.S. - Chesapeake Biological Lab started on the road to automation in 1984. Our initial thrust was to choose an inexpensive circulation system which had the capabilities to grow and make use of MARC records. Our second step was use of a CD-ROM product to build our database. I discussed all of the preliminary preparations in my paper "The BiblioFile Connections: from manual to automated" (Heil 1987).

In April of 1988 I became the C.E.E.S. representative to the Council of Library Directors of the University of Maryland and at that same time the University system was being forged into a single State Wide System. Thus the first meeting I attended, May 11, 1988 was a joint meeting of the "old" University of Maryland System Librarians [Univ. of Maryland College Park, University College, University of Maryland School of Law Library, University of Maryland Baltimore County and University of Baltimore, University of Baltimore Law Library and University of Maryland Eastern Shore] and the "Board Schools" (or State Colleges) [Frostburg, Salisbury, Towson, Bowie, and Coppin] as well as the Directors of the then designated "Public independent" State Colleges Morgan and St. Mary's Colleges [Morgan is currently designated as Maryland's Public Urban University] and the Director of the University of Maryland at Baltimore Health Sciences Library.

It was decided at that first meeting that it would be advantageous to us to be the leaders in cooperative efforts for the "new" combined system. Additionally, the "old" State Colleges and the "old" Universities were looking to both sending out R.F.P.'s for new library automation systems. Thus we additionally formed a University System Library Automation Committee which later evolved into the Library Information Management Systems Second Generation (LIMS II).

As Honda says in its new ad campaign: "timing is everything." C.E.E.S. was looking to becoming more fully integrated into the University Library System and this was definitely an
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opportune time to become involved. Most of the credit for our getting involved in the University Wide Library System goes to Dr. Kenneth Tenore (the Director of C.B.L.) and the strong faculty support C.B.L has always demonstrated for Library Services. Dr. Tenore first persuaded Dr. Morris of the importance of C.E.E.S. being represented in the Council of Library Directors and secondly, fully endorsed the need for C.E.E.S.'s participation in the Library Information Management System R.F.P.. Dr. Tenore's strong support was fundamental in C.E.E.S.'s final commitment to participation.

The R.F.P. process for such a complex situation was arduous. I have two filing cabinet drawers full of various versions and the final contract is in two three inch binders. There was nearly a full year of meetings covering each functionality desired and subject specialist/ department head representatives from every campus at those meetings. Basically I was tied up 2-3 days a week at meetings at various locations throughout the State on various functionalities. The MSD approval for the RFP came on June 6, 1989 and the announcement went out in the June 16, 1989 Maryland Register. There was a pre-proposal conference on July 7 for the purpose of answering vendors questions and evaluation scheduled to start in September. Final selection was in the Spring of 1990.

October 23, 1990 a LIMS II celebration of the procurement effort was held recognizing with certificates of appreciation the committee of 64 who contributed to the successful conclusion of the RFP.

Being part of such a large system brings the opportunity for many changes and the necessity for many decisions. I hope to give you a broad overview of the opportunities and options and what I have learned along the way.

The first project that was accomplished, before the LIMS RFP, was an agreement on "Direct Borrowing Privileges" of the Libraries of Maryland Public Colleges and Universities. This is an important forerunner, and has had impact on a number of issues and policies since its implementation.

Summary of Direct Borrowing Privileges: Effective July 5, 1989, any student, faculty or staff member with a currently validated identification card at the following Maryland college and universities is entitled to direct borrowing privileges at the libraries of any of these institutions: Bowie State University, Coppin State University, Frostburg State University, Morgan State University Salisbury State University, St. Mary's College of Maryland, Towson State University, University of Baltimore, University of Maryland at Baltimore (UMAB), University of Maryland Baltimore County (UMBC), University of Maryland Center for Environmental & Estuarine Studies (UMCES), University of Maryland College Park (UMCP), University of Maryland Eastern Shore (UMES), University of Maryland University College (UMUC). USE OF LIBRARY MATERIALS: Each individual has the same on-site use of unrestricted library materials as users at the home institution. The borrowing of library materials is a transaction between the individual borrower and the lending library; the borrower must abide by the rules and regulations of the individual lending institution.....HOW TO BORROW MATERIALS: Borrowers must present to the lending library a validated institution identification card and any other documentation to verify current affiliation with the participating institutions as requested. Users may be asked to go
to their home institution’s library to obtain documentation to verify their current affiliation status before using other libraries. Each lending library reserves the right to deny borrowing privileges to any individual who fails to present sufficient proof of current affiliation with a participating institution. NO TRANSFER OF BORROWING PRIVILEGES: Direct borrowing privileges are not transferable. Borrowers are cautioned not to allow others to use their identification cards since the owner of the card will be solely responsible for any transactions charged to it. WHAT CAN BE BORROWED: Any library material that the institution’s own students, faculty and staff can borrow is available for direct borrowing by other valid users. Some materials may be designated as available for home institution use only (e.g. reserve collections, some nursing collections, rare books, selected legal materials). LOAN PERIODS: Each lending library will offer at least a 21 day loan period to student borrowers. A longer loan period is typically given to faculty and staff users.... RETURN OF MATERIALS: It is the responsibility of the borrower to return the borrowed material to the library from which it was borrowed. The following libraries have established delivery service: UMAB, UMBC, UMCP, UMES and UMUC. Because of this service, users who borrow materials from any of these libraries have the added convenience of returning these materials to any of the libraries listed above. The date of return at the drop-off library will be treated as the date of return to the lending library....

The advantages of being part of the University System include: 1) the ability to see if another Library in the System has an item and if it is available; 2) to place an immediate hold/recall for a desired book (and know that it could arrive in just 3 days - overnight for the computer processing, the next day it appears on the router of the holding library, if it is pulled that day and mailed or UPS’d the same or following day for overnight delivery); 3) the acquisitions files that are being started will help with collection development choices; and 4) the availability of databases such as Uncover.

The drawbacks include: 1) the amount of time it takes being part of a much larger unit; 2) going to frequent distant meetings; 3) having to meet stricter cataloging standards; 4) costs of maintenance and being a part of the system; 5) worrying about how we will be able to continue funding for participation after initial five years; and 6) lack of staffing to pro-actively participate.
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I. LESSONS LEARNED ALONG THE WAY

A. BUDGET

1. PERSONNEL  Don't go it alone. See that there is a budget for a person to be dedicated to the automation task. (Make sure this is someone who knows or will take the time to quickly know your library situation and needs - if you don't have someone you can put in the slot find someone with special library experience (preferably from a Medical or Law Library) they were the closest to us in patron needs.

a. TASKS A full-time person should be employed just to:

   (1) cover meetings, see that your interests are being considered
   (2) review documents and make comments for improvement
   (3) notify you/library committee of necessary changes in policy
   (4) implement necessary changes
   (5) keep the implementation people aware of your status and needs

b. Have regular meetings/briefings (quarterly) with faculty staff and/or administrators.

c. Follow implementation schedules (demand progress reports). It took 3 years for our ITD staff and the vendor to come up with an adequate means of addressing the complexity of implementation and who was responsible for what and how near to completion any task was.

d. Travel.

(1) allow for significant increase for mileage to meetings
(2) allow for attendance at Technology and Implementation Conferences

2. EQUIPMENT

a. If at all possible do NOT use dumb terminals (they limit capabilities too much)

b. Buy computer setups with as much speed and RAM as you can afford (newer systems are more complex and demanding more space (RAM and ROM) and flexibility)

c. Plan on at least doubled use. Even with our campus having direct twisted pair cable connections from most computers the library systems computers are being used with record frequency and there are persons waiting in line.

d. Additionally, plan on at least one computer in the public area having administrative capabilities (to check status of items, etc.)

e. Printer (We did not purchase High Speed printer - the out put we have did not justify the high cost $6,000)
3. SUPPLIES:
   a. PAPER If you buy a high speed printer triple the amount of paper you think you will need our daily reports are always at least 30 pages.
   b. BARCODES. We had to switch to Coda Bar for our books and also added our journal/serials.
   b. ENVELOPES For mailing notices, window envelopes.

4. POSTAGE/UPS
   a. METERED Mail. Significant increase in interlibrary loan requests and in forms to be mailed.
   b. UPS Since most mail within the University system is in one zone it is actually a faster, cheaper and safer way to send books (because of tracking capabilities). The Hold/Recall option has greatly increased our costs in this area (not only because we are borrowing more) but also because other sites are borrowing more from us and because students who live in the area can use us as pickup/delivery sites.

B. OPTIONS

1. MEDIA
   a. Categories
      (1) Previously only had: Periodical, Reference, Maryland, Microforms, Archives
      (2) Needed to add: Class reserves, Permanent Reserves
   b. Loan periods
      (1) Needed to set length of loan by material type
      (2) Needed to decide if material type would override patron type for length of loan
      (3) Needed to decide if there could be overrides in any of the categories.

2. BORROWER TYPE
   a. Categories
      (1) Previously only had: local and visitor
      (2) Needed to differentiate: Faculty, Graduate Students, Staff, Undergraduates, Special Borrowers (actually set 2 types of special borrowers)
   b. Loan Periods
      (1) Previously all materials circulated to local personnel until end of Semester (3 loan periods per year, summer 2 combined into 1)
(2) Set length for Faculty and Graduate Students still at Semester. Varied the others to graduated lengths of time, none less than 28 days.

3. CATALOGING
   a. Conversion
      (1) We used Bibliofile to do as many of our holdings as possible.
      (2) Approximately 80% of our holdings went into the new system with no problems.
      (3) Of the approximately 20% of holdings that did not go into the new system (mainly, because of missing OCLC number) approximately 10% were already in the UMS Catalog and in Maintenance we could pull the record from Global and put a copy into our PAC and then add our barcode information.
      (4) The remaining 10% are currently only accessible in our database by title searching. UMCP has offered to do original cataloging at cost (@$16 per title) but we need grant funding to pursue this.
   b. Temporary Records
      (1) Temporary records are any records in the system that are not full OCLC records. Every campus has a varying number,
      (2) Temporary records can only be searched by TITLE and only in the separate campus catalogs NOT in the GLOBAL catalog.
   c. Global Database
      (1) The Global database shows in a merged format the holdings of any library in the University of Maryland System.
      (2) Global holdings are only applicable to full OCLC records.

C. OPPORTUNITIES
   1. DATABASES
      a. Uncover every campus of the University has access to the Uncover Database. This has proven to be very popular.
      b. Add-ons - many of the campuses have added extra databases either through CARL or through local loader.
         (1) There was a joint proposal for funding through an Undergraduate Education initiative for 3 databases to be added to the catalogs of institutions offering undergraduate programs. (This excluded us and Law Libraries)
2. RESOURCE SHARING
   a. Hold/Recalls
   b. Instant Renewals
   c. (Eventually - I.L.L. photocopies)

D. COSTS

1. ESTIMATED: Our original participation level was greatly modified by the initial cost estimate of over $22,000 for the first year. We dropped having direct connections from our AEL and HPL sites because the Communications equipment was so expensive. We have communications equipment at CBL and we have an indirect link though Salisbury for HPL. Our AEL facility is within 1 block of the Frostburg Library and has no library holding to circulate so it has direct patron access through Internet, but no Staff functionality since none is needed.

2. FORMULA: The formula for cost sharing was designed by Victor Korenman (a physics Professor at UMCP and Asst. VP for Academic Affairs) for whom we named the system “Victor” for all his hard work and dedication. Basically it revolves around User population and Projected holdings over the length of the contract.

3. REAL: We were able to reduce our 1 % assessment to real costs of @ $8,000 per year by limiting our equipment purchases to only the most vital pieces.

4. POSSIBLE CHANGES AT END OF 5 YEAR CONTRACT: It is my hope that our contribution percentage could be decreased somewhat because of collection growth and amount actually added to the system has been significantly less than anticipated.

II. STATE WIDE INITIATIVE
A. What it is:
   1. Computer network of Maryland's libraries
   2. That allows access to scores of public databases as well as Internet
   3. Goal is access by all citizens of Maryland

B. Connectivity
   1. By June 1995, most Maryland public library systems
   2. Many schools and colleges
   3. By phone access from home or office (most calls local)
   4. From Internet: sailor.lib.md.us or 192.188.199.5

C. Access to:
   1. Maryland online library catalogs
   2. Access to Internet
3. Selections of books
4. Dictionaries and other factual resources
5. Community information
6. Federal government information
7. Questions and Comments feedback section
SIZE COMPARISON
OF UNIVERSITY POPULATIONS SERVED

39,590  UMUC
31,928  UMCP
15,713  TSCO
11,038  UMBC
6,258   SSU
5,858   HOGA
5,011   UMAB
5,129   FSU
4,932   BSU
3,046   CSU
2,567   UMES
1,348   STMA
450G   GEES