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ABSTRACT

Designed to provide library service for two or more different groups of library users in one library facility, shared-use or joint-use libraries are a unique aspect of library resources sharing. Thirteen examples of shared-use library collections in shared or joint-use library facilities in Florida were examined in this investigation. Special focus was placed on the perceptions of librarians who work in these libraries in order to determine how well the libraries meet the information needs of users and how successful the libraries are in conserving financial resources as a result of combined collections. A design of a special resource collection for one of the institutions participating in a shared-use library was formulated to demonstrate the planning process for collection sharing. Guidelines and contractual agreements relative to collection development that exist between the various shared-use libraries in Florida were evaluated and used to develop a model for agreements and a mission statement for shared-use libraries. Four types of shared-use library facilities in Florida were included in the study: community college/school libraries, community college/public libraries, community college/university libraries and school/public libraries.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Limits on financial resources, expanding amounts of printed information and changes in electronic technology have encouraged information sharing between multi-type libraries. According to Marlyn Kemper, "A complex problem facing library professionals is the inability to purchase everything that might be needed by their clientele. With steadily decreasing budgets and rising costs, librarians are fighting to maintain a high level of service" (1). In many instances this information sharing has taken the form of electronic networks that allow searching of bibliographic files for interlibrary loan and to build machine readable records. Many libraries in Florida participate in these types of networks through national, state and local systems and consortia. Figures 1, 2, and 3 illustrate library resource sharing networks found in Florida.

Figure 1. National Bibliographic Networks
OCLC is an acronym for Online Computer Library Center (2). Services provided by OCLC include building machine readable databases of bibliographic records for member libraries. Libraries can then use the records for interlibrary loan, acquisitions and conversion of past records. The services are brokered through regional corporations that deal directly with member libraries. The broker for the southeastern part of the country is SOLINET (Southeastern Library Network). Figure 1 illustrates national networks.

Figure 2. State Networks
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The state university libraries of Florida share bibliographic information by participation in FCLA (The Florida Center for Library Automation). Each library has its own database that includes subsystems for circulation, public access, serials control and acquisitions. Through FCLA each library can access the holdings of the other libraries in the network. The network also includes the bibliographic records of two community colleges. Figure 2 illustrates this network.
Two formal regional networks exist in Florida, TBLC (Tampa Bay Library Consortium) and SEFLIN (Southeast Florida Library Network). Figure 3 illustrates the relationship of libraries that participate in TBLC. This network involves all types of libraries except school libraries in a seven county area. The consortium is developing an online database of the collections of member libraries and is providing inter-library loan through telefacsimile delivery and a courier system (3).

Florida has also been a leading state in the development of another kind of library resource sharing, the establishment of libraries that serve differing library clients and agencies from one library collection centrally housed. These shared-use or joint-use libraries are one method of providing for the information needs of the state and of conserving financial resources at the same time. Figure 4 illustrates the concept of a shared-use library.
The concept of one collection serving multiple uses is not new. The public library movement in this country in the late 19th century gained impetus from the lack of libraries in schools and in many cases the public library served as the school library. By default, these libraries served and continue to serve more than one type of library client.

Criticism of the concept of shared-use libraries focuses on differences in the missions and goals of the libraries involved in the shared-use library. In order to accomplish the mission and goals of each type of library, each library provides services that are specific to its own clients (4).

Although the libraries may appear to have similar missions and goals, their methods of service or emphasis may be very different. An academic or school library needs to be easy to access by faculty and staff and located near classrooms. A public library should be located in a population center and provide ample parking.

Academic and school libraries have extensive bibliographic instruction needs. Other types of libraries may seldom require formal library instruction programs. Public libraries are often very involved in activities for pre-school age children.
Academic libraries may require a restrained atmosphere incompatible with the activities of young children. Special libraries may have confidential or very valuable collections with restricted use. Materials that are suitable for adults or post secondary students, may not be suitable for school age students (5).

Because of these and other possible conflicts in services, extreme care in developing agreements and contracts between libraries is essential in all areas of library service. Location of the library building, locations of collections, responsibility for collections, staffing, and budgets, special arrangements, authority for the library, building maintenance and other areas must all be considered in planning for shared-use.

Statement of the Problem

The concept of one library collection serving the needs of a variety of types of library clients makes fiscal sense to legislators and taxpayers. Legislators who are striving to provide information resources demanded by their constituents see combined library collections as providing information access at a reasonable cost. Taxpayers resist the expense of duplicating similar library facilities in a community. But to many library professionals, the idea of merging library collections from school, public, academic and special libraries compromises the mission of these libraries.

A problem exists in attempting to meet the collection requirements of multi-type libraries in one collection.
Information is needed about how a combined library can provide for the special collection needs of member libraries and about the possible benefits and costs of shared-use libraries.

If the mission of a public library is to provide recreational, continuing learning, children's literature and reference materials, how can this library's collection also serve the curriculum needs of an academic institution (6)? If different types of academic institutions such as a university and a community college share a common library, how can it be assured that the research needs of scholars are met and the yet the collection reflects the curriculum and educational level of the student body (7)? If a special library is involved in a shared collection, how can it provide and protect its unique material? These and similar questions are being asked by librarians as institutions consider merged or shared library collections, services and facilities.

Library resource sharing is being mandated in Florida and the development of one library collection to serve multi-type libraries occupying the same physical facility emerges as one answer to meeting the information needs of the state. Economic and political realities have resulted in the establishment of shared library collections in Florida regardless of the hesitation of some library professionals. "The current economic problems of libraries are lack of capital, institutional barriers to innovation, and competitive pressure from more technologically advanced and responsive systems," according to Miriam Drake (8).

Given that shared collection libraries have already been
established and will continue to be established in Florida, an understanding of the benefits and drawbacks of providing access to information through this library design is important to the library profession. For libraries entering into a shared collection library design, it is imperative that participating agencies set guidelines, develop agreements and provide for special requirements through written arrangements for collection management and for financial responsibility for the collection.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to identify and describe the libraries in Florida that have shared-use collections and to determine how successful these libraries have been in serving library users and in conserving financial resources by surveying librarians who work in these libraries. The importance of the study relates to a trend in Florida toward the development of shared-use libraries. For example, three new combined libraries opened in early 1988 and another opened in August 1988.

This study includes the design of a special resource collection serving one agency participating in a shared-use library as an example of collection sharing and development. This library collection serves the Child Welfare Academy at Gadsden. Trainees at the academy also use the shared collection of Gadsden County Public Library and Tallahassee Community College.

The general guidelines and requirements that have been used for shared-use library configurations in Florida and the contractual agreements relative to collection development
policies between these various agencies are evaluated. A general model for these agreements is developed. A mission statement for shared-use libraries is also developed.

The libraries were studied from a historical and current viewpoint by survey and interview. In addition to studying documents about shared-use libraries in Florida, librarians at each of the libraries studied were asked to respond to two questionnaires. Special attention was paid to the perceptions of those interviewed as to what each library gains or loses in sharing collections both in terms of service to users and financial support. Of importance are the positive and negative experiences of librarians in collection development, collection maintenance and collection use in shared-use libraries.

L.J. Amey has stated that "... professionals... have concluded in advance that joint-use libraries will not work... To be fair, however most of the evidence on which they based their attitude was derived from a decidedly negative literature. They lacked information about successful joint-use ventures" (9).

Part of purpose of this study is to discover the attitudes of librarians in joint-use library ventures in Florida.

Four types of shared-use library facilities in Florida are relevant to the study: school/public libraries, school/community college libraries, community college/public libraries; and community college/university libraries. The libraries included in the study are listed in Table 1.
Table 1. Florida’s Shared-Use Libraries

| University of South Florida (USF) and Edison Community College (ECC) |
| The University of South Florida (USF) and Polk Community College (PCC) |
| The University of Central Florida (UCF) and Brevard Community College (BCC) |
| The University of Central Florida (UCF) and Daytona Beach Community College (DBCC) |
| The University of West Florida (UWF) and Okaloosa-Walton Junior College (OWJC) |
| Florida Atlantic University (FAU) and Palm Beach Junior College (PBJC) |
| South Regional Library, Broward County and Broward Community College (BCC) |
| Gadsden County Public Library, The Florida Child Welfare Academy, Gadsden Center and Tallahassee Community College (TCC) |
| Lecanto High School and Central Florida Community College (CFC) |
| Gateway High School and Valencia Community College (VCC) |
| Meadowlaine Community Library and Meadowlaine Elementary School |
| Stone Community Library and Stone Middle School |
| St. Petersburg Public Library Azalea Branch and Azalea Middle School |

Background and Significance

In 1977 the State Library of Florida studied the concept of combined school/public libraries to determine the potential for improved service. Two libraries of this type existed in the state at that time, Meadowlaine Community Library and Stone Community Library, both in Melbourne. These libraries were part of the study. According to Wilma Woolard in her survey of Combined School/Public Libraries, "[Florida concluded] that the combined school/public library does provide a possible solution for communities unable to support separate facilities offering
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In 1977 the State Library of Florida studied the concept of combined school/public libraries to determine the potential for improved service. Two libraries of this type existed in the state at that time, Meadowlane Community Library and Stone Community Library, both in Melbourne. These libraries were part of the study. According to Wilma Woolard in her survey of Combined School/Public Libraries, "[Florida concluded] that the combined school/public library does provide a possible solution for communities unable to support separate facilities offering
minimum services. However, such programs are difficult to implement successfully and must be subject to a number of special considerations" (10). The overall tone of the report cautions against this type of library resource sharing.

Central Florida Community College opened a center in the rural community of Lecanto in 1985. Classes are taught in the Roger Weaver Educational Complex which was also opened at that time and consists of kindergarten through senior high buildings on one campus. The community college utilizes the senior high classrooms and the senior high library. Valencia Community College is involved in a similar venture at its Osceola Center in Kissimmee with Gateway High School.

Community College/public library shared collections is recent as a formal concept, but as Joseph Lindenfeld points out "there are probably very few community college libraries that do not cooperate with nearby public libraries (11). In 1978 Thomas Reitz reported on the attempts made by Seminole Community College to provide public library service on a non-contractual basis as a public service to area residents since there was an "absence of free county wide public library service" previous to 1976 (12). Reitz continues "Public library service by academic libraries is certainly not new, .... The amount and propriety of this type of activity will certainly vary with the other kinds of library service available in a given area. Institutions surrounded by strong county or municipal service will not feel the need to compete with or duplicate these services.... Academic service to the public may even retard the development of good public library
service" (13). Twenty years later Seminole Community College is still providing this service.

A well publicized example of a public library and a community college library sharing a facility is the South Regional Library of Broward County which opened in 1983. According to librarian, Deborah Passalacqua, "When the Broward County Library System and Broward Community College joined forces in 1981 to plan the South Regional/Broward Community College Library, they faced a major challenge. How could they integrate the functions of public library, community college library, learning resources center and classrooms in one building" (14)? Existing collections needed to be merged and a plan for collection development designed. Jessica Roberts, another librarian at the facility, has commented on the expanded number of periodicals and indexes and "the South Regional Library has a guaranteed book budget since its contract with the school requires the purchase of $100,000 of material annually. That part of the library's $200,000 plus materials budget couldn't be cut even in a lean year" (15). Problems in deselection of materials have arisen as the library has matured that relate to differing needs in collection development between public and academic libraries and a liaison librarian position has been deleted.

In 1986, Tallahassee Community College and Gadsden County, Florida entered into an agreement whereby the college purchased the old Gadsden Memorial Hospital and agreed to renovate the building to house community college classrooms, the state training academy for child welfare, and the main branch of the Gadsden Public Library with the public library serving the
community, the community college students and the staff and trainees of the academy. The establishment of an academy to train workers hired by Health and Rehabilitative Services in the field of child welfare has required the development of a special resource library for research and training which is a component of the facility. Courses at the academy are structured in two to four week sessions requiring students to be residents of the Academy during their training. Courses began in the fall of 1987. The public library moved to its new location in February 1988. Community college courses in the new facility began in the fall of 1987 (16). The design of a core collection for the academy library and suggestions for the use of Gadsden Public Library by academy staff and trainees is a component of this study.

An important concept is revealed in the agreements reached in these two instances of academic libraries sharing collections with public libraries. The design of the Broward Community College and Broward County shared collections contract requires the county to purchase materials to support the college curriculum. The Tallahassee Community College and Gadsden County Public Library contract requires that the college provide the materials needed for curriculum support. (The special library at the Gadsden Center is under the umbrella of the community college contract.)

The University of South Florida has two sites that combine university and community college library resources. These cooperative agreements are between the University and Edison Community College and the University and Polk Community College.
service" (13). Twenty years later Seminole Community College is still providing this service.

A well publicized example of a public library and a community college library sharing a facility is the South Regional Library of Broward County which opened in 1983. According to librarian, Deborah Passalacqua, "When the Broward County Library System and Broward Community College joined forces in 1981 to plan the South Regional/Broward Community College Library, they faced a major challenge. How could they integrate the functions of public library, community college library, learning resources center and classrooms in one building" (14)?

Existing collections needed to be merged and a plan for collection development designed. Jessica Roberts, another librarian at the facility, has commented on the expanded number of periodicals and indexes and "the South Regional Library has a guaranteed book budget since its contract with the school requires the purchase of $100,000 of material annually. That part of the library's $200,000 plus materials budget couldn't be cut even in a lean year" (15). Problems in deselection of materials have arisen as the library has matured that relate to differing needs in collection development between public and academic libraries and a liaison librarian position has been deleted.

In 1986, Tallahassee Community College and Gadsden County, Florida entered into an agreement whereby the college purchased the old Gadsden Memorial Hospital and agreed to renovate the building to house community college classrooms, the state training academy for child welfare, and the main branch of the Gadsden Public Library with the public library serving the
ECC/USF began in 1981, and PCC/USF opened in 1988. The University of Central Florida opened a combined use facility in cooperation with Daytona Beach Community College in 1987. Brevard Community College and the University of Central Florida have operated a shared campus for a number of years in Cocoa. Florida Atlantic University has been under contract for eight years to provide library services for students at the South Campus of Palm Beach Junior College and the University of West Florida, and Okaloosa-Walton Junior College share a collection at their Ft. Walton Beach site (17).

According to Jean Froscher, a librarian at Edison Community College, the shared-use concept between USF and ECC was in response to a directive from (then) State Commissioner of Education, Ralph Turlington, to cut back on educational capital outlay funding and explore the feasibility of shared facilities at all levels of institutional expansion. "In compliance... a novel plan was developed by ECC and USF. Cooperation is the key word in this innovative action" (18).

Cooperation between libraries for the purpose of collection sharing has been documented since the 19th century. National and international projects such as the Farmington Plan (1947) concentrated on collection development. Machine readable records made OCLC and RLG feasible in the 1970's. Most recent efforts in library resource sharing have been the refinement and development of electronic networks on local and national levels. Joel S. Rutstein has stated that "in order to accomplish any success in a resource sharing environment libraries must be familiar with one another's holdings" (19). He goes on to say that a collection
policy statement is the working tool of cooperation (20). Each library must have a rationale for its collection, be able to describe its collection, and provide accountability for the collection to the funding agency. These concepts are crucial when considering cooperative contractual agreements between more than one agency in developing a shared library collection. Before a shared-use library can begin, each library involved must understand its own collection requirements and its own financial basis for collection support. Only then, can the libraries plan for a shared-use library.

Limitations of the Study

The scope of this study is limited to those libraries in Florida that participate in one of the patterns of shared-use described earlier in this chapter. The study is limited to libraries that share their collections in one physical facility and by design use one collection to meet the various information needs of the user groups of the cooperating libraries.

The study concentrates on the collections of the libraries and does not discuss other aspects of the shared-use concept such as the design of the building or staffing except as those areas relate to how the collections meet user needs or conserve financial resources of the libraries. The study focuses on two aspects of collection management in shared-use libraries: 1) collection services to the library user groups; and 2) financial responsibility for the library collection. The study is planned
to determine if the librarians of these libraries perceive that the needs of the library users are being met and if the shared-use library design conserves financial resources.

The libraries in Florida that participate in this library design are: three school/public libraries; two school/community college libraries; two community college/public libraries, one of which includes a special library; and six community college/university libraries. Because of the limited number of libraries involved in shared-use in Florida, the population of the study includes all of the libraries. For the statistical results of the study, one librarian from each institution participating in a shared-use library is surveyed since in several instances only two librarians are involved.

The perceptions of the library directors, other library personnel, administrators of the agencies involved, and designers or planners of the libraries studied are included when they relate to the collections of the libraries and the financial resources of the libraries.

Major Issues and Research Questions

The major issues and research questions resulted from a study of the literature on the subject of combined libraries to find a rationale for the establishment of these libraries. Recent articles such as those collected by L.J. Amey in COMBINING LIBRARIES: THE CANADIAN AND AUSTRALIAN EXPERIENCE (21) verified the pertinence of the issues and questions.

Does a shared-use library meet the information needs of the library user? Does this library design provide library service
for all of the library user groups involved and is this service at least as good as the service that would have been available from separate libraries? Or does this type of library result in mediocre collections that lack the specificity and depth that might be found in separate libraries?

Does one library determine the direction or emphasis of the collection? What is the mission of a shared-use library? How are the questions about the differences in the missions and goals of various types of libraries that are raised by library professionals resolved in planning a shared-use collection?

Do the libraries that form a shared-use library find savings in expenditures for collections? Are expenditures between the library agencies decided and maintained in a mutually agreeable fashion?

These are major issues examined in this study. Studying examples of shared-use libraries in Florida can help determine if sharing library collections is a viable solution to providing library services to different user groups and to conserving financial resources.
Definition of Terms

Definitions are based on following texts: LIBRARY MANAGEMENT by Robert D. Stueart and John T. Eastlick; INTRODUCTION TO LIBRARIANSHIP by Jean Key Gates; JOINT-USE FACILITIES FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION IN FLORIDA by the Florida Postsecondary Education Planning Commission; A STUDY OF THE COMBINED SCHOOL PUBLIC LIBRARY by Shirley L. Aaron and Sue O. Smith; THE PUBLIC LIBRARY MISSION STATEMENT, American Library Association; and THE TASK FORCE ON LEARNING RESOURCES OF FLORIDA'S COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM, Florida Association of Community Colleges and the State Board of Community Colleges.

Academic Library -- A library designed to provide library support for a post-secondary educational institution.

Community College Library -- A library designed to provide library support for a two-year post-secondary educational institution, a Junior College Library.

Community College/Public Library -- A library designed to provide library support for a two-year post secondary educational institution and a specific community and financed by both the institution and the community.

Community College/University Library -- A library designed to provide library support for a two-year post secondary educational institution and a four-year (and graduate) post-secondary educational institution and financed by both.
Collection -- An organized group of library materials.

Goal -- A broad philosophical aspiration that an organization seeks to obtain.

Joint-Use Libraries -- (See Shared-Use Libraries)

Library Client (Clientele) -- (See Library User)

Library Network -- A method of linking libraries for cooperation and resource sharing often by electronic technology.

Library User -- A person who accesses the materials of a library, a library client, library clientele, or library patron.

LUIS -- Library Users Information Service. The online bibliographic database used for circulation, public access, and acquisitions by university libraries in Florida. It is a modification of the NOTIS system developed by Northwestern University.

MARC -- Machine readable cataloging. A standard developed by the Library of Congress for the equivalent of cataloging cards recorded on magnetic tape.

Merged Collection -- (See Shared Collection)

Mission -- A statement of the purpose of an organization.

Multi-Type Libraries -- More than one type or kind of library.

Public Library -- A library designed to provide library support for a specific community, financed by that community, and available for use by the community.
Resource Sharing -- A method of providing access and use of the materials of one library by another library.

School/Community College Library -- A library designed to provide library support for an elementary or secondary level educational institution and a two-year post-secondary educational institution and financed by both institutions.

School Library -- library designed to provide library support for an elementary or secondary level educational institution, a School Media Center.

School Media Center -- (See School Library)

School/Public Library -- A library designed to provide library support for an elementary or secondary level educational institution and a specific community and financed by both the institution and the community.

Services -- Areas of library activity that fulfill a need such as User Services or Technical Services.

Shared Collection -- An organized group of library materials housed in one library building and developed by more than one type of library for use by more than one type of library user.

Shared-Use Library -- More than one type of library occupying one library building and serving more than one type of library user, a joint-use library.

Special Library -- library designed to provide library support
for a certain organization such as a corporate library.

SUS -- State University System (Florida). The nine public universities.

University Library -- A library designed to provide library support for a four-year (and graduate) post secondary educational institution.
Summary

A study of shared-use libraries in Florida is important because the state continues to seek ways to provide for the informational needs of citizens while acting in a conservative manner in the expenditure of state revenue. Shared-use libraries are an option in meeting this obligation.

In January 1985, the regents of the university system issued "A Path to Excellence in Public Higher Education in Florida." This report and its recommendations were the result of a regent's study of educational funding (22). Recommendation 6 is on joint-use facilities. The report states that "Joint use of facilities with other agencies, both public and private, could result in expanding the capacity of the System's physical plant " (23). The study's recommendation is that "The Board of Regents should assess the Joint-Use Facility Program to determine whether this method of providing space could be expanded to realize greater savings " (24).

Additionally the Post Secondary Planning Commission issued a statement in January 1988 that considers options for automation of various types of libraries. The report is specific to community college libraries and recommends that any current funding of automation projects be limited to those community college libraries that share facilities with university libraries (25).
Each of the shared-use libraries in Florida that were operating at the time of the study is included. Information about the libraries was gathered by surveying librarians at the shared-use libraries. Site visits were made to most of the libraries to gather further information.

Developing a model for agreements for shared-use is part of the work. Agreements in use at the libraries were requested to help develop this model. A mission statement for shared-use libraries is designed as another
CHAPTER II

Review of the Literature

The Review of the Literature is presented in three sections: The Learning Society, Types of Libraries, and Library Cooperation Through Shared-Use Libraries. Libraries are being challenged to examine new ways to provide access to information and to share resources. Combining the resources of different types of libraries in one library facility is one way to meet this challenge.

Library networks, library cooperation, and library resource sharing are components of an information based society. In reviewing the literature on shared-use libraries, ways that shared-use libraries contribute to access to information were studied. Different types of libraries have evolved to meet the needs of specific groups of library users. Yet, there are examples of different types of libraries that have combined resources in a cooperative effort to meet the information needs of expanded groups of users. Reports of these cooperative efforts form part of the review of the literature.

The Learning Society

"The United States is rapidly shifting from a mass
industrial society to an information society, and the final impact will be more profound than the nineteenth century shift from an agricultural to an industrial society" (26). If John Naisbitt is correct in this assessment then libraries of all kinds, the traditional storehouses of information, must prepare for this impact.

The Changing Roles of Libraries

One way of determining what the role of libraries is in an information based society is to look to the needs of users. Who needs information? What kind of information is needed? How can it be delivered accurately, reliably and quickly? The question for library professionals is not how libraries will change, but how can libraries respond to the information needs of users? Burt Nanus of the Center for Futures Research has stated "users will need protection from the potential abuses of an information based society—distortion or manipulation of information, fraud, violations of privacy, information overload, and exploitation of the information poor by the information rich. A focused national concern for managing the evolution of information services in the interest of social excellence and user protection now seems to be a matter for high national priority" (27).

In 1982 then Secretary of Education, T.H. Bell, appointed a commission to assess the quality of education in America and to compare it to other countries. The report of this committee was presented in 1983 and is titled "a Nation at Risk: the Imperative for Educational Reform." This report did not explicitly refer to libraries as part of the educational process
and the library profession reacted to this omission by holding seminars called the Libraries and Learning Society Project to emphasize the importance of libraries in education.

Peggy Sullivan remarks in her paper that was part of the project that "The services that libraries offer to the learning society are determined by the amount and kind of personnel, materials and physical facilities that can be deployed to provide those services. To these traditional components of service must be added one that cuts across all of them and that can increase their individual strengths when well utilized: the linkages among libraries" (28). Sullivan delineates four major categories or types of libraries and points out how these categories of libraries can work together in cooperative efforts to provide information services.

Although it is difficult to forecast how information services of the future will evolve, certain directions are likely. We can expect some traditional libraries to continue. We can expect the private sector to become increasingly involved in providing information services. We can expect storage formats and methods of accessing information to change. We can expect libraries to continue to investigate methods of information sharing, networking and cooperation.

Libraries for Library Users

In addressing the problem of defining library networks, Alphonse Trezza remarks "Working together, sharing resources and services, and believing in each other's motives can make it possible for us to consider the possibility of one type of
library, i.e., a user-oriented library -- not a collection centered library; a service-centered library, not a process-centered library" (29). Trezza discusses the role of the library as it acts as an intermediary between users and new technology. He makes a case for a blurring of the definition of types of libraries and an increase in emphasis on the information needs of users. "Perhaps during the next 20 years, the time for the demise of distinction between academic, school, public and special library will arrive" (30).

Miriam Drake and Harold Olsen looked at changes in academic libraries in the late 1970's. They state, "Changing economic conditions and pressure for greater productivity from the public sector will be the major factors stimulating innovation in libraries. It is clear that institutions of higher education can no longer afford traditional libraries and comprehensive collections" (31). Economic retrenchment in higher education seemed likely and these authors forecast that services would be altered and resource sharing through library networks would increase. They conclude that "Librarians will need to set aside outdated attitudes about library service, risk-taking, money and numbers, and rise to the need to innovate" (32).

Library professionals must prepare for change but "Sad to say, the library, logically one of the institutions most concerned and involved with information technology, has not been much involved with its development. If librarians are willing to face facts, they will admit that the library is not used as much as it should be. Many students and faculty members do not use libraries, and libraries are expensive to maintain in view of the
cost and this relatively small use .... studies will undoubtedly lead to suggested changes in the form in which literature is accessed, indexed and retrieved, in order to make it more accessible and available to researchers. The form should be determined by the function of information in terms of the users needs at specific points in the innovation process, rather than having the form determined by the need of the librarian" (33). The shared-use library is one method of focusing on the needs of the library user in an information based society.

**Types of Libraries**

This study addresses combining the collections of a library of one type with those of a library of another type and forming a third type of library with a shared collection. For purposes of this study the types of libraries are defined as school, public, community college, university and special.

**School Libraries**

School libraries exist to support the educational goals of the school and its curriculum. Modern school libraries provide educational support services in a variety of formats. Jane Anne Hannigan has stated that "The child is the center of the schooling process. All of the resources, services and programs offered by the school media center must, therefore, be designed to facilitate the child's growth as an aware, productive and fulfilled human being" (34).

School librarians have produced sets of standards under the auspices of the American Library Association and the Association
for Educational Communications and Technology which delineate the role of the school library in supporting the curricular needs of schools and school districts. Bibliographic instruction and awareness of literature through storytelling and booktalks are important components of the school library. Educational media and the equipment needed to use this media is usually channeled through the school library. School libraries are frequently available only during the school day and may be open libraries, where students can use the library at any time, or closed libraries, where students use the library only at times allotted for their class. School libraries are referred to as Media Centers and school librarians as Media Specialists.

Jean Gates reminds us that although the basic purposes of a school library are applicable to all levels of library service in schools, there are in practice three levels of school libraries: elementary, middle or junior high and senior high. These three types of school libraries require specific kinds of service (35).

"The school program of this decade calls for broad curricular offerings, attention to individual differences, and independent study and inquiry, all supported by a wide variety of resources and the library/media center becomes the natural center for learning" (36). What Gates is pointing out, is that for many schools, the traditional functions of a school library have been merged with the instructional opportunities of evolving technology to form a new type of educational support service.

Public Libraries

Public libraries have long dealt with defining their mission
and setting standards for public library service. The first standards for public libraries were issued by the American Library Association in 1934. Since public libraries are service agencies responsive to a community, each library is different. "The only really essential requirement in the definition of a public library is that its use should be free to all residents of the community on equal terms" (37). Jean Gates uses this definition in discussing the municipal public library. The definition is from Careleton Bruns Joeckel in 1935 from "The Government of the American Public Library."

Gates states that "It is the function of the ... public library to provide the printed and nonprinted materials to meet the individual and group needs of its constituency for information, education, self-realization, recreation, and cultural growth and for assistance in carrying out their duties as citizens and members of the community" (38).

Community College Libraries

These libraries support colleges offering the first two years of post-high school education. Traditionally, they have been referred to as Learning Resources Centers. The terminology was developed in order to emphasize that these libraries were sources for a variety of types of information found in a variety of formats. Standards for community college libraries were one of the first to be established by the American Library Association and have been both qualitative and quantitative.

In discussing community college libraries, Gates states that
the community college library should include all forms of recorded information owned by the college and the collection should be selected and developed on the basis of the educational philosophy of the college, its curriculum, instructional methods, student characteristics, faculty needs and other services (39).

Guidelines for community college libraries were published by the American Library Association in 1972 and quantitative standards were written in 1979 (40). New Guidelines were issued in 1982 and are not quantitative. "These guidelines are diagnostic and descriptive in nature....[and] have been prepared to give direction to two-year colleges desiring to develop comprehensive Learning Resources Programs" (41).

University Libraries

University libraries support the educational programs of the institutions by providing curriculum support and by providing materials for in-depth research by faculty and students on the undergraduate and graduate levels. "For the undergraduate students, the library program provides materials and services specifically designed to meet their requirements. For the students pursuing advanced study, the faculty members involved in that level of study, and the resident or visiting research specialists, it provides resources and services to support each of the graduate programs and materials of sufficient quantity and diversity to support research of whatever kind in every subject field" (42).

College library standards were first prepared for the American Library Association in 1959, revised in 1975 and again
revised in 1986. These standards give general guidelines and formulas for evaluating collections in eight sections (43). The model statement for the mission of undergraduate libraries as approved by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ALA) states that the "Subject scope of the undergraduate library will primarily support the teaching curriculum (44).

Special Libraries

Special libraries exist to meet the needs of a defined library clientele. These libraries serve the information needs of organizations with information pertinent to the work of that organization. "The determining factor in the organization of the collection is the necessity for quick and efficient access" (45). Special libraries have been leaders in using technology to meet the information needs of special segments of society such as business, industry, law and medicine. These libraries have collections limited to specific subject areas. Their collections are sometimes confidential or restricted in use so that sharing a special collection with the collection of another library requires a carefully designed agreement for cooperation.

Although all libraries are, in general, places where information is kept in some organized fashion for the purpose of study, reference and learning, libraries in the United States have evolved to meet the needs of specific groups of library users: the public at large, school age children, college students, graduate and research students and corporate or business or other special users. Combining the collections of these different types of libraries requires considering the
special collection requirements of the libraries involved in shared-use.

Library Cooperation Through Shared-Use Libraries

Nearly ten years ago the United States Office of Education sponsored a conference to explore the implications of expanding library networks throughout the nation. This conference focused on electronic technology as a means of improving access to information held in the nation's libraries but was also cognizant of existing cooperative arrangements for information management and delivery ranging from cooperative serials purchasing between libraries to storage and preservation. "Cooperative acquisitions development is provided by several networks. The Southwest Academic Library Consortium members voluntarily participate in collection development, and a state plan for serials acquisition has been developed by the Health Science Library and Information Cooperative of Maine" (46).

The conference appendixes reveal that the idea of other types of library cooperation were also the concerns of those library professionals discussing the future of American libraries. "... Cooperation should be increased - between the Public School Libraries, the Public Library and the libraries of the University of the District of Columbia in order to capitalize on existing resources. Cooperation might extend to centralized processing and purchasing operations," (47) according to a resolution passed by the District of Columbia's Governors' Conference on Libraries and Information Services. Although there
is no specific mention of shared collections, at least the inference can be made that centralized processing and purchasing implies sharing collection information.

Accountability in libraries involved in cooperative collection development was studied by Maitel Cason. Her emphasis was on Research Libraries Group libraries and she traced the history of cooperative collection development in academic libraries. Her studies emphasize the need for evaluation and definition of collections in order to share resources (48).

Thirty years ago, an entire issue of LIBRARY TRENDS was devoted to the issue of "Building Library Resources Through Cooperation." Ralph Esterquest, who edited the issue, stated that "the underlying objective and raison d'etre of cooperation is to increase the nation's total library resources without correspondingly increasing library expenditures....cooperation will enable libraries to give more satisfactory service, whatever their financial resources than would be possible without it" (49). His idea can be applied to libraries which are sharing collections in Florida today.

Shared College Collections

Eileen Thornton, in studying cooperation between college libraries cites, in the same issue of LIBRARY TRENDS, North Central College and the Evangelical Theological Seminary in Naperville, Illinois (50). In 1954 these two institutions dedicated a joint library with a common administration and service area and special areas for the college and the seminary. All books owned by each school remained vested in that
institutions and all new books became the property of the shared library. The institutions could transfer their previous collections to the new library but they were not required to do so. The library incorporated and formed its own separate board of trustees which determined on an annual basis what monies should be contributed by each institution for collection development and operation.

This library was formed because neither of the parent institutions had the financial resources to provide for the information needs of their students. Together they were able to finance a new building capable of holding 140,000 volumes and seating 340 library users. Twenty years later, the two libraries dissolved the corporation. The seminary removed its books and periodicals. By telephone interview, it was found that this was not viewed as having a positive effect on the collection (51).

A shared-use library is part of the Auraria Higher Education Center in Denver. This center includes the Denver Campus of the University of Colorado, Metropolitan State College and the Community College of Denver at one location. The center was created because the three institutions were seeking to expand and improve educational offerings in Denver and because the city, county and state were involved in financing these institutions. In April 1974 the center was established by law (Colorado House Bill 1163) (52).

In preparation for the shared-use library, the library of Metropolitan State College assumed the responsibility for ordering, cataloging and processing materials for the three libraries. The periodicals librarian for Metropolitan State in
In 1973, Terry Ann Mood, stated in an article in COLORADO ACADEMIC LIBRARIES, that "Cooperation is not limited to the Technical Services areas; other areas of the Libraries are also involved in the cooperative effort" (53).

According to Marilyn Mitchell, Assistant Director for Collection and Automation Services at the Auraria Library, the library has always been administered by the University of Colorado and currently all money is "appropriated to the University of Colorado which passes it on to the library through the University budget process" (54). Appropriations are based on full-time equivalent students (FTE) at each institution. A board of directors is responsible for the school and consists of four directors appointed by the governor and one member each from the state board of community colleges, the regents of the University of Colorado, and the trustees of the state colleges of Colorado.

The Carnegie Branch Library and Community Education Center in Houston, Texas is a shared-use library established between the Houston Public Library, the Houston Independent School District and Houston Community College in 1982. The director of the public library, David Henington, stated that most cooperative ventures housed in schools have met with little success. "The Carnegie project is one that the library profession will be watching closely," according to Henington, because it is one of the few times that a school library has been placed in a public library (55). Dr. Monroe Neff, dean of adult and continuing education for Houston Community College remarked that "Without the library's extensive collection of materials, we would be unable to offer this spectrum of course offerings" (56).
library is planned as part of a community educational park that includes a middle and high school. The public school system contracts with the public library for services. The community college leases space from the public library.

Also in Texas, Laredo Junior College and Laredo State University have operated a shared library since 1970 at the time the University began offering courses in the area. "What this means is that all faculty and students of both institutions have equal access to the entire facility -- book collection and services. All the books owned by each institution are listed in the general card catalog. The cooperative agreement took a significant step forward in September of 1974 when the book collection became integrated" (57). The general agreement for this shared-use library states that the reason for combining the college and university collections is to realize economies of effort and to improve library services through sharing resources (58).

The State Board of Community Colleges of Florida issued a Master Plan for Community Colleges in 1988 titled "Challenges". Challenge 6 is "To provide sufficient learning resources that complement classroom instruction and the total learning environment" (59). The community college system in Florida consists of 28 colleges located throughout the state to provide college education within commuting distance for all citizens of the state. As a result, many of the colleges have more than one campus. Nine public universities are located throughout the state. Both the community college system and the university system have a commitment to the concept of providing a learning
environment. To date, six examples of community colleges and universities sharing library collections have been established. All, with one exception, involve branch campuses of state universities. A seventh site opened in late summer 1988 (Palm Beach Jr. College, North Campus).

Joint-use facilities, including library facilities, were particularly attractive to post-secondary educational institutions in Florida from 1976 to 1985 because of a statute passed in 1976 that allowed for a procedure outside the usual channels for allocating capital outlay funds for joint-use facilities. This statute, s235.195,FS, subsequently amended, "removed joint-use projects from consideration in the development of the three-year priority lists for educational facilities construction developed by the State Board of Community Colleges and the Board of Regents" (60).

Shared Community College/Public Libraries

Joseph F. Lindenfeld in studying six instances of cooperation between community colleges and public libraries states that "Most community colleges offer open admissions, as do public libraries. Most public libraries actively encourage lifelong learning as do community colleges. Many community colleges have extensive developmental/remedial programs, as do some public libraries. And both usually put learning and the provision of information above scholarly research" (61). Lindenfeld sees cooperation between these two types of libraries as part of a trend.

The six libraries discussed by Lindenfeld have shared-use
collections. These libraries are Flathead Valley Community College and Flathead County Montana Libraries, Blytheville Arkansas Public Library and Mississippi County Community College, Noarlunga Australia Community College and Public Library, Carnegie Branch Library and Community Education Center Houston Texas, Broward Community College and Broward County Florida South Regional Library, and Memphis and Shelby County Tennessee Public Library and Shelby State Community College (62).

Lindenfeld directs the last mentioned shared-use library. The library is located on the campus of Shelby State Community College and the college pays for all of the operating expenses. College students have borrowing privileges at all branches of the public library. The public library assumes responsibility for technical services (63).

Lindenfeld finds four factors that are necessary for this type of library cooperation: common needs, resources that the other library wants in terms of funding, space, staff etc., clear boundaries of responsibility, and good will. "If each party is not willing to share something and to listen and help in the event of a disagreement, then cooperation cannot work" (64).

Shared School/Public Libraries

Studies and surveys by Wilma Woolard of school and public library shared collections and buildings were mentioned in Chapter 1. Woolard reports that her studies indicate that these combined libraries are most likely to be successful in communities with populations of less than 5,000 She finds that
communication and community involvement is higher in smaller communities and that these factors combined with a desire to conserve financial resources make innovative library resource sharing possible. She cites remarks by John Berry to the effect that if librarians don't develop library programs that offer better library service more economically and efficiently than the traditional structuring of separate library service areas, that citizens and legislators will impose their own alternatives (65).

Amey's study of school/public libraries in Canada showed that the professional librarians who were surveyed agreed (97% of the school librarians) (95% of the public librarians) that there was a difference in purpose between school and public libraries. Moreover Amey's study showed that these library professionals thought that students would not benefit from improved services from a combined library (66). These results indicate a perception in the library profession that the different types of libraries have different missions and goals and that this is problematic to librarians in considering shared-use.

Lawrence Jaffe studied collection development and resource sharing in the combined school/public library. He found that "Libraries employing a combined structure have usually received negative treatment in library literature with recommendations to abandon such service arrangements. Despite this unfavorable treatment, the interest in and use of combined libraries persists, primarily due to lack of funds and community desires to maximize the use of physical facilities" (67). Jaffe found in studying these school/public libraries in Pennsylvania that 50% (eight out of sixteen interviews) of librarians thought that the
shared-use library resulted in better services to students. That leaves 50% who were not convinced. One librarian who is cited by Jaffe states that because of the differing goals of the libraries, coordination of purchases, programs and services may be precluded (68). Jaffe found that a major problem in collection development dealt with governance. If the libraries did not have a combined structure for budget, selection of materials was constrained.

Jaffe points out that even though some combined school/public libraries appear to meet the needs of their users, these are in small communities. "For example, collection size and circulation records in a village of 2000 cannot be contrasted to the services offered by a library with a potential service population of 20,000" (69).

Jaffe studied five areas of shared-use in school/public libraries and developed elements for success in each area. In the area of collection development he states the following element as necessary for success: "The combined school/public library must strive to select and acquire a balanced collection for all patrons and establish the most simple and useful means of access to materials" (70).

Shirley Aaron and Sue Smith conducted a three phase study of combined school/public libraries in 1977-78 in order to determine their feasibility in Florida. Phase one consisted of visits to seven libraries outside of Florida. The second phase was visits to the Stone and Meadowlane Libraries in Melbourne and phase three was a checklist for libraries and communities considering forming combined school/public libraries. The results of this
study are mentioned in Chapter I, however to restate, it was found that if resources were available to support separate school and public libraries, combining these libraries would not result in better services. If resources were not available for both school and public libraries, then combining the two was a possible solution.

The oldest and largest combined school/public library system exists in Kansas City. The system was established in 1873 and the public library administration still reports to the school board. Seven of the thirteen public library branches are in schools. Susan Cherry quotes Harold R. Jenkins, director of the public library, about some of the problems in this system. "It's intimidating for patrons to use a branch located in a school." He continues that: "Parking is difficult and many of the schools are located on school lots set back from the streets" (71). Cherry also relates that a school board member stated that the school board spends 98 percent of its time on school related items and 2 percent of its time on the library.

In May 1988, the St. Petersburg Public Library System opened its newest and largest (square footage) branch, Azalea Branch Public Library. This library is shared with Azalea Middle School and consists of a separate building on the school campus. It is connected to the middle school by a covered walkway and a school entrance. A public entrance faces a parking lot. The library is the result of five years of planning and study by the public library system and the school system to provide library services in a growing commercial area with high land values.

The planning document for the library states "Libraries
should provide services that are alternative approaches to systematically designed learning experiences, and to nurture the individual's independent inquiry process" (72). When the library opened, a local newspaper reported "Community officials are finding that such buildings are a good use of taxpayer dollars" (73).

Sharing Resources

Mary Ellen Kennedy studied cooperative purchasing agreements between schools and public libraries with emphasis on a project called INNS (The Indiana National Network Study). Coordinating purchasing as a means of resource sharing was studied in this project. Additionally, Kennedy worked with Blanche Woolis in 1982 to reassess those combined school/public libraries studied in 1973. "With few exceptions, the data did not reveal the existence of cooperation between school and public libraries in purchasing" (74). She summarizes that there is very little cooperative purchasing between school and public libraries in Indiana. She surmises that this lack of cooperation between school and public libraries may be the result of inertia or a fear of loss of autonomy (75).

An article in SCHOOL LIBRARY JOURNAL in 1983 discussed three plans for cooperative purchasing of video tapes. One plan, The River Raisin Library Video Purchasing Project is made up of seven libraries in Michigan including the Detroit Public Library. Another cooperative consists of twelve libraries of different types in New Jersey. The article concludes that these cooperative purchasing plans have been successful for the libraries involved (76).
"Almost everything you read now in collection development reports that the idea of the self-sufficient, independent library is dead" (77). Joseph Branin of the University of Georgia Libraries is speaking about cooperation between RLG libraries, but his statement has implications for the idea of a shared collection as well. He reasons that library cooperation is mandated because of less money, rising acquisitions costs, a shift to periodicals, politics, the information explosion, better access and new technology, the changing needs of scholarship and finally, the attitude of users. They want access to information and they have high expectations for delivery according to Branin.

SOLINET sponsored a Resource Sharing and Networks Support forum in March of 1986. The forum focused on trends and programs in the Southeast in the area of coordinated collection development through networks. None of the papers directly dealt with shared collections as an answer to collection development problems, however the idea of fostering methods of library cooperation was apparent.

Lee Pike of the Alabama Library Exchange discussed the multi-type library consortium that she is involved with. It consists of a university library, two community college libraries, four public libraries and a high school library sharing a database. She states that "In addition to the obvious purpose of strengthening the resources in the system, I would say the program contributed in terms of communication, education, orientation to system purposes and perhaps the most important of all, taking a group of libraries that had worked pretty much in
isolation and bringing them together to explore the promise of improved patterns of service through formal cooperation" (78).

Patterns of Agreements Between Libraries

In devising a design for a shared collection in a shared facility between different library agencies, the autonomy of each agency or institution is a delicate issue. Documents from the different examples of shared libraries in Florida reveal differing approaches to this issue.

Edison Community College and the University of South Florida have enjoyed, according to Learning Resource Director, Charles Ritchie, the advantage of greatly increased holdings using a ratio based on the enrollment headcount for each institution. "It is understood that each institution will add to its share of the merged collection of books, periodicals, non-print materials and other materials in accordance with its program needs and service thrusts through general and special allocations budgeted for that purpose" (79). The document later addresses this as a basic or minimum effort and suggests that any special governmental allocations or grants be contributed over and above the ratio amounts. For 1986-87, the ratio was .852:1 for Edison Community College and .148:1 for the university.

In December of 1980 Broward Public Library and Broward Community College signed a contract for the construction of the South Regional Library to be located on the South Campus of the college. That document states that the county shall purchase at least 4000 titles annually that are selected by the college and a minimum of 325 periodical titles. Dollar amounts are not
specified which is certainly to the advantage of the college since the cost of academic titles and journals continues to increase (80).

The contract between Tallahassee Community College and Gadsden Public Library in the area of collection development uses a full-time enrollment formula. The college agrees to provide for direct support of its programs and for the purchase of "books and periodicals equal to $50 per full-time equivalent student in general support of the college academic activities" (81). No mention is made of how this formula was arrived at. At the current cost for library materials this agreement provides funds sufficient to purchase two academic titles per student per year or one monograph and one serial. The total original amount contributed by Tallahassee Community College in support of collections was $3000.

Thus in looking at the agreements of only three of the shared-use libraries in Florida, three different patterns emerge -- one based on student head-count, one based on specific numbers of library materials and one based on full-time equivalent students (FTE).

Summary

The shared-use library by definition is a combination of the collections of more than one type of library to serve the information needs of more than one type of library user. In planning for a shared-use library collection, guidelines and
procedures for the development of the collection assume importance. Libraries in Florida that are shared-use have used several patterns for collection development.

In 1979, the American Library Association addressed the issue of planning for collection development by determining guidelines for collection development policies. The ALA GUIDELINES FOR THE FORMULATION OF COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT POLICIES states "the belief that collection development policy statements must be comprehensible and comparable if they are to prove useful in the implementation of long-range goals for sharing of resources." [and] "Widespread budgetary constraints and the growth of interlibrary cooperation for shared resources and service networks have given impetus to the pressure to analyze collection activity in universally comprehensible terms" (82).

"No two libraries have identical missions nor identical means for achieving them. It is hard to imagine that any library does not have as part of its mission a commitment to the learning society," (83) according to Peggy Sullivan in her discussion of the need for library cooperation. Although Sullivan does not mention the shared-use concept in discussing linkages between libraries, it can be deduced that clarity of collection development policies in shared-use libraries also would be of concern to her.

Libraries in any cooperative venture first need to define what type of library they are. They need to know who their users are, set guidelines for their own collections, and understand their own missions. This relates to how library professionals
understand what their library is about. Is it to serve students? Is it to serve the general public? Is it to serve some special segment of society? Or is it to serve the information society -- the learning society?

This study focuses on combining library collections from different types of libraries in a shared physical plant as one form of library cooperation. The concept of library cooperation and resource sharing is to utilize all avenues to meet the information needs of the user.
CHAPTER III

Research Design

Planning

In order to gather information about shared-use library collections in Florida, it was necessary to determine the examples that exist in Florida. A list of library collections that involve two or more different institutions sharing one library collection in a shared or joint-use library facility and providing library service to two or more user groups was developed by contacting the State Library of Florida and the Florida Post-Secondary Education Commission. Additionally, the FLORIDA EDUCATION DIRECTORY 1987-88 (84) and the 1987 FLORIDA LIBRARY DIRECTORY WITH STATISTICS (85) were used in developing the list. For purposes of this study the libraries selected are found in Table 2.

It can be observed from this table of libraries that six of the libraries are very similar, community college and university libraries. Two of the libraries involve community colleges with public libraries, although one of these also includes a special library. And two of the libraries combine a community college library with a high school library. Three of the libraries are elementary or middle school libraries and public libraries.
Table 2 Names and Acronyms of Libraries in This Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community College and University Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edison Community College and the University of South Florida -- ECC/USF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk Community College and the University of South Florida -- PCC/USF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brevard Community College, Cocoa Campus and the University of Central Florida -- BCC/UCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytona Beach Community College and the University of Central Florida -- DBCC/UCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okaloosa-Walton Junior College, Fort Walton Beach and the University of West Florida -- OWJC/UWF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach Junior College, South Campus and Florida Atlantic University -- PBJC/FAU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community College Libraries and Public Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broward Community College, South Campus and South Regional Library, Broward County -- Broward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallahassee Community College, Gadsden County Public Library and the Child Welfare Academy -- Gadsden Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community College Libraries and High School Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Florida Community College and Lecanto High School, Lecanto -- Lecanto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia Community College and Gateway High School Kissimmee -- Osceola</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Libraries and Public School Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Azalea Branch Public Library and Azalea Middle School, St. Petersburg -- Azalea Meadowlane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Library and Meadowlane Elementary School, Melbourne -- Meadowlane Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Library and Stone Middle School Melbourne -- Stone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggestions and recommendations for sharing the resources of the Child Welfare Academy Library and the Gadsden County Public Library and for use of the public library by trainees at the
academy are part of a report on the shared-use library between Tallahassee Community College, the academy and the public library. The report is included in the study as an appendix as an example of library cooperation.

Because a small number of libraries were involved, all of the libraries listed were part of the study. Information gathered by the study was in regard to how well the library collections serve the needs of the library user groups; and in regard to discovering if the merged collections result in financial savings for the institutions. A survey, interviews with librarians and others involved in the libraries and a study of relevant literature were used to collect information. The study was descriptive research.

Assumptions

There are two reasons for developing shared-use library collections. These are the underlying assumptions of the study.

1. That shared-use library collections are formed to provide improved access to information for users of the libraries involved.

2. That shared-use library collections are formed in order to conserve the financial resources of the institutions.

Assumptions of the study are that librarians who work in libraries with shared-use library collections perceive that there is increased access to information for users of the library as a result of shared-use. And Secondly, that librarians who work in libraries with shared-use library collections perceive that
financial savings for the libraries result from shared-use collections.

Hypotheses

The null hypotheses are:

1. That librarians who work in libraries with shared-use library collections perceive that there is no difference in access to information for library users as a result of the merged collections.

2. That librarians who work in libraries with shared-use library collections perceive no difference in financial expenditures as a result of the shared-use collections.

The review of the literature in Chapter II, describes examples of shared-use library collections as a means of library cooperation, resource sharing, and meeting the information needs of library users. It explores reports of financial savings that may result from shared-use library collections.

The Research Questions

The research questions, as discussed in Chapter I, are to investigate if shared-use library collections are a viable means of meeting the information needs of library users in Florida in terms of sharing information resources and conserving financial resources.

The survey instrument questions were designed to gather data from libraries that currently exist in Florida and which have shared-use collections in shared or joint-use library facilities. Because the literature review (Chapter II) reveals that different
types of libraries have different missions; and because shared-use libraries combine libraries of different types, questions about the missions of libraries are part of the research. Other data was gathered to indicate if equality of member libraries in financial support, collection development and emphasis of the collection relates to the success of the venture.

The survey gathered data on how the libraries determine financial responsibility for the development of collections. The study investigated agreements, contracts and arrangements between the institutions. Comparisons of these arrangements was used to develop a model for collection development in shared-use libraries.

Population

The population of the study consisted of two librarians from each of the thirteen libraries that are currently sharing library collections in shared-use or joint-use facilities in Florida. One librarian from each of the institutions from each of the examples was surveyed.

Surveys were distributed to two randomly selected librarians at each library. Several of the libraries are very small and have only a few employees so the number of responses was limited. Librarians were selected as the respondents to the survey rather than selecting administrators of the institutions or other persons who may be involved in the libraries because: 1) librarians were likely to be able to answer questions about how the library collections meets the needs of the library users and 2) they were responsible for choosing materials for the collections and as a result either knew or could estimate
expenditures and financial responsibility for the collections from each institution.

Individuals, other than the librarians selected, were interviewed in order to gain perspective on the concept of shared-use library collections. These individuals were not asked to participate in the survey. Information gathered from interviews was used to help describe each of the libraries.

In addition to the sample population—26 librarians who received surveys, sub-populations were found according to the type of libraries involved in the shared-use libraries. There were four sub-populations: 1) community college librarians; 2) university librarians; 3) public librarians; and 4) school librarians. These sub-populations were treated as samples.

The one library that involves a special library does not have a special librarian employed. Services are provided by the staffs of the community college and public library that are part of that facility.

Two other populations were studied. The size of the general population of the communities in which the libraries are located is of interest because studies such as those of Wools, Blanchard, Jaffe and Aaron have found that one indicator of success for shared-use libraries is location in a small community. The survey instrument asked librarians to estimate the size of their communities. This information was used to group the libraries and to observe the relationship of size of community to positive and negative attitudes of the librarians. Estimates were verified by comparing them to statistics found in The American Library Directory (86).
Variables

The design of the study was non-parametric. Responses from each of the population groups to each of the questions on the survey instrument were the dependent variables. The independent variable was the shared-use library collection. Comparisons using relative ranks were used to evaluate certain survey questions. For example, the distribution of community college librarians was compared to the distribution of the total population and to the distributions of the other three sample groups. Ranked questions used the Likert Scale with arbitrarily assigned values.

Evaluation Design

One method of gathering information for this study was the use of a survey questionnaire. A second method was by personal interview and visits to the libraries being studied. "Survey research ... employs questionnaires and interviews in order to determine the opinions, attitudes, preferences, and perceptions of persons of interest to the researcher" (87).

Descriptive research was used in this study. It was necessary to be able to describe the libraries in Florida that are involved in shared-use.

Three different instruments were used in the study: 1) a questionnaire that gathered general information about the library and its community; 2) a questionnaire specific to the components of shared-use collections; and 3) an outline of questions asked in interview situations. These instruments are found in Appendix I, II, and III.

Each library was studied and described. Questions from the
surveys were statistically evaluated. Some of the libraries use written documents to determine collection responsibilities. These documents were requested and an examination of these statements revealed approaches used to plan shared library collections. A general model for these statements was written. (Appendix IV)

Instrumentation and Data Collection

The survey questionnaires are found in Appendix I and II. The interview form and the form for listing the components of collection development statements are found in Appendix III and IV. The survey was distributed by mail with responses requested within 15 days. Since it was important to receive as many responses as possible, every effort was made to collect the surveys by additional phone calls and visits to the sites. The librarians receiving the surveys were interviewed in person, when possible, and the libraries visited.

Validity of Instruments

A pilot test of the survey instrument is desirable in descriptive research. "It is impossible to predict how questionnaire items will be interpreted by respondents unless the researcher tries out his questionnaire and analyzes the responses in a small sample of subjects before starting his main study" (88).

The questionnaires were given to a librarian from a community college, from a university, from a public school and from a public library. A statistics instructor from a university and a librarian from a shared-use library from another state also
received the instruments. Their suggestions were used to refine the original instruments. A list of those persons who assisted in this part of the study are listed in Appendix V.

Procedures and Methods

Data resulting from the surveys of librarians involved in shared-use and information gathered from interviews were subjective. When the questionnaires were returned and the interviews and site visits conducted, the data were evaluated.

Questions on Questionnaire 1 - EVALUATION OF COLLECTION SHARING IN SHARED-USE (JOINT-USE) LIBRARY COLLECTIONS seek to find information in two major areas: 1) financial and budgetary arrangements between the libraries that are specific to collection management (Questions 1 through 10 deal with this area of the study); and 2) services to users (Questions 11 through 23 deal with this area of the study). Questions 24 and 25 relate to the mission or goals of different types of libraries.

Questions 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21 on the survey instrument use the Likert Scale for responses. Assigning weights to this scale from 5 for strongly agree to 1 for strongly disagree allows for statistical manipulation of the responses. For example, it can be numerically stated if most librarians agree that more periodical indexes are available as a result of shared collections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The numerical values indicate the direction of agreement or disagreement of respondents. For example, if the responses of all community college librarians to a question resulted in a value of 3.25, it can be deducted that a large percentage of community college librarians have no opinion about the question.

Question 2 also uses the Likert Scale. It elicited information only from librarians working in libraries that have written statements for collection management between the types of libraries.

Question 1 reveals the number of libraries that have or do not have written agreements or statements for collection development and management. Although, this is a simple yes or no question, the result indicates the number and percentage of those libraries with and without written statements. This information has value because the study includes a model for written statements. Responses to each of these questions were grouped according to the type of library the librarian represents.

Responses from community college librarians were compared to those of university librarians. Responses from public librarians working in community college/public libraries were compared to librarians working in school/public libraries. Responses from school media specialists were compared to responses of community college librarians and so on.

Questions 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 22, and 23 and questions 1 to 8 of Questionnaire II, GENERAL INFORMATION, were used to describe each of the libraries. Questions 24 and 25 are concerned with the missions of libraries.

Results of these questions were grouped generally and by
type of shared-use library. That is the results of the questions were grouped by university/community college libraries, by public elementary schools and public libraries, by high school and community college libraries and by public libraries and community college libraries even though these groups may be limited to only two libraries.

Since the libraries involved range geographically from the Panhandle area of the state to the Keys, site visits to all of the libraries was prohibitive. As many sites as possible were visited and interviews conducted with librarians and other personnel (Table 3). Again, this information is subjective and is included to add perspective to the research, but cannot be evaluated in a statistically relevant manner.

Statistical Tests

Two nonparametric tests were used to evaluate survey responses. These tests are the Mann-Whitney U Test and the Wilcoxon-T Test.

The Mann-Whitney U Test determines if different groups are significantly different on the dependent variable. It is used for small samples and requires that the responses be ranked in order of value (89).

The second test that was used, the Wilcoxon-T Test is a more powerful evaluation technique. This test is used to compare the probability distributions between two pairs (90). In this case the pairs were the responses of librarians from each of the types of libraries to the questions on Questionnaire I.
Formats for Presenting Results

Results are reported in four sections in Chapter 4. Section 1 is a description of each of the libraries. Section 2 is the statistical analysis and results of the survey. Section 3 is the evaluation of written collection management statements and a suggested model for these statements and section 4 is a suggested mission statement. Results of the questionnaires are reported in graphs and figures.

Expectations

This study was undertaken because of statements such as that made by Joseph Lindenfeld in his discussion of shared-use community colleges and public libraries. "So service to patrons is the primary goal of most public libraries and community colleges and, as has been noted, often the students at the community college and the patrons of the public library are the same people who need the same books and information," (91).

Similar statements have been made by researchers such as Wilma Lee Woolard in reporting on the combined school/public library. "The combined school/public library would seem to offer some communities the best means of coordinating local resources, particularly in cases where no library facility exists" (92).

THE MASTER PLAN FOR FLORIDA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION (1982) contains this statement "Community Colleges and high schools in particular should share facilities, equipment and faculties (93)." This document also states: "Current efforts at coordination, automation, sharing and cooperation should be continued to broaden the educational experiences of students, provide the widest possible access to materials, and avoid
unnecessary duplication. Particular efforts should be made for common use of library resources when two or more colleges or universities are in the same county" (94).

It was expected that the results of the survey instruments, interviews and site visits would confirm these statements. Grouping the responses from librarians according to the types of libraries they work in revealed if there was any difference between success in meeting the needs of library users by sharing collections and the type of libraries involved. That is, it was likely that a great deal of success would be found between community college libraries and university libraries since both are academic libraries serving postsecondary library users.

The study also deals with the perceptions that shared-use library collections save money. Woolard found that "Contrary to the belief held by many proponents of combined libraries, such mergers do not produce significant financial savings" (95).

The Master Plan for Florida Postsecondary Education 1988 Update points to the development of joint-use facilities including libraries between community colleges and universities because of rapid growth (population) of areas served by community colleges and not by universities and because of articulation agreements between institutions of higher education in Florida. "'Joint Use' of libraries ... is encouraged. It is obvious that by mixing and combining functions, facilities, students and programs, a hybrid situation has been created. If past trends are any indication, the future of such a hybrid may be predicted, particularly in rapidly growing areas" (96).

This study also reports a projected Public Education
Capital Outlay of 88 million dollars which is a 77% decline from the current year appropriations level (97). These two statements indicate an interest by the state in future sharing of facilities including libraries to conserve financial resources.

It was expected that librarians responding to questions in this study would have the perception that the libraries provide cost effective access to information for various library user groups. It was also expected that any administrators or other officials interviewed would agree.

Summary

This study was designed to gather information about shared-use library collections in Florida. The focus of the study was to determine if these libraries meet the information needs of library user groups and if the shared collections result in financial savings for the institution.

In order to gather information about the topic, surveys and interviews were used. Two librarians from each of the thirteen libraries selected for the study were surveyed. Interviews with these librarians were conducted as part of the study. Site visits to the shared-use libraries were made when possible. Survey questions were used for statistical evaluation and to describe the libraries.

The study was limited because there were, at the time of the study, only thirteen shared-use libraries in Florida. The relatively small number of the libraries involved and the limited number of librarians at several of the libraries prohibited the
selection of a statistically significant sample and made statistical measurements difficult. For this reason nonparametric statistical tests were used. The study employed descriptive research.

Written policies, agreements and arrangements for the shared-use collections were requested from the libraries that were part of the study. Not all of the libraries had formal statements. The statements were evaluated and a model for these statements developed. To demonstrate the processes of resource sharing and library cooperation suggested holdings, policies for using the public library and guidelines for sharing resources were developed for the Child Welfare Academy Resource Library, a joint-use facility between Gadsden Public Library and Tallahassee Community College.
CHAPTER IV

Presentation and Analysis of Data

This study was undertaken to discover if the collections of shared-use libraries in Florida serve the needs of the users of those libraries and if these merged or shared collections save money for the institutions they represent. For these reasons the survey instrument includes questions about size and content of the collections, questions about the financial responsibility and contributions of the institutions, and questions about the missions of the libraries.

"Every Library exists chiefly to serve the needs of its own community of users" (98). If this premise of George Bonn is accepted, then shared-use libraries also exist to serve the needs of users. Bonn continues "It is now also generally agreed that any evaluation of a library's collection must take into account the library's stated goals, objectives, mission or however else it defines its reason for being, in the context, when appropriate, of the goals, objectives, or mission of a parent organization or even a system to which the library may belong" (99).

The presentation and analysis of data are divided into four parts. Those parts are the Description of the Libraries, Statistical Analysis and Results, Missions of the Libraries, and a Model Agreement.
Description of the Libraries

In carrying out the research as many of the shared-use libraries [10] as possible were visited. Librarians who were asked to complete the survey instrument were interviewed. Administrators of the institutions were interviewed when possible. These interviews were conducted as informal discussions about how the library collections actually meet user needs and how well the financial arrangements between the institutions work in practice. General information about the libraries was also gathered for example, the political, social, educational or other reasons that influenced the establishment of the libraries. A list of interview guidelines is found in Appendix V. Site visits were conducted at the following ten sites listed in Table 3.

Table 3. Site Visits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCC/UCF - Brevard Community College and the University of Central Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBCC/UCF - Daytona Beach Community College and the University of Central Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECC/USF - Edison Community College and the University of South Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC/USF - Polk Community College and the University of South Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward - Broward Community College, South Campus and Broward County South Regional Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadsden Center - Tallahassee Community College and Gadsden County Public Library and the Child Welfare Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowlaine - Meadowlaine Elementary School and Meadowlaine Community Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecanto - Central Florida Community College and Lecanto High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osceola - Valencia Community College and Gateway High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azalea - Azalea Middle School and Azalea Branch Public Library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive information about the remaining sites was
gathered by telephone interview, written requests and information contained in the literature. Three libraries were not visited. Those libraries were Okaloosa-Walton Junior College and the University of West Florida, Palm Beach Junior College and Florida Atlantic University, and Stone Community School.

Of the shared-use library collections in Florida, all but three of the library collections involve community college libraries. The community college libraries are being shared with universities, public libraries and high school libraries. Examples that do not include community college libraries are three public libraries that are sharing collections with elementary or middle school libraries.

University and Community College Libraries

The pattern of sharing libraries between universities and community colleges in Florida is as follows:

1. Three of the collections are based on established community college library collections that are being expanded by a university which is providing funds for additional materials to support its programs.

2. One collection is based on an established university collection with the community college reimbursing the university for the use of its library.

3. Two of the collections are being developed from start by both the university and college involved.

Part of the explanation for the number of joint facilities that involve postsecondary education was the passage in 1976 of Florida Statute 125.195, Cooperative Development and Use of
The statute was addressed to public school districts, but was amended in 1977 to include community colleges and universities. The statute provided advantages for those colleges and universities that wished to expand their areas of service because funds for building the joint facilities were not part of the three-year priority lists for educational facilities that the State Board of Community Colleges and the Board of Regents develops. The Institutions were able to request inclusion in the state capital outlay budget through a separate procedure. The statute has since been amended to require inclusion of joint-use facilities on the priority lists for at least one of the institutions.

**ECC/USF - Edison Community College and the University of South Florida**

ECC/USF began their joint-use venture in 1980 when state funds were allocated to the university to construct four academic and administrative buildings on property adjacent to the campus of Edison Community College. Part of the rational of the joint-use campus was that the university would not have to duplicate service facilities such as the library, bookstore and student center. Essentially the university located near a community college campus which was already operating in order to utilize facilities already in place.

"The library arrangement may be a model for many similar activities. While holdings have been merged from the students' point of view, USF holdings are separately identified and an inventory maintained to generate future acquisitions under the State University System [SUS] budget formula" (101). At this site
the library is owned by the community college. Materials are marked according to the institution that purchased them and separate shelf lists are maintained.

Because of the SUS system's online catalog, holdings of the community college are entered into the Florida Center for Library Automation database, LUIS. LUIS consists of nine databases, one for each university. The databases consist of four subsystems: an online public access catalog, serials control, acquisitions, and circulation.

Students from both the college and the university have the benefits of an integrated system and access to the library holdings of all campuses of the university and to the holdings of the other public universities in the state. A courier system between the university sites is provided. The college has one campus. The university has four.

Responsibility for acquisitions to the collection of the shared-use library is determined by a formula based on headcount of students enrolled at each institution. The formula is as follows:

**Figure 5 ECC/USF Funding Formula**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Based on the Previous 1st Term Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECC Cost Ratio</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USF Cost Ratio</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The university had problems providing the funds it had agreed to in 1984. The funding problems occurred because the
university system cannot transfer funds within a budget from one line item to another. Thus if funds for personnel have been allocated, but are not spent, they cannot be transferred to capital outlay to purchase library materials. Line item funds must be used during a set fiscal year. Careful analysis of the institutional budgets has solved this problem.

The original agreements assumed an ability to transfer within the budget. Regardless of this problem, 1985 Report 5 of the Postsecondary Education Planning Committee, JOINT-USE FACILITIES FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION IN FLORIDA, states: "In many ways, in spite of the operational funding problems described above, the USF/ECC campuses in Fort Myers are a model for inter-institutional cooperation to serve the post-secondary educational needs of an area" (102).

PCC/USF - Polk Community College and the University of South Florida

This shared-use library is on the shared campus of the University of South Florida and Polk Community College in Lakeland. Formal agreements or contracts for the library at this facility were finalized in August 1988. The campus was opened in January 1988 and classes for both the community college and university are in session.

Original plans for the PCC/USF joint facility called for using the library of the adjacent Travis Vocational-Technical Center as a library for both the college and the university. Although the properties adjoin, the vocational center is separated from the campus of the college and university by a considerable distance and a chain-link fence. Additionally, a
service road between the two properties has been closed. Students and faculty would have been required to leave the joint campus, drive or walk down a county road and enter the vocational center through its main entrance. The vocational center also enforces a strict dress code which college and university students would have had to adhere to in order to use the library. The vocational center library collection focuses on technical materials related to the curriculum of the center. For these reasons the college and the university decided to begin a shared-use library on the joint campus.

Each institution maintains a separate account for purchase of materials. The college had an initial expenditure of $60,000 to begin the collection. The university had $72,000. Current plans call for a one quarter/three quarter split between the institutions with the university providing one quarter of the cost for collection development and the college providing three quarters. The funding formula is as follows. (Tentative Formula).

Figure 6  PCC/USF Funding Formula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCC Budget Request</th>
<th>PCC Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCC Headcount + USF Headcount</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USF Budget Request</th>
<th>USF Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCC Headcount + USF Headcount</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The library being developed for PCC/USF is currently housed in an area that was designated for another purpose. Space allocated will probably be adequate to house a small reference
collection. It will be necessary to make use of the collections of the college's main collection and the collections of the university to provide circulating materials to students.

The two institutions use different automated systems. The college system is an in-house system that controls circulation and allows for limited searching by author and title. The university is part of the LUIS system. Purchases are entered into both systems by the libraries exchanging shelf list records. Shelf lists of holdings are maintained by both institutions and a card catalog of the Lakeland Campus holdings is maintained in the campus library.

Because the automated circulation systems are different, the two institutions have not come to an agreement on how to circulate materials from the other campuses of the university or the college. At this time college or university students and faculty who locate material held by USF through the LUIS system must go to the university's main campus to check out the material, or use inter-library loan forms. The material cannot be sent directly to the Lakeland Campus by courier for circulation. On the other hand, materials from the main library of PCC can be sent by courier to the Lakeland Campus.

BCC/UCF — Brevard Community College and the University of Central Florida

In 1983 the University of Central Florida and Brevard Community College opened a Lifelong Learning Center on the Cocoa Campus of Brevard Community College. A long history of cooperation between the two institutions led to the development of this facility. UCF graduated its first student from the Cocoa
In 1976, "Much of the impetus for the current joint-use facility was generated by the college as a means to better serve the citizens of Brevard County" (103).

At this site the library is owned by the community college and all acquisitions are marked as owned by the college with the exception of periodicals provided through the state university extension service, and a collection of business titles. In essence the university uses the established library of the college as a base collection.

A shelflist of holdings is maintained for the entire college including its other sites. Students have access to the LUIS system, but holdings of the community college are kept in a card catalog (includes all holdings of BCC regardless of location). University courier and college courier services are provided to share resources and inter-library loan is encouraged.

The college selects and orders all materials for the library. Funds from the university are provided at $25 per FTE based on estimates by administrators and librarians at each institution. Original funding was at $6 per FTE. Funds transferred to the community college library budget can be used at the discretion of the library director. That is, the funds can be used for personnel, materials, equipment or any other need the director has and there is freedom to move these funds from line item to line item as needs change.
UCF has been offering courses in the Daytona Beach area for twenty years. Plans for joint use with Daytona Beach Community College are based on a history of cooperation between the two institutions which has taken the form of university classes offered on the community college campus and a later construction of a university building. The college has one main campus, has recently opened a center in Deland and has several special service sites.

The plan for library services is based on the pattern of the University of Central Florida and Brevard Community College where the college owns and operates an established library and the university is contracting with the college for use by its students. The Memorandum of Understanding between the institutions is being finalized.

The community college library is automated, however records are not in full MARC format. In order to merge the community college collection with LUIS, the state university automated library system, the community college records will have to be modified. Currently, students choose between two systems. Courier service is provided from the university for interlibrary loan.

In trying to develop an agreement for collection development and other library services, several approaches were taken. Since the institutions knew of the past financial problems at ECC/USF and since the library configuration is very similar to BCC/UCF, it seemed likely that a dollar amount per FTE similar to that of
BCC/UCF would be arrived at. After calculating costs in a number of ways, the administrations of the university and college settled on a cost per FTE in January 1987. The university compensated the college at a rate of $27 per FTE for the first term of 1986 and at $30 per FTE for 1987 and is currently at a rate of $35 per FTE. The funding will continue to be reviewed (104). This funding is to be used to provide for technical processing, circulation, reserves, expansion of the periodicals collection, independent study and reference.

PBJC/FAU - Palm Beach Junior College and Florida Atlantic University

Florida Atlantic University and Palm Beach Junior College have one of the oldest shared-use libraries in Florida. College students have used the university library for over eight years. Essentially, the students at Palm Beach Junior College South Campus use the library of the university and the junior college compensates the university for this use based on a dollar amount per each student. In 1987 this amounted to approximately $20 per junior college student. The college leases 10 acres of land from the university and has 19 temporary buildings at the site.

A second shared-use library collection opened in late summer 1988 on the North Campus of the college. This shared-collection is a reverse image of the South Campus. This time the college library serves as the host library and the university compensates the college for use by university students. Agreements and details of this arrangement are not final.

The FAU library has a collection of 465,000 titles and a
yearly materials budget of over $1 million on its main campus (the South Campus of the College). The PBJC library on its North Campus has a collection of 18,000 titles.

The library on the North Campus will be renovated and additional materials provided. On each campus the "host" library has primary responsibility for the library including selection of materials, budget, and staff.

The pattern at PBJC/FAU is similar to that of ECC/ USF and BCC/UCF where an established library collection is used as a base to build a more extensive collection to serve the needs of a different group of library users. The South Campus of PBJC/FAU is unique in that it is the only instance of an established university library serving as the base collection for a community college.

OWJC/UWF – Okaloosa Walton Junior College and the University of West Florida

This site was developed in response to growth in the population near Eglin Air Force Base, the largest air force base in the world. Cooperative efforts began in 1968 when the university and the college began offering a two plus two program at the base.

The library was begun with a core collection permanently loaned by the state university extension service and set up in what had been an elementary school library (in a facility leased from Okaloosa County School District). The university has primary responsibility for the library including personnel and
acquisitions. Separate budgets are maintained for each institution. In 1987/88 the college contributed one eighth of the budget for acquisitions. "Okaloosa-Walton Junior College allocates and spends its budget for library materials from the parent library. The Center (university) librarian controls the budgets allocated by the University of West Florida" (105).

Access to holdings of the university is provided through LUIS. The system includes the holdings of the Ft. Walton Beach Center and the holdings of the Eglin Base Library. Inter-library loan is facilitated by a university courier and by telefacsimile. Materials at the college main library can be requested and renewed via a toll-free telephone number. This library serves as a branch library for both the college and the university. This library and the library at the Lakeland Campus of PCC/USF are the two community college/university libraries that are not based on the expansion of an existing library.

High Schools and Community College Libraries

There are two examples of high schools and community colleges that share library collections. In both instances the libraries are part of newly constructed schools. The college administrative areas are separate from the school administrative areas. The library collections were developed by the schools through construction funds and are owned by the schools. In both cases formal agreements for the use of the school libraries by college students do not exist and formal agreements for providing funds to support the college curriculum do not exist. A third
example, Marathon High School, was listed as joint use in State reports. Librarians from both the school and college stated that they do not have a shared collection at Marathon.

Lecanto

The library that is shared by the Lecanto Campus of Central Florida Community College and Lecanto High School was begun in 1984 as part of the Roger Weaver Educational Complex in Lecanto, Citrus County. Mr. Weaver was an educational leader in the community, serving several terms as superintendent of schools. He envisioned an educational park that would include an elementary school, middle school, high school and community college. A community effort led to a special legislative appropriation to begin the complex.

The college and the high school have adjacent main entrances that are very similar in appearance. The college has classroom space of its own for daytime classes and uses the high school classrooms for additional space for evening classes. The high school library serves both institutions.

The facility is operated without a detailed agreement as to the responsibilities of each institution. The library collection was basically built through funds allocated for constructing and furnishing the facility. $50,000 was allocated and the materials for the library were selected by the high school librarian. After the initial allocation, some funds have been provided by the Citrus County School District and the college, but a formula or other method of allocating funds for collection maintenance
and development has not been arrived at. Separate budgets are maintained by each institution.

The library is staffed by a school librarian until 3:30 pm and from 3:30 until 9:30 pm by a college librarian. College and high school students can use the library at any time. Entire high school classes are often scheduled at one time to use the library for research.

The library is designed in two floors. The main entrance, circulation area, reference collection, study rooms and office space are on the second floor. A staircase leads to the first floor which houses the circulating collection, a second circulation desk and audio-visual equipment. There are no exits from the first floor. Because of a small staff size, the circulating collection is sometimes closed since the first floor collection cannot be monitored from the second floor.

All materials in the collection are marked as owned by the high school and the Dewey Decimal System is used for cataloging. Audio-visual equipment circulates only to the high school. An automated circulation system is used. Both institutions maintain a shelf list of holdings they have purchased. A card catalog accesses the collection. An informal courier system provides some access to the main campus library collection of the college. The college librarian can ask the library staff on the main campus to locate materials and send them to Lecanto or college students have the option of going to the main campus in Ocala.

Osceola

The joint-use campus of Valencia Community College and
Gateway High School in Kissimmee is in use while under construction. The high school library was one of the first buildings constructed. The site is a large campus with the college offices separated some distance from the high school but joined by a nature walk. The college uses the high school classrooms, laboratories and the library, and has its own administration building.

In planning the library, the high school librarian chose to catalog materials by the Library of Congress system with the expressed intent of being able to integrate the collections of the high School and the college in a future automated system. Currently, the high school uses an automated circulation system and is planning for an automated public access catalog. The shelf list is maintained by the computerized system and a card catalog is currently in use. The college is investigating various methods of automation.

The collection was developed by utilizing funds allocated for construction and furnishing. $30,000 was provided. A formal plan for future funding has not been developed.

Gateway High School library is open for use by high school and college students during the school day. In the summer of 1987, the library was open in the evening for college student use and staffed by the high school librarian. A lack of funding ended this arrangement, but both the librarian and the college administration have expressed interest in re-establishing evening hours.

The design of this library is of interest because it has
many areas that cannot be easily monitored by the small library staff. Essentially the floor plan resembles a dumbbell with the collection, circulation desk and offices in one end, a long hallway with the entrance in the middle, and production, studios, audio-visual storage and other rooms in the other end.

Marathon

Marathon High School (Monroe County School District) and Florida Keys Community College agreed in 1980 to construct a joint-facility on the existing campus of Marathon High School. The facility was designed primarily to provide vocational training.

A shared-use library collection really does not exist at this site. The study conducted by the state Postsecondary Education Commission in 1985 reports that "Library resources are shared, but separate ownership is maintained" (106). However, both the librarian at the high school and the director of learning resources for the college have stated that this is not the case. The letter of agreement between the Monroe County School District and the College in 1982 and the resolution signed by both institutions in 1980 make no mention of library services.

According to Patricia Lowe, Marathon High School Librarian, "The media collection at Marathon High School is used only by the high school faculty and student body. If a student enrolled in the community college wants to use the facilities and materials in the MHS Library, they are welcome, but the collection does not circulate to them" (107).
Lawrence Berk, Library Director, Florida Keys Community College, wrote: "Our college students at Marathon generally attend classes during the evening when the high school library is closed. Occasionally, materials are placed on reserve at the local public library for our students' use. Basic services are provided to students at Marathon by the library on the main campus of the college" (108).

Public Libraries and Community College Libraries

There are two instances of public libraries and community colleges that share collections. The first example, The South Regional Library of Broward County and Broward Community College is a successful example of the merging of two library collections. The second example, Gadsden Public Library and Tallahassee Community College, is not a merged collection. The college is paying the county for use of the library by its students and is adding materials to the library to further support its curriculum.

Broward County South Regional Library and Broward Community College

This library is the campus library for the South Campus of the college (Judson A. Samuels Campus) and serves as a regional public library with a collection of over 100,000 titles. The college library had previously been housed in a store-front and was not adequate to support the programs of the college. Funding
For the facility was provided equally by the state and by a local bond issue. Cost for the facility was $5 million. The college entered into the agreement for sharing a facility because it was considered that five to ten years might elapse before a college library would be constructed on the campus. The public library system needed a convenient location to improve library service in the area. The previous location of the public library was also a store front. This cooperative effort was the first to combine a college library collection with a public library collection in Florida.

The collections were merged to form a collection of over 100,000 titles. The classification system for both collections was and is the Dewey Decimal System which facilitated the merger. The agreement calls for the county to provide funds for the purchase of a minimum of 4,000 titles per year that are selected by the college and a minimum of 325 periodical titles.

Originally, the library was staffed by county library personnel and a liaison librarian from the college. The College, after five years, discontinued the liaison librarian position. Most selection of academic materials results from faculty input to reference librarians. The library has a large number of staff and has extensive hours of operation. Because the library has a high number of volumes, a great deal of information is readily available to students and faculty of the college.

The public library system has an automated catalog and circulation system that is also in use at this library. Access to college owned materials located on other campuses is by
contacting the main campus library by phone or in person. There is a union shelf list and a union card catalog on the Central Campus of the college for materials on the Central and North Campuses. The North Campus card catalog contains records of the materials of only that campus. In most cases, college students go to the other campuses of the college to locate materials that may be part of the college collection. Any student at the college can use any of the public libraries in the county by applying for a public library card.

Physically, the South Regional Library/BCC is designed so that activities for children are on the first floor along with circulation, the fiction collection, meeting rooms, and audio/visual services. Reference services, the nonfiction collection and study areas are provided on the second floor.

Since community college instructional patterns require use of audio-visual materials and equipment, a separate audio-visual area for storage and distribution is housed on the first floor. A writing laboratory, tutorial areas and a college preparatory laboratory are adjacent. A media specialist is responsible for this area. Although these items are not available for circulation to the general public, the public is welcome to use the materials in the library. The public library video tape collection is available for use for college instruction. Originally in separate locations in the building, public library and college audio-visual materials are now housed in a common area. The staffs of the college and public library are cross trained.

The contractual agreements are under review and changes such
as using a dollar amount instead of a numerical count for addition to the collection are under study. This dollar amount would include the purchase of audio-visual materials and software and eliminate some restrictions on storage of periodical backfiles.

Because of the positive response of the community, the students and the campus administration to the shared college and public library, the college and the county are considering a similar shared facility to be located on the North Campus of the college. The County Library Board recommended the location in June 1988.

Gadsden

Gadsden Public Library and Tallahassee Community College entered into an agreement in 1986 to provide for library services to the college students at the college's Gadsden Center in Quincy by the county public library. The college purchased the old Gadsden Memorial Hospital to provide administrative and classroom space for its center and to house the state Child Welfare Academy which the college administers.

The college leases a little over 8,000 square feet to the county to use as its main library. The library opened at this site in March 1988. The county has a right to a perpetual lease at the site which cannot be terminated by the college. The county can terminate the lease by giving 12 months notice to the college.

Physically, the library is on the ground floor of the old
hospital and has its own entrance on this level. The main entrance to the facility is on the first floor where the college administration, the academy administration and student services are located. The second floor houses the college classrooms. The third floor houses the training areas for the academy and a small resource library (Appendix VI).

The agreement allocates $50 per FTE in general support of college academic activities with the first payment to be made when the library opened. The agreement is for the college and the public library staffs to "agree on what books and periodicals are to be provided and TCC will purchase same and deliver to county " (109). The college maintains a shelf list and the public library enters the materials into its card catalog. No off-site access to the college's main library collection is provided. Students must go to the main campus to use that collection. The public library staff serves both students and the public. Agreements for use of the public library collection by trainees at the academy are under consideration (Appendix VI).

Public Libraries and Public Schools

There are three examples of public libraries and public schools sharing collections. Two of these libraries are in Melbourne and are the oldest examples of shared libraries in the state. Both libraries began in the early 1970s. The third example, Azalea Branch of St. Petersburg Public Library was opened in the spring of 1988.
"It all sounds very simple -- but there are those of us who know better" (110) according to Clark Maxwell, chairman of the Brevard County School Board in the early 1970s when Meadowlane Community Library was being planned. Meadowlane Elementary School served a small, semi-rural population in the west Melbourne area. No local public library service was available. The library at the elementary school was in line to receive $100,000 in capital outlay funds to bring the library up to existing standards.

An innovative school principal, John Leppert, and an innovative school librarian, Virginia Wright, wanted to provide year-around library service to the students of the elementary school and the local community. They reasoned that for little more than the amount allocated by the school board for upgrading the school library, public library service could also be provided. Planners of this facility were able to convince the community to commit to raising $30,000 to add to the amount allocated by the Brevard County School District. A variety of fund raising techniques were used and in 1970 the library was completed and dedicated.

This library is of special interest because it is the first shared-use library in Florida that was designed as such and has remained in operation. In Aaron's study in 1978, three previous examples of shared library collections between two or more institutions were identified (111). One of these instances involved the public library in Palatka providing service for a
private school while that school was under construction. The second instance was a public library serving an elementary school in Winter Haven. This school, according to Aaron, no longer exists. The third instance was in St.Petersburg at Glen Oaks Branch which was a public library branch located on school property. The building was returned to the School District and the branch absorbed into the Mirror Lake Branch Library.

Efforts have been made to close the Meadowlane Community Library primarily because of low public library circulation figures and the lack of space for public library programming and materials. A community effort was mounted in 1984 to prevent dissolution of the library, however, the issue is likely to be of concern again as a result of automation plans of the Brevard Public Library System.

Currently, the school uses one automated circulation system and a card catalog for public access. The public library uses a different automated circulation system and a separate card catalog. Plans for an automated public access catalog are being made for the public library system. The school employs a media specialist and a clerical support staff. The public library employs a branch librarian and clerical support staff. Employees are not cross-trained.

The library is approximately 6,000 square feet. Juvenile titles are shelved along the walls of the library and adult titles are shelved in stacks in the center of this area. Reference titles are housed centrally. A small adult reading room containing reference materials and adult periodical titles is located near the stack area. A storytelling or instructional pit
is located near the reference area. This area is used almost exclusively during the school year for class instruction. The school has a daily schedule of classes which report to the library, a common practice in many elementary school libraries. As a result, there is a great deal of noise and activity in the library during the school day as classes come and go. A conference room located next to the library and entered through the library is scheduled by the school for meetings during the school year. The public library can use the conference room by scheduling it with the school principal.

The collection is classified by the Dewey Decimal System and interfiled with designators to indicate whether materials belong to the school or the public library. Materials are separately purchased and processed and separate shelf lists are maintained. Access to other holdings of the public library system is by courier.

Access to the library for both the public and students is through a main entrance opening to a small off-street parking lot. The library is constructed as a wing of the school. The entrance to the library is on the entrance loop of the school. Considerable congestion occurs at the beginning and end of the school day as parents arrive to pick up their children. A nearby public parking lot is available across a small access road.

Azalea

This library, located near a commercial and shopping area in St. Petersburg, opened in May 1988 after five years of planning
and construction. A task force composed of representatives from the Pinellas County School District, the City of St. Petersburg, the library staff and the community studied other examples of shared public school and public libraries.

The public library had operated a branch library in a storefront in the area until the cost to renew the lease became prohibitive. As a result, the collection of the branch was boxed and the library system looked for a solution to providing library services in the area. Several school sites were evaluated and the Department of Leisure Services (which includes the public library system) and the School Board of Pinellas County decided to locate the library on the grounds of Azalea Middle School. The middle school library was located on the second floor of the school in space needed for other activities. Renovating the space for public use was not practical since the library could only be reached by enclosed stairwells and there was no elevator service.

The city applied for a state grant to help fund the public library contribution to the facility. Delays in awarding the grant and restrictions on its use eventually caused the city to reject the award. This procedure caused considerable delay in beginning construction of the library.

The library is owned and operated on a 50-50 basis by the city and the school board. School library materials are purchased by the school district, processed and sent to the library. Public library materials are purchased by the public library, processed and sent to the branch library. Each
Institution maintains a separate shelf list. A dollar amount or other formula has not been planned. The school district will fund library purchases according to the amount it is able to budget for middle school media centers and the public library system will treat the facility as a branch library and fund it as such.

An automated library system to include circulation and a public access catalog is being planned by the public library. It is anticipated that holdings of the Azalea Library will be entered into the system with flags or indicators to identify the materials as public or school purchased. A courier service provided by the public library provides access to public library collections at other locations. Because the system has not been automated, all requests go to the main library which locates needed material either in the main collection or the branches and then routes the material to the requesting branch.

The library is staffed by two media specialists, one 12 month and one 10 month who are employed by the school district. The public library has provided additional clerical staff as needed.

The Art Deco style building, with 14,000 square feet of usable space, is designed so that the circulation desk, periodicals collection and reference collection divide the school area from the public area. The public area contains adult fiction and nonfiction and a pre-school or picture book reading area as well as elementary school fiction. The school area contains juvenile fiction and nonfiction. The well planned design includes separate restroom facilities for adult library users and
the school children. Conference rooms, a production area and a darkroom are available for both the students and the public.

Classes are scheduled to use the library when they are engaged in reference activities. The library operates as an "open" school media center where students can come to the library at any time with permission of the classroom teacher. Regular scheduling of classes in the library is not anticipated, however, formal bibliographic instruction for students is planned.

The main public entrance to the library faces a busy street and includes off-street parking. The entrance sign states that it is Azalea Branch Public Library. The school entrance is connected to the school by a covered walkway and its entrance sign states Azalea Middle School Media Center.

Stone

Stone Middle School and Stone Community Library is in a Black neighborhood in Melbourne Florida. The current librarian for the Middle School has been employed at the school for only one term. The librarian for the public library did not respond to requests for information.

According to Aaron and Smith, the library was established to help the school retain accreditation and to "pacify the Black community." They termed the library a failure according to their criteria (112).

The county and the school district entered into a contract to build the library on the school property in August, 1972. The building is just under 3000 square feet. The initial book
collection was purchased for $20,000. The school media specialist was designated as the head librarian.

In 1980, the library became part of the Brevard County Public Library System. It was necessary for the library to improve its collections and services to meet the standards of the county library system. A public librarian was assigned to the library (113). The library is still staffed by both a school librarian and a public librarian. The library served this community for 18 years.

Statistical Analysis and Results

The Survey Instruments

A survey instrument consisting of 25 questions was designed to gather information about the libraries. (Questionnaire I, Appendix I). This instrument contained 12 questions that used the Likert Scale and two questions that asked for yes or no responses. The remaining 11 questions asked for information specific to the libraries being studied. A general survey was also used. (Questionnaire II, Appendix II). This survey consisted of eight questions and was used to find information about the sizes of the communities where the libraries are located, the numbers of library users, the sizes of the collections and other related information.

Population

Thirteen libraries were part of the study. Two responses were sought from librarians at each of the libraries. One
response was sought from a librarian from each library participating in each example of a shared-use library. Responses were received from all of the libraries in the study. Two librarians did not return the survey instruments. They were one public librarian and one community college librarian. As a result, 24 surveys were used for the statistical tests. In some cases librarians did not answer all of the questions on the surveys.

Presentation of the Data

The data gathered from the two survey instruments is presented in two parts. Information from Questionnaire I is presented below. It is followed with information from Questionnaire II.

Questionnaire I

Responses to questions using the Likert Scale were given the following numerical values: Strongly Agree = 1; Agree = 2; No Opinion or No Change = 3; Disagree = 4; and Strongly Disagree = 5. Responses to the questions using Yes or No were given the following numerical values: Yes = 1 and No = 2. The data from Questionnaire I are presented in four sections. Section 1 is a question by question analysis of the data from Questionnaire I including a graph of the distribution of the responses, the mean and median values of the responses and the standard deviation of the responses.

Section 2 shows the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test values for paired differences. Responses for this section were divided into
four subgroups according to the type of librarians answering the survey. These four subgroups are community college librarians, university librarians, public librarians and school librarians. The Wilcoxon Test was used to determine if there was a difference in responses to each question based on the type of librarian responding.

Section 3 reports Mann-Whitney U Test values. Two subgroups were used for the Mann-Whitney Test. These two subgroups were community college librarians and university librarians. These subgroups were selected because they were the largest.

Section 4 reports the correlation coefficients calculated for certain questions. These questions were selected to determine if there is a relationship between the perception of librarians about one aspect of the shared-use library and their perceptions about another aspect. For example, is there a relationship between the perception of librarians about how well the shared-use libraries meet the needs of library users and the perception of librarians about the financial savings of the shared-use libraries?

A significance level of alpha = .05 was selected. It was determined that it was more important to support the concept that shared-use libraries provide access to information for library users and financial savings for the libraries than to reject the idea.
Figure 7
Question 2. This agreement is financially equitable to the institutions sharing the collection?

<table>
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<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</table>

Likert Scale

Mean = 2.75
Median = 2
Standard Deviation = 1.19

The number of respondents is very small for this question. It can be observed that there is a tendency to agree that the arrangements between institutions are financially equitable. No significance can be attached to this observation.

Figure 8
Question 8. As a result of sharing collections, each parent institution is required to spend less money to provide materials for users of its library than it would have if the library collections were separate.
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Likert Scale

Mean = 2.291
Median = 2
Standard Deviation = 1.206

Responses to this question indicate that there is a strong agreement that parent institutions are required to expend less money to provide library services by participating in a shared collection than they would have if the libraries were independent of each other.
Figure 9

Question 12. Certain library materials such as indexes or journals are available to users because of the shared-use collection that would not have been available if the collections were separate.

<table>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likert Scale

Mean = 1.458
Median = 1
Standard Deviation = .706

There is a very strong indication that increased availability of indexes and related materials is perceived to be result of shared collections.
Question 13. Certain library materials, for example, materials that may be sexually explicit, contain vulgar language, or describe violence are not available to users because of the shared-use collection that would have been available if the collection were separate.
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<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean = 3.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation = .888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is very little indication that sharing collections results in restrictions on the availability and accessibility of materials of a sensitive nature.
Question 14. Merging the collections of this library resulted in increased use (circulation) of the materials in the collection.

There is no clear indication that shared-use libraries are perceived by librarians to be a result of shared collections.

Question 15. Certain library materials such as popular titles or controversial subjects are less available to users because of increased numbers of users of the shared-use collection.
There is no indication that access to materials that are in heavy demand because they deal with popular or controversial subjects is reduced because of shared collections.

**Figure 13**

Question 16. The collection contains fewer unique materials because it is a shared-use collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3.916  
Median = 4  
Standard Deviation = .493

There is no indication that librarians perceive that there are fewer unique or special materials in library collections as a result of shared-use.
Figure 14
Question 17. Resource sharing and networking between the shared-use library and other libraries has increased as a result of the shared-use concept.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likert Scale
Mean = 2.29
Median = 2.5
Standard Deviation = .978

There is some indication that librarians perceive that resource sharing or networking is encouraged by sharing collections.

Figure 15
Question 18. Library users are more successful in locating and accessing information because of the shared collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likert Scale
Mean = 2.125
Median = 2
Standard Deviation = .832

Responses indicate that librarians perceive that sharing collections results in more success in locating information for library users.
Figure 16
Question 19. Merging the collections of this library resulted in an increase in the quality of the collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9</th>
<th>*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Responses

Likert Scale

Mean = 2.167
Median = 2
Standard Deviation = .986

There is an indication that librarians perceive an increase in the quality of the library collections as a result of shared-use.

Figure 17
Question 20. Merging the collections of this library resulted in an increase in the depth of the collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Responses

Likert Scale

Mean = 2.166
Median = 2
Standard Deviation = .942

There is an indication that librarians perceive an increase in the depth of the collection as a result of shared-use.
Figure 18

Question 21. One of the institutions responsible for the shared-use collection determines the direction of growth or emphasis of the collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Responses

Likert Scale

Mean = 3.33
Median = 4
Standard Deviation = 1.178.

There is little indication that one library in a shared-use library determines the direction or emphasis of the library collection.
Wilcoxon T-Test

The results of the Wilcoxon T-Test are shown in the following charts. The T value indicates differences between the perceptions of the four subgroups of librarians. The higher the T value, the higher the difference between the perceptions of the librarians.

Key =
- CU = Community College and University Libraries
- CP = Community College and Public Libraries
- CS = Community College and School Libraries
- SP = School and Public Libraries

TP = Total Pairs
ZD = Zero Differences
PU = Pairs Used
T = Wilcoxon T

Figure 19

Question 2. This agreement is financially equitable to the institutions sharing the collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CU</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest discrepancy in perception is indicated by the college and public librarians. The number of libraries in this group is very small and no statistical significance can be attributed to this result.
Figure 20
Question 8. As a result of sharing collections, each parent institution is required to spend less money to provide materials for users of its library than it would have if the library collection were separate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CU</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest discrepancy between perceptions that each library was required to expend more money came from school and public library combinations. Since the number of these libraries is very small, no statistical inferences can be made, but it should be noted that two of these libraries are the most likely candidates of the study to dissolve shared-use.

Figure 21
Question 12. Certain library materials such as indexes or journals are available to users because of the shared-use collections that would not have been available if the collections were separate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CU</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no indication of a difference of opinion about the availability of additional library materials based on the type of librarian responding to the question.
Figure 22

Question 13. Certain library materials, for example materials that may be sexually explicit, contain vulgar language, or describe violence are not available to users because of the shared-use collection that would have been available if the collection were separate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CU</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no indication of a difference of opinion about restrictions on the availability of sensitive materials.

Figure 23

Question 14. Merging the collections of this library resulted in increased use (circulation) of the materials in the collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CU</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was strong indication that there was a difference in the perception of librarians from different libraries in regard to increase in circulation of materials as a result of shared-use. The highest difference occurred between community college and university librarians.
Question 15. Certain library materials such as popular titles or controversial subjects are less available to users because of increased numbers of users of the shared-use collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CU</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an indication that there is a discrepancy in the perception of availability of materials in libraries that are shared school and public libraries.

Figure 25

Question 16. The collection contains fewer unique materials because it is a shared-use collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CU</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is little variance in the perceptions of librarians regarding the number of unique titles in the collections.
**Figure 26**

**Question 17.** Resource sharing and networking between the shared-use library and other libraries has increased as a result of the shared-use concept.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CU</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an indication that resource sharing and networking is not perceived as clearly the result of sharing specific library collections.

**Figure 27**

**Question 18.** Library users are more successful in locating and accessing information because of the shared collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CU</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly librarians in college libraries and those in universities, public libraries and school libraries that share collections with college libraries are in agreement that library users are more successful in locating and accessing information as a result of shared-use collections.
Figure 28
Question 19. Merging the collections of this library resulted in an increase in the quality of the collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CU</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results indicate that only the school and public librarians who share collections do not agree that sharing the collections results in an improvement in the quality of the collections.

Figure 29
Question 20. Merging the collection of this library resulted in an increase in the depth of the collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CU</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no indication of difference of perception between librarians from different types of libraries in regard to how sharing collections affected the depth of collections.
Figure 30

Question 21. One of the institutions responsible for the shared-use collection determines the direction of growth or emphasis of the collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CU</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was indication that college and university librarians did not agree that there is no emphasis of one library collection over another and strong indication of this between school and public librarians.
Section 3

The Mann-Whitney U Test

The Mann-Whitney U Test was used to evaluate the responses of community college librarians and university librarians on selected questions. The level of significance was set at .05. This test is appropriate for small sample sizes and is sensitive to both central tendency and distribution of scores. If the calculated value is less than the critical value the null hypothesis is rejected. For this section the null hypothesis is:

There is no difference in the attitude of community college librarians and university librarians.

Question 8. As a result of sharing collections, each parent institution is required to spend less money to provide materials for users of its library than it would have if the library collections were separate.

Calculated Value = 6

Critical Value = 9

The null hypothesis is rejected. There is some difference in attitude between community college librarians and university librarians in regard to financial savings as a result of shared-use.

Question 12. Certain library materials such as indexes or journals are available to users because of the shared-use collection that would not have been available if the collections were separate.

Calculated Value = 6

Critical Value = 9

The null hypothesis is rejected. There is some difference in attitude between community college librarians and university librarians in regard to increased availability of indexes and journals.
Question 15. Certain library materials such as popular titles or controversial subjects are less available to users because of increased numbers of users of the shared-use collection.

Calculated Value = 1          Critical Value = 1

The null hypothesis is accepted. There is no difference between the attitudes of community college librarians and university librarians in regard to availability of popular or controversial materials.

Question 16. The collection contains fewer unique materials because it is a shared-use collection.

Calculated Value = 4          Critical Value = 6

The null hypothesis is rejected. There is a difference in attitude between community college librarians and university librarians regarding the availability of unique materials.

Question 17. Resource sharing and networking between the shared-use library and other libraries has increased as a result of the shared-use concept.

Calculated Value = 1          Critical Value = 1

The null hypothesis is accepted. There is no difference in attitude between community college librarians and university librarians in regard to increases in networking and resource sharing.

Question 18. Library users are more successful in locating and accessing information because of the shared collection.

Calculated Value = 1          Critical Value = 1

The null hypothesis is accepted. There is little difference in attitude in regard to success in locating information between community college librarians and university librarians.
Question 19. Merging the collections of this library resulted in an increase in the quality of the collection.

Calculated Value = 1  Critical Value = 1
The null hypothesis accepted. There is agreement between community college and university librarians attitudes about the increase in quality of the collection.

Question 20. Merging the collections of this library resulted in an increase in the depth of the collection.

Calculated Value = 2  Critical Value = 3
The null hypothesis is rejected. There is some difference in attitude between community college librarians and university librarians regarding increases in the depth of the collection.
Section 4

Cross Tabulation

In order to find out if librarians perceived a relationship between different aspects of shared-use, a cross tabulation was performed for selected questions. This procedure produces a correlation coefficient (114). Two aspects were emphasized: 1. The success of library users in locating information as a result of shared-use (Question 18) and 2. Financial savings for the libraries as a result of shared use (Question 8).

Figure 31

Question 18 (Locating Information) and Question 21 (Emphasis of Collection)

Correlation Coefficient: \( -0.297 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 18</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The librarians studied perceive a low negative relationship between the success of library users locating information and whether one library controls the direction of the collection.
Figure 32
Question 18 (Locating Information) and Question 20 (Depth of the Collection)

Correlation Coefficient = .664

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 5 0 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1 8 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 0 2 4 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 0 0 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a moderate positive relationship between perceived ability to locate information and the depth of the collection.

Figure 33
Question 18 (Locating Information) and Question 19 (Quality of the Collection)

Correlation Coefficient: .737

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 6 0 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 0 8 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 0 1 4 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 0 1 1 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a perceived high positive relationship between success by library users in locating information and increased quality of the collections through shared-use.
Figure 34

Question 18 (Locating Information and Question 17 (Networking and Resource Sharing))

Correlation Coefficient = .415

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 4 1 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 2 3 4 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1 0 5 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 0 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a low positive correlation between success by library users in locating information and networking or resource sharing that might have resulted from shared-use.

Figure 35

Question 18 (Locating Information) and Question 16 (Unique Materials in the Collection)

Correlation Coefficient = -.380

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 0 0 0 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 0 0 1 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 0 0 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 0 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a low negative correlation which indicates the librarians perceived no reduction in the amount of unique materials available for library users as a result of shared-use.
There is a low positive relationship which means that librarians perceive little change in the availability of popular and/or controversial materials because of shared-use.

Librarians perceive that there is a low positive relationship between the success of library users in locating information and increases in circulation in shared-use libraries.
Figure 38

Question 18 (Locating Information) and Question 12 (Increased Indexes)

Correlation Coefficient = .328

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 12</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^----Question 18

There is a low positive relationship perceived by librarians between increased availability of indexes and other services and the success of library users in locating information.

Figure 39

Question 14 (Increased Circulation) and Question 17 (Resource Sharing and Networking)

Correlation coefficient: .334

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 14</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^----Question 17

This procedure indicates that there is a low positive perception of a relationship between increases in circulation and increases in resource sharing and networking.
Figures 40 and 41

**Figure 40**

Question 8 (Financial Savings) and Question 18 (Locating Information)

Correlation Coefficient = .129

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 8</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 18

Librarians perceived a low positive relationship between the success of library users in locating information and financial savings for the libraries.

**Figure 41**

Question 8 (Financial Savings) and Question 14 (Increased Circulation of Materials)

Correlation Coefficient = -.103

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 8</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 14

Librarians perceived a low negative correlation that indicates that they find very little relationship between financial savings for the libraries and increased circulation as a result of shared-use.
A moderate positive relationship was indicated between whether librarians thought that the shared-use libraries save money and if they thought the agreements between the libraries were equitable.

Librarians found no reduction in the availability of popular or controversial materials and financial savings as a result of shared-use.
Figure 44
Question 8 (Financial Savings) and Question 17 (Networks and Resource Sharing)

Correlation Coefficient = -1.470

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 3 2 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 0 1 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 5 3 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 0 1 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Librarians perceived a very high negative relationship. They found no relationship between increased networking and resource sharing and financial savings.

Figure 45
Question 8 (Financial Savings) and Question 19 (Quality of the Collection)

Correlation Coefficient = .204

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 5 1 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 2 1 3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1 3 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 0 2 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a low positive correlation perceived by librarians that shared-use libraries provide financial savings and the quality of the collections is improved.
There is a low positive relationship between perceptions of financial savings and no reduction in the depth of the collection.

There was little perception by librarians that financial savings that resulted because of shared-use also resulted in one library being emphasized over the other.
Questionnaire II

Librarians were asked to indicate how long the shared-use library they work in has existed. The length of existence of the libraries was considered as a possible indication of how successful the librarians perceived shared-use to be in meeting the needs of library users and saving money for the institutions.

Length of time of existence of the shared-use libraries is indicated below. There was discrepancy in responses from the librarians at the same libraries and there were other inaccuracies in reporting this information. Corrections such as how long a library had existed were made to the information but these corrections did not influence the analysis.

It can be seen in Figure 48 that from 1980 to 1985, seven or more than half of the shared-use libraries were begun. All of these libraries involve community colleges and all with the exemption of Broward involve community colleges with other educational institutions. There is a nine-year gap between the establishment of the first two libraries and the next group. Length of time of existence did not relate to the librarians attitudes about the success of the venture.
Libraries were rated successful or unsuccessful according to the responses of librarians to personal interview questions. This rating is admittedly subjective. Librarians were asked if they considered the libraries to be successful in terms of serving the needs of library users and in terms of financial savings for the libraries. They were also asked if they would recommend that other libraries participate in shared-use and if they were in favor of the concept for their own libraries. Figure 48 shows that three libraries were found to be unsuccessful.

The size of the community served was of interest because of past studies that indicated success of shared-use libraries might be related to the size of the community. Information gathered from librarians is apparently approximations in some cases. The size of the general population of the community and the number of users is shown in Figure 49.
Since the population of this study is very small, no real conclusions can be drawn about the success of the libraries and the size of the community. It should be noted that several of the libraries that were regarded by their librarians as highly successful are in heavily populated areas.

Information about collection sizes was considered to determine if there was any relationship between the size of the collection and the attitude of the librarians about the success of the libraries. Figure 50 gives the size of the collections of the libraries studied.
There is no apparent relationship between the perceived success of the libraries and the size of the collections.

Librarians were asked to report the annual budget for their libraries. In the responses to this question, some discrepancies were observed between information from the same libraries. Some of the libraries, notably DBCC/UCF and PCC/USF were studying financial agreements but had not formalized them. Two of the libraries had no agreements. Figure 51 illustrates the approximate budgets for library materials of the libraries studied.
Figure 51
Library Budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Budget (in $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAU/PBJC</td>
<td>1,104,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USF/ECC</td>
<td>207,230 varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward</td>
<td>100,000 approximate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USF/PCC</td>
<td>72,000 (USF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50,000 (PCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCF/BCC</td>
<td>40,000 (BCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Departmental (UCF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCF/DBCC</td>
<td>35,000 (DBCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Departmental (UCF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWF/OWJC</td>
<td>35,000 approximate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azalea</td>
<td>19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadsden</td>
<td>15,000 (Public)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,000 (TCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway</td>
<td>9,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecanto</td>
<td>5,000 (CFCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,375 (Lecanto HS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowlane</td>
<td>10,000 (Public)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,200 (Meadowlane El.S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>8,095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Librarians were asked to report any special collections that are part of their libraries. Ten libraries reported special collections of one type or another. No libraries reported these collections as restricted to use by a type of library user.

Librarians were asked to report if there were any areas of the shared-use library that was not shared. Two libraries reported that they share only print materials. These libraries are Lecanto and PCC/USF. Two libraries reported restrictions on use of materials or space during the school day. These libraries are Azalea and Meadowlane.
Model for Agreements

A copy of agreements between libraries was requested from the thirteen libraries studied. All except one of the libraries sent documents although some of those documents were not formal agreements. Valencia Community College and Gateway High School was the only library that did not have any documents available. Central Florida Community College and Lecanto High School had only a proclamation.

The following model suggests the components that should be included in an agreement to ensure that each library entering into a shared-use agreement is served and protected. Legal documents are also suggested.

I. Mission Statement. The libraries should develop a statement regarding the reason for the establishment of the shared-use library and expectations for the library.

II. Administration and Organization. The libraries should come to an agreement about which library will be the chief administrative unit including responsibility for daily and routine activities. An internal organizational chart should be developed to show lines of responsibility and coordination within
the library and an external organizational chart should be developed to show the relationship of the library to the parent institutions.

(In this study, 11 of the 13 libraries designated one of the libraries as the administrative unit.)

III. Financing the Library. The libraries should agree to a method of contributing to the financial support of the shared library. A procedure for amendment in this area is suggested. This section should specify operating expenses including utilities, insurance and related expenses, personnel expenses, purchase of property, purchase of resources, cost of special resources, payment procedures, accounting methodology, reconciliation procedures, and special contributions and allocations.

(In this study several methods were used including number of patrons, number of full-time equivalent students, dollar amounts, informal agreements and other methods.)

IV. Advisory Committees. Input from users of the libraries is important to give the library the support of its community and to give direction to the library.

V. Services. The libraries should specify what services are available to library users. If any services are restricted to
certain user groups, this should be stated. How these services are organized and which library has responsibility for them should be stated. These services include reference, audio-visual, technical services and others.

VI. Staff. The libraries should determine the number of professional and support staff necessary. The libraries should specify which institution is responsible for salary, benefits, recruitment and training of staff. Section II should clearly outline supervisory and reporting relationships. Section III should outline financial responsibility.

VII. Hours of Service. Different types of libraries have different patterns of library days and hours of service. The libraries should determine what the service hours will be for the shared library.

VIII. Collection Development. The libraries should determine which library has responsibility for selection, acquisition, purchasing, processing, weeding, maintaining records and other responsibilities of collection management. These should be formal policies and procedures.

(Various patterns were found in the libraries studied, but it was observed that the librarians were more satisfied if one of the libraries assumed this responsibility.)
IX. Circulation Methods and Policies. The libraries should specify requirements for use of the library.

X. Accessing Information. The libraries should determine the method that will be used to organize and access library materials. If automated systems are planned, the libraries should determine which system best meets the needs of the library. Access to external library services and databases should be specified.

XI. Resources. The libraries should state that the resources of the library are merged, combined or joined. Responsibility for resources such as equipment and furniture should be included in the statement. Responsibility for replacement and disposal of resources and accountability should be clear. These should be written policies and procedures.

XII. Review and Modification. The agreement should allow for review and change in the specifications of the agreement. The length of time that the agreement covers should be stated.

XIII. Planning for the Future. The libraries should recognize that libraries change as society changes. A method of planning for the future of the library should be part of the agreement. This planning could involve community and user studies.
XIV. Dissolution or Termination of the Library. The libraries should recognize that it may be necessary to dissolve the shared-use library at some time. A method to reconcile the contributions and responsibilities of the libraries involved should be part of the initial agreement.
Model Mission Statement for Shared-Use Libraries

Question 25 of Questionnaire I asked librarians to state what they understood the mission of a shared-use library to be. Using these comments and guidelines from mission statements produced by the American Library Association for several different types of libraries, a model for a mission statement for a shared-use library was developed.

Mission Statement

It is the intent of the libraries which have combined their efforts in this shared-use library (joint-use library) to develop a stimulating environment that encourages thought, creativity, and intellectual growth. Resources are integrated to provide comprehensive service that allows access to information in various formats to meet the needs of all users of this library.

The library will continually identify and assess the information needs of library users and plan and develop ways to deliver this information. The library will protect and serve the best interests of the institutions that support the library by apprising the institutions of policies, procedures, progress and problems that relate to the library.

The library seeks to provide economical access to information for the supporting institutions and communities. The library will develop and review budgets as required by the institutions.
The library will employ qualified library personnel with the capacity and skills to identify and respond to the needs of the various users of the library. The library will employ sufficient numbers of personnel with specialized skills to provide required services for special groups of users.

The library will provide facilities, materials, and equipment sufficient in size, number and scope to meet the variety of information requirements of the library. The library will encourage cooperation and resource sharing with other libraries and information sources.

Summary

This chapter reports and analyzes, as clearly as possible, the responses to the two survey instruments that were used in the study. A description of the shared-use libraries in Florida is also part of the chapter. A model agreement and a mission statement were designed.

Three patterns for sharing collections were found. The most common pattern was for one library to serve as a host for the second library and to be compensated for its services. The second pattern was the merging of two existing collections. The third pattern was to develop the collection from the beginning as a shared collection with each institution providing funds.

The information gathered by the Questionnaire I was analyzed by using measurements of central tendency based on a Likert Scale, by the Wilcoxon T-Test, by the Mann-Whitney U Test, and by
Cross Tabulation. Non-parametric statistical measurements were selected for the study because of the small number of libraries in the sample and because of the subjective nature of the information.

In general, responses to questions in this part of the study indicated that librarians perceived the shared-use collections to be successful both in terms of meeting the information needs of library users and in conserving financial resources. College, university, school and public librarians indicated that sharing resources increased the availability of information for library users at the same or reduced costs to the institutions.

Information gathered by Questionnaire II was descriptive of the libraries. Using this information, an attempt was made to relate the success or failure of the libraries, in the opinion of the responding librarians, in regard to the length of time the library had existed, the size of the community, the number of library users, the size of the collection and the library budgets. According to the responses of the librarians, the success or failure of the libraries was not directly related to any of these factors.

Success of the shared-use libraries may be more closely tied to a cooperative attitude about resource sharing than to the size of the libraries, the size of the communities, or the expenditures of the libraries. The type of library — college, university, school or public — was not an indicator of success.

Librarians whose institutions have defined budget processes and formal contracts had the most positive attitudes about the success of shared-use libraries. Although several libraries had
contracts or agreements, components of these contracts and agreements varied and no model was apparent. No library had a separate mission statement although several of the contracts and agreements had implied statements.

A model for agreements between libraries, and a model for a mission statement for a shared-use library were developed as part of this chapter. The results of the study are further discussed in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V

Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations

This chapter is divided into the following three sections: conclusions including the results of the study, implications for the future of shared-use libraries, and recommendations for libraries considering shared-use. The study indicated that shared-use libraries are a viable means of providing access to information and the conservation of financial resources. Reasons for the establishment of more shared-use libraries were found and it is necessary for plans to be made for the future of libraries and to investigate ways they may be improved.

Conclusions

General Comments

Throughout this study, evidence was found, that the desire to cooperate and share resources on the part of librarians, administrators, institutions and the community is a primary element in the success of shared-use libraries. Without this cooperative attitude, shared-use libraries cannot meet the needs of library users or save financial resources of the libraries involved.
"It depends, a lot, on the personalities involved." (115)

Virginia Wright, the first librarian at the first joint-use library in Florida, is referring to the elements that make a library with shared-use collections work. She is speaking about one aspect of library cooperation: the attitudes of librarians.

Instances were found where libraries appeared to be shared-use, but in reality were two separate libraries operating in the same physical space. In one case, circulation systems are different, staff members report to separate administrative units, and separate missions are addressed. In an example such as this, it is a difficult, if not impossible task, to provide for the informational needs of the library users. Although certain financial savings may be realized such as in building maintenance, in essence each library is developing its own collection to meet the needs of its own users.

Other libraries are working to overcome any obstacles to ensure that the shared-use concept of library resource sharing is successful. Librarians and support staff have been cross-trained and use carefully designed guidelines to ensure that the collection meets or surpasses the information demands of all user groups. In these libraries, it is almost a formal job requirement, to have a cooperative attitude toward resource sharing and toward serving all groups of library users.

In some of the libraries, the library staff and the major part of the collection are part of one of the institutions. In these libraries, one library becomes the host library for the second library. In these cases, it is routine for the guest library to repay the host library for serving its users and to
delegate collection management, including selection, to the host library. This relationship implies a great deal of cooperation, trust and confidence on the part of both librarians and institutions.

The questionnaires sent to librarians in shared-use libraries, revealed that those librarians who work in libraries with formal agreements have the highest perception of the success of shared-use collections. Several patterns of formal agreements have been used, but success appears to be related not to the pattern used, but to the existence of a formal agreement.

Results

Unexpected Results

One of the most useful results of this study was building an accurate list of those libraries in Florida that are currently participating in shared-use libraries. Some information was available through the state library, other through the Postsecondary Education Commission, still other through various printed documents and directories, but a comprehensive list did not exist.

In some ways the study resembled a treasure hunt without a map. Clues and rumors were followed to find the libraries. There was very little in recent literature relating to shared-use libraries in Florida. Literature searches pointed, for the most part, only to recent well-publicized examples of shared-use such as Broward County’s South Regional Library, and to shared-use libraries established in 1980 or before.
In some instances printed reports were inaccurate. A newspaper article reported that the library that was the subject of the article was the only example of this type library in Florida. "..., officials say, it will become the state's only fully equipped combination public and school library built by two governmental units, but operated as one entity" (116). Actually, the library is unique. It is the only shared-use library (at this time) that is jointly operated by a city and a school. The other examples of public libraries and school libraries involve counties.

In a formal state report one library, Marathon High School library, is described by the Postsecondary Education Commission as providing service to both high school and Florida Keys Community College students. In fact, the library serves only the high school. "Library resources are shared, but separate ownership is maintained," according to this report (117). But, according to the librarian at Marathon High School "The media collection at Marathon High School is used only by the high school faculty and student body. If a student enrolled in the community college wants to use the facilities and materials in the MHS library, they are welcome, but the collection does not circulate to them. The community college does not have a collection at this site". (118) The community college library director concurred.

Shared-use libraries were opening as the study was being conducted. The Lakeland Center of Polk Community College opened in January 1988, Gadsden Public Library and Tallahassee Community
College opened in April 1988, Azalea Branch of St. Petersburg Public Library and Azalea Middle School opened in May, 1988 and another, the library of the North Campus of Palm Beach Jr. College became shared-use with Florida Atlantic University in the late summer of 1988. The Library Board of Broward County recommended in June 1988 that the proposed North Regional County Library be located on the North Campus of Broward Community College and be a shared-use library with the college. The joint-use facility of the University of West Florida and Okaloosa Walton Junior College received $1.6 million in funding for construction in 1988/89.

Empirical Results

The results of the survey questionnaires supported the hypotheses of the study. As indicated by responses to the questionnaires reported in Chapter IV, librarians surveyed perceive that shared-use libraries increase the availability of resources for library users and that the libraries save financial resources by reducing duplication of collections.

Librarians indicated an increase in resources such as indexes and periodicals, but no decrease in the availability of materials due to increased use of the collections. That is, library resources were not strained by increased use by a new group of library users. Material about popular, controversial, and sensitive subjects remained available to library users.

Librarians also indicated that shared-use libraries were better able to provide resources because of having more than one
revenue source even though each library might be expending less for the collections than it would have if it were separate. Sharing collections was found to be of financial benefit for the libraries studied.

The size of the collections of the libraries, the size of the population of the community, and the size of the budget for the libraries did not indicate whether the librarians in the study considered the shared-use library to be successful. This is in contrast to results of some past studies of shared-use libraries. Librarians in this study perceived that success was more closely related to a cooperative attitude than to any other factor. The type of library was not found to be an indicator of success, however, college and university librarians were very likely to consider their shared libraries to be successful.

The study found strong indications that librarians thought that the users of shared-use libraries were successful in finding the information they were seeking. They saw no reduction in services even though shared-use increased the number of users of the collections. Availability of materials was increased through resource sharing.

The study found that institutions were able to expend less money in providing information resources as a result of shared-use. Duplication of library materials was reduced with no perception by librarians of a loss of library service. Duplication of facilities and library staffs were found to be reduced by sharing collections.

College and university libraries that share collections were perceived by both college and university librarians to be
successful. Since both of these types of libraries provide curricular and research support for postsecondary education, combining their collections was logical to the librarians surveyed.

Validity of the Hypotheses

Librarians responded that their experiences in shared-use libraries indicated that library users had increased access to a variety of information sources, especially reference materials. "It makes information and facilities available to the community as well as students that otherwise would not be available with such easy access" (119). A very positive response was reported by several librarians who think library users receive more attention from the staff. One librarian responded "I think the ... students get more individual attention because we try to give them as much help as we do our own students "(120).

Librarians perceive that shared-use library collections are cost effective. In responding to questions on the survey questionnaire that deal with financial savings for the institutions, most librarians agreed that each library contributed less money toward collection development than would have been necessary if the collections were two different libraries. "Two sources of funding are available for purchase "(121). "Cost Saving " (122). "More use for the $ ")(123).
Implications

The major implication of the study is that shared-use libraries are a viable concept for library resource sharing for community colleges, universities, public libraries and school libraries in Florida and will continue to be developed. Shared-use or joint-use libraries can meet the information needs of diverse groups of library users. These libraries can conserve the financial resources of the institutions supporting the libraries.

"Libraries in Florida have made great strides in recent years in developing a statewide library network connected to regional and national library networks, in initiating an automated, statewide unified catalog of holdings, and in building cooperative arrangements to share facilities and resources" (124). This comment from the 1982 Master Plan for Florida Postsecondary Education clearly indicate the direction the state is taking in planning how libraries will serve the information needs of students in the state. These remarks also indicate the direction that public libraries may take. Efforts to coordinate, automate, share and cooperate should be continued in an effort to broaden the the educational experiences of students and to provide wide access to materials and avoid duplication of resources and materials.

This study was undertaken with the assumptions that the reasons for the establishment of shared-use libraries in Florida were to provide improved access to information for users of these libraries and to conserve the financial resources of the
institutions involved and the state. These assumptions were arrived at after studying the literature about (1) shared-use library collections, (2) cooperation between different types of libraries and (3) library resource sharing. These assumptions are valid.

Shared-use libraries will continue to be established to provide increased access to information for library users. Shared-use libraries will continue to be established because they are cost effective. They reduce duplication of library buildings, services and collections.

Other reasons for shared-use library collections were also found as the study progressed. These reasons are that shared-use library collections can assist institutions in meeting accreditation standards; that colleges and universities in Florida can increase the likelihood of receiving funds for new service areas by sharing facilities; that the the state has assisted libraries in shared facilities with library automations projects; and that LSCA funds for shared-use public libraries may become available.

1. In establishing branch campuses, colleges and universities will develop shared-use libraries with other nearby institutions in order to meet accreditation criteria for library services at branch campuses.

The accrediting agency for schools and colleges in Florida is the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges (SACS). This association requires that "At any off-campus location where
credit courses are offered, an institution must ensure the provision of and access to adequate learning resources and services required to support the courses, programs and degrees offered. The institution must own the learning resources or provide them through formal agreements" (125).

What the above statement means is that colleges and universities which are developing facilities or centers separate from their main campus, must provide library and other academic services or endanger their accreditation. Courses taught at branch campuses must be supported at the same level as those at the main campus. The six community college/university libraries, the two community college/high school libraries, and one community college/public library (Gadsden) fit this pattern. That is, the libraries serve off-campus centers of the community colleges or universities.

In part this supports the second hypothesis of the study, in that the libraries are sharing collections to save money expended for collection development. A strong secondary reason is pressure from the accrediting agency to provide library services at off-campus sites. The two community college/high school libraries, neither of which have formal written agreements for library services, need to develop such agreements to meet accrediting requirements.

2. Joint-use facilities for colleges and universities will continue to be established.

Prior to 1985, state regulations allowed for the construction of joint-use facilities without requiring that the
facilities be listed on a post-secondary facilities construction priority list. "The Commissioner of Education shall, upon his approval, include such projects in the legislative capital outlay budget request, including an estimated cost of completion not to exceed 50 percent of the cost...(for community colleges and state universities the remaining 50 percent also is provided from state funds) (126).

Currently, the state requires that the facility be listed on either the university or the community college priority list. Evidence that the legislature looks favorably on these projects is found in the funding of the University of West Florida/Okaloosa Walton Junior College facility.

3. Community Colleges will seek ways to share library collections with universities in order to receive state allocations for library automation.

Bibliographic records from the nine university libraries have been automated through the Florida Center for Library Automation (FCLA) established in 1984 by the state legislature. Two community college libraries were included in the databases, Santa Fe Community College in Gainesville because of an already begun automation project with the University of Florida, and Edison Community College because of its shared-use with the University of South Florida. The proviso language contained in the bill states "Funds in Specific Appropriation 507B for developing an automated system shall be expended based on a plan approved by the Division of Library Services of the Department of
state. The plan shall include the State University System, private institutions, community colleges, public libraries and other resources available within the State and by interstate cooperative agreements "(127).

In 1987 a review of the work of FCLA was undertaken by the postsecondary Education Planning Committee. Since the university automation project was nearing completion, the next steps for library automation needed to be determined. The committee recommended that the proviso language be "altered to differentiate between 'automated' and 'access' services to be provided by the FCLA " (128). They further recommended that FCLA should be retitled SUCLA or the State University Center for Library Automation.

During this same period, the State Board of Community Colleges, using the 1984 proviso language, submitted a budget request to the legislature requesting funds for the automation by FCLA of three more community college libraries in addition to Santa Fe and Edison, as "a first step in the eventual phase-in by the FCLA of all 28 community colleges in the system" (129). Three community college libraries were used to produce a cost estimate for the budget request.

The Postsecondary Education Commission recommended that the State Board of Community Colleges develop a plan for automation and its suggested pilot project that would contain criteria to make decisions about inclusion of community college libraries in FCLA taking into account that it may not be technically feasible nor desirable to add many community college libraries to FCLA.
The report states "Therefore, first priority should be given to community college libraries which are shared with state universities" (130). This plan is to be submitted to the 1989 legislature. The committee report continues that "Funding for the 1988-89 proposed pilot project should be limited to three additional community colleges which share libraries with state universities" (131).

The implication for community college libraries of this report is evident. Those colleges that share libraries with universities will be first in line for automation by the state and inclusion in the state-wide bibliographic database. Instead of committing institutional funds to expensive bibliographic record conversion projects and to purchasing hardware and software for library automation, those colleges that have shared-use libraries with universities may be automated at no cost to the colleges.

The two college libraries that serve the branch campuses of the University of Central Florida, Daytona Beach Community College Library, and Brevard Community College, Cocoa Beach Campus are possible choices. The second library shared by the University of South Florida with a community college, Polk Community College Library, is another likely choice for a pilot project. The University of West Florida Library that is shared with Okaloosa/Walton Junior College is already part of the FCLA database but the main library collection of the Junior college could be added to the system. The library of the South Campus of Palm Beach Jr. College is the main library of Florida Atlantic University and part of the system, but the North Campus library
(the main library of the college) could be selected for inclusion because shared-use with the University began in late summer 1988. The three community college libraries that were used to produce the cost estimates for the State Board of Community Colleges budget request are not part of the above list.

Additionally, the committee suggested that the pilot libraries have membership in SOLINET. Polk Community College has a membership which it is now activating. Both Brevard and Daytona Beach are active members of the network. Palm Beach Jr. College is not a member. Okaloosa/Walton Jr. College is a member.

An interesting offshoot of the automation process by the state is in determining ownership of library materials. The collection of Edison Community College Library is entered in the database of the University of South Florida. The college receives university funds to purchase materials. Does this mean that the college library collection is part of the university collection? If other college libraries that are sharing collections with universities such as Daytona Beach, Brevard, Polk, Okaloosa Walton, and Palm Beach become part of the library automation project, will their collections be entered into the university database? Will their collections then become part of a university collection?

4. Public Libraries may be able to request LSCA funds for the construction of shared-use libraries.

Federal Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) funds
are available for assistance to public libraries that need to remodel and/or construct library buildings. A question raised by this study is whether a public library could receive LSCA funds for a library shared with another type of library. The Administrative Code states that funds are to be used to construct public libraries but section IB-3.006 states that "A single building which is not devoted exclusively to public library service and for which a prorating of expenditures shall be required" (132) is eligible. Glenn Tripplett, Public Library Consultant, for the Division of Library and Information Services (Florida Department of State) thinks the concept presents a "complex and potentially difficult situation; no precedents appear to exist for it. Several problem areas seem to arise involving the use of state funds to construct anything other than public libraries, unconditional use of such a construction by the public library, and eligibility of the public library for service grant awards" (133). If LSCA grants are not available for a shared-use library, then the shared-use concept may not be attractive to some public libraries since construction funds would have to be raised from local revenue sources. The libraries would be ineligible for LSCA funds.
Recommendations

For the Libraries

In considering or participating in shared-use or joint-use, libraries (or their parent institutions) should determine how the mission of each of the libraries can be met by the shared-use library. A mission statement for the shared-use library should be adopted.

Methods to provide for the information needs of the users of each of the libraries should be planned. A formal contract, agreement or statement should be developed for the library that includes administration, services and responsibilities. Plans for future financial support should be part of this initial process. This study revealed instances where funds for the library collection came from non-recurring capital outlay construction funds and where no ongoing financial support for the libraries had been planned.

Systematic review of the level of availability of resources is necessary. Users of the library and members of the general community can provide information about how well the library provides access to information sources. Systematic review of the funding agreements, sources and formulas is also necessary to insure that financial agreements are and continue to be equitable.

The success of shared-use library collections is facilitated
by careful planning and a cooperative attitude of librarians, administrators and by the support of the community. Careful study of the demographics of the community, current and future library budgets and funding, and review of future information needs are required for a successful shared-use library venture.

Meadowlane Community Library and Azalea Public Library are examples of libraries that resulted from strong community effort. Meadowlane Library continues despite many obstacles primarily as a result of community support.

For Further Study

This study identified four areas that should be studied further. These research areas are: new shared-use libraries in Florida; ownership and responsibility for shared-use libraries in view of accreditation criteria; the success of the various methods of funding shared-use libraries; and possible federal sources for funding of shared-use public libraries.

New examples of shared-use libraries in Florida came into being as the study was being conducted. It is likely that more libraries will adopt this form in order to meet the information needs of a growing state. A study of the development of these libraries will give more information about the success of the shared-use concept.

A question about ownership of shared-use collections was raised by the study. This aspect of shared-use libraries should be investigated in consideration of accrediting standards.
Accredited institutions are required to provide adequate levels of library support for programs. How shared-use libraries contribute this support needs to be studied.

The study revealed different methods of providing for funding of shared-use library collections. These methods include student headcount, full-time student enrollment ratios, dollar amounts, and numbers of volumes. A comparison of these methods and how well each method supports the libraries will provide valuable information about the success of shared-use libraries.

The availability of LSCA funds for shared-use libraries should also be investigated. This study revealed that there may be avenues to fund the construction of shared-use public libraries with federal funds to supplement local taxes and bond issues.

The Future of Shared-Use Libraries

To accommodate Florida's rapidly increasing population more shared-use libraries that provide ready access to information will be formed in the future. Planning for information resource sharing and networking including shared-use libraries should continue to be emphasized by the state.

This study focused on how changes in electronic access to information has encouraged and will continue to encourage shared-use libraries. The two community colleges that are part of the university system automated database have without question, increased information resources for their students. The Division of Community Colleges has mandated a study of library
Automation in the colleges to determine how the college libraries can interface with the university system and other information systems.

According to David Lewis, "This is a time of transition and fundamental change in institutions." (134) Lewis emphasizes the role of electronic technology and its impact on the university environment. Shared library collections are part of this fundamental change and their evolution will be effected by electronic technology.

In an information-based society, library professionals must adapt to continuing technological developments in providing information services to an increasingly sophisticated community of users. The process of sharing collections between various types of libraries constitutes a major contribution to resource sharing and networking thereby enhancing the librarian's role in facilitating access to information.
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APPENDIX I

EVALUATION OF COLLECTION SHARING IN SHARED-USE (JOINT-USE) LIBRARY COLLECTIONS

1. Are books and other materials purchased for this collection chosen according to a written agreement for the development of the shared-use collection?
   Yes ______  No ______

2. (If Yes) This agreement is financially equitable to the institutions sharing the collection?
   Strongly Agree ______  Agree ______  No Opinion ______  Disagree ______  Strongly Disagree ______

3. If a written agreement exists, are materials added to the collection by each institution by:
   number of volumes ______
   what is the number ______

   number of titles ______
   what is the number ______

   percent of volumes ______
   what is the percent ______

   percent of titles ______
   what is the percent ______

   number of users (headcount) ______
   what is the headcount ______

   FTE (full-time equivalent students) ______
   what is the FTE ______

   dollar amount ______
   what is the amount ______

   other ______
4. If a written agreement for development of the collection does not exist how does the library determine financial responsibility for collection development?

5. Have special collection development agreements or arrangements (formal or informal) that were not originally specified evolved as this library collection has developed?
   Yes ______  No ______

6. If yes, what are those special agreements?

7. Which institution has responsibility for purchasing materials and maintaining the library budget?

8. As a result of sharing collections, each parent institution is required to spend less money to provide materials for users of its library than it would have if the library collections were separate.
   Strongly Agree ______  Agree ______  No Opinion ______  Disagree ______  Strongly Disagree ______

9. What is the most positive financial aspect of this shared-use library collection?

10. What is the most negative financial aspect of this shared-use library collection?
12. Certain library materials such as indexes or journals are available to users because of the shared-use collection that would not have been available if the collections were separate.

Strongly Agree __  Agree ___  No Opinion ___  Disagree ___  Strongly Disagree ___

13. Certain library materials, for example, materials that may be sexually explicit, contain vulgar language, or describe violence are not available to users because of the shared-use collection that would have been available if the collections were separate.

Strongly Agree __  Agree ___  No Opinion ___  Disagree ___  Strongly Disagree ___

14. Merging the collections of this library resulted in increased use (circulation) of the materials in the collection.

Strongly Agree __  Agree ___  No Opinion ___  Disagree ___  Strongly Disagree ___

15. Certain library materials such as popular titles or controversial subjects are less available to users because of increased numbers of users of the shared-use collection.

Strongly Agree __  Agree ___  No Opinion ___  Disagree ___  Strongly Disagree ___

16. The collection contains fewer unique materials because it is a shared-use collection.

Strongly Agree __  Agree ___  No Opinion ___  Disagree ___  Strongly Disagree ___

17. Resource sharing and networking between the shared-use library and other libraries has increased as a result of the shared-use concept.

Strongly Agree __  Agree ___  No Opinion ___  Disagree ___  Strongly Disagree ___
18. Library users are more successful in locating and accessing information because of the shared collection.

Strongly Agree Agree No Opinion Disagree Strongly Disagree

19. Merging the collections of this library resulted in an increase in the quality of the collection.

Strongly Agree Agree No Opinion Disagree Strongly Disagree

20. Merging the collections of this library resulted in an increase in the depth of the collection.

Strongly Agree Agree No Opinion Disagree Strongly Disagree

21. One of the institutions responsible for the shared-use collection determines the direction of growth or emphasis of the collection.

Strongly Agree Agree No Opinion Disagree Strongly Disagree

22. What is the most positive aspect of the shared-use library collection in providing for the needs of library users?

23. What is the most negative aspect of the shared-use library collection in providing for the needs of library users?
24. What is the library mission of each of the institutions sharing the library collection?

Institution A  

Institution B  

Institution C  

25. What is the library mission of the shared-use library?
Appendix II

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. How long (number of years) has this library had a shared-use library collection?

2. What is the population size of the general community in which the shared-use library is located?

3. What number of users are served by the library?

4. What is the size of the collection?
   Number of titles ______
   Number of volumes ______

5. What is the annual budget of the library for purchase of library materials?

6. List any special collections that are part of the library.

7. If you share only certain items, for example only the reference collection or only audio-visual equipment, please indicate what that area is.

8. Please indicate which type of shared-use library best describes this library.
   School/Public Library ______
   University/Community College Library ______
   Public Library/Community College Library ______
Appendix III

EVALUATING COLLECTION AGREEMENT STATEMENTS

Library 1  Library 2

Responsibility for Selection
Responsibility for Purchase
Responsibility for Processing
Responsibility for De-Selection
Ownership of Collection

Can the shared-use collection be dissolved and materials returned to one or both of the libraries involved?
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

How are materials from other libraries accessed by users of the shared-use collection?
(Note: Most of the libraries involved are part of a system. For example, all but one of the community college/university libraries, are on branch campuses).

Which library actually selects the largest number of titles?

What do you do if there is a conflict in the selection of a particular title?

Can you relate any instances where library users gained or lost access to information as a result of the shared collection?

Have there been any instances when funding for the collection was inadequate because of problems with the parent institution?

Would you advise another library to enter into a shared-use agreement?

Would you work in (or develop) a shared-use library if you had the option to do it again?
APPENDIX V

Test of
Survey Questionnaire

Community College Library
   Charles Rodgers, Pasco Hernando Community College

University Library
   Delma Rodriques, University of South Florida

School Library
   Janet Williams, Charlotte County School District-

Public Library
   Ellen Clark, Hernando County Public Library

Statistics Professor
   Dwight Newsome, University of South Florida and Pasco
   Hernando Community College

Other
   Joseph Lindenfeld, Shelby State Community College, Memphis,
   TN.
Appendix VI

Appendix VI consists of a two-part report about developing a resource library for the Florida Child Welfare Academy at Quincy. This library is located in the same building as the Gadsden Center of Tallahassee Community College and the Gadsden County Public Library. This appendix is presented as an example of a shared-use library.
INTRODUCTION

The establishment by the Florida State Legislature in 1986 of a training academy for Child Welfare workers (Florida Statute 402.40) led to the development of the training academy at the Gadsden Center of Tallahassee Community College. The first class of trainees began in the fall of 1987.

Since the academy is a resident training facility giving intensive training to child welfare workers over four week periods, a great deal of learning takes place over a short period of time. The need for a reference library to support the academy curriculum is apparent. The academy is located in a shared-use building that includes the main branch of the public library of Gadsden County. The other occupant of the building, which was formerly the county hospital, is the Gadsden Center of Tallahassee Community College. Tallahassee Community College also serves as the administrative agent for the academy. The Gadsden County public library, through contract, serves as the academic library for students attending TCC at the Gadsden Center. This configuration of agencies sharing a common facility, allows for a unique opportunity for library resource sharing.
A Resource Collection
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BIBLIOGRAPHY

Print

General reference materials are not included in this report, but should be part of the academy collection. These general works include an encyclopedia, dictionaries, Florida and U.S. Statistical Information, The Florida Handbook and Almanac and other materials.


Anthony, E. James. The Child In His Family: The International Yearbook for Child Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines. Wiley (to date) 7v. $50 each.


*The five books listed directly above are books for use with elementary school age children and are included as examples of the kinds of books available for counselors to use with young children.*


Bender's Editorial Staff. Child Custody and Visitation Law and Practice, 4 vol. Bender, 1984+. $320

Bensinger, Gad J. and Frost, Thomas (eds) Conference on the Sexually Abused Child: Selected Papers. Loyola U. Crim. 1984. $7.00 (0-942854-03-9)


Brudno, Barbara. Poverty, Inequality and the Law: Commentary and Analysis. West 1976 (Write for more Information)


Dowell, Michael. State and Local Government Responsibilities to Provide Medical Care for Indigents. NCLS 1985 $25


Law and the Courts.: A Handbook of Courtroom Procedures American Bar Assoc, 1988. $3 (pamphlet)


Physician And the Mental Health of the Child. 2 vol. Vol 1, Assessing and Development and Treating Disorders Within and Family and Vol 2, Psychological Concomitants of Illness. Issues and Skills in Relating Primary Medical Care to the Other Human Services. American Medical Association, 1986


Polangin, Richard. Employment and Demographic Characteristics of AFDC & Food Stamp Recipients: A Three Year Longitudinal Study. NCLS Inc., 1985. $5.50


*Note* Additional materials are available in booklet form from...
such agencies as The National Committee for Prevention of Child Abuse. Child Abuse and The Law. NCPCA: P.O. Box 94283, Chicago, Ill., $4.50 is an example. This booklet is a guide to recent changes in child abuse law including the use of closed circuit television.*

HRS Documents

The following brochures can be ordered as single copies or in bulk from: The Department of HRS

Jacksonville Warehouse
5107 University Blvd. West
Jacksonville, Florida.

5730-003-0105-0 Client Rights, Obligations and Responsibilities.
5730-008-012-0145-8 Is There Help For My Child?
5730-016-0160-0 Preventing Handicaps In Children
5730-090-0160-1 Open Your Heart, Open Your Home.
5730-014-0165-1 Foster Care In Florida -- A Guide For Parents.
5730-022-0165-6 Be A Foster Parent
5730-032-0165-0 Foster Care Information
5730-037-0165-2 Low Income Energy Assistance Program
5730-010-0175-1 Volunteer Crisis Home Program
5730-015-0175-3 Children, Youth and Families Program
5730-016-0175-8 Sexual Abuse of Children
5730-017-0175-2 Child Abuse and Neglect In Florida -- A Guide for Professionals.
5730-020-175-4 Foster Care A-Z Handbook
5730-003-0205-6 Child Support Enforcement Rights and Responsibilities.
Nonprint includes Videotapes, Slide/Tape Programs 16 mm Films and Computer Software.

Such general guides as the Educational Film/Video Locator (Bowker, annual editions, $175) should be included in the collection in order to locate audio visual material that is not included in this report.

Videotape: Please note the copyright date, length of Presentation and cost in making decisions to purchase.


Anger. (How children are affected by adult anger) MTI 15 min. 1984. $265.


Child Abuse: Cradle of Violence. MTI. 1976. 20 min $405


Child Abuse: It Shouldn’t Hurt to be a Kid (mandated responsibility to report child abuse) Alms. 27 min 1985. $380.


Child Sexual Abuse Prevention: Socio-Cultural and Community Issues (For professional inservice training) Alms. 30 min. 1986 $145.

Childhood Aggression: A Social Learning Approach to Family Therapy. Media Guild. 31 min. 1976. $450

Childhood Sexual Abuse: Four Case Studies. MTI. 50 min. 1977. $660.

Cipher In the Snow. (Short story about emotional neglect.) Brigham Young University. 22 min. 1973.

Crack: Cheap and Dangerous. (Crack cocaine) MTI. 7 min 1986 $99.


Dispositional Conference (Multidisciplinary team) Mike Williams Assoc. 30 min. (no date)

Don’t Give Up On Me. (Child Abuse from the perspective of parents). MTI. 25 min. 1975. $430

Drug Information Series ( 7 videotapes on recognizing substances, use and dangers: alcohol, depressants, hallucinogens, inhalants, marijuana, narcotics, and stimulants). MTI 10 min. each. 1983 $185 each.

Double Jeopardy. (Child Abuse -- Judicial proceedings) MTI. 40 min. 1979. $250.


Family Matters (two families and social stresses and support) Cornell Univ. 30 min. 1984.

Foster Care Remembered: A Personal Story. Washington University, St. Louis. 1983.

Four Foster Parents: Their Own Stories in Their Own Words. Washington University, St. Louis. 1983 42 min.


Hidden Shame. (Father-daughter sexual abuse) MTI. 19 min. 1983 $330.

How About Saturday? (Elementary school age child emotional response to divorce) MTI 20 min 1979 $250.


Incest: The Victim Nobody Believes. (Interview with three young women who were victims) MTI. 23 min. 1978 $455.

Interviewing Children Sounds Easy, But... University of Washington, 1979. 24 min.


The Last Taboo. (Six stories of child sexual abuse) MTI 28 min. 1977. $455.


Lots of Kids Like Us (Children of an alcoholic parent) MTI 28 min. 1983. $380.

The Lures of Death. (Deceptive practices of child abductors) MTI. 15 min. 1984. $265.

No Longer Alone (Family Violence and its impact on children) MTI. 30 min. 1986. $415.


Raised in Anger (Family violence). Media Guild. 54 min. 1979. $395.

Runaway (Documentary about the millions of abandoned and runaway children) Media Guild. 54 min $245.


Sexual Abuse of Children: America’s Secret Shame (For professional inservice training) Aims 28 min. 1979. $260.


Social Worker as Witness. University of Texas, 1981. 50 min.

Sometimes It’s OK to Tattle (Features community resources available to children in child abuse cases) MTI 12 min. 1982 $150.

Stepparenting Issues (Authority, sibling rivalry etc.) MTI 20 min. 1982. $190.

Understanding Children’s Feelings: Models and Approaches Techniques and Skills. 3 parts 20 min each. (Dealing with troubled children) Productions, 1982. 60 min.


Whatever Happened to Lori Jean Lloyd? (Runaways) Dave Bell 1980. 27 min.

What’s Wrong With Me? (Child victim) Disney, 1983. 6 min.

Who Do You Tell? (Discussions with pre-adolescents) MTI 11 min. 1978. $250.

Whose Child Is This? (Teacher discovers child abuse) Motorola Teleprograms, 1979. 28 min.

Slide and Slide/Tape


Goodbye Again...Separation Issues in Child Placement University of Minnesota, 1976. 11 min.

Lift a Finger. Program in four parts: Administrator’s Role; Teacher’s Role; Young Adults; Citizen’s Role. (child abuse) INFORM, 1975. 20 to 45 min. ea.

She Was Always Hugging Me...Handling Separation Issues in Child Placement. Univ. of Minnesota, 1976 14 min.

Theft of Childhood...Toward Understanding Abusive Parents University of Minnesota. 1975. 15 min.

16 MM Films

Some materials originally produced in 16 mm format may not be available in VHS. If the academy has access to a 16 mm projector, purchase of the following materials may be indicated.


Behind Client Behavior
Casework and the Community
Doing Casework
Patterns of Behavior
What Is Successful Casework?


Counselling With Parents, Interview I, III, VI. Pennsylvania State University, 1967. Black and White. 30 min. each.


Dynamics of Divorce, No.4 & No.5. A Child’s Rights. Univ. of Minnesota, 1975. 30 min. each.

An Experience With Aggressive Behavior. INSTRUX, Inc. 1967. Black and White. 15 min.

In Charge At Home. Cornell Univ. 21 min. 1985.

Initial Interview. (Intake Interview) University of Wisconsin, 1962. Black and White. 22 min.


Interviewing the Abused Child. MTI. 27 min. 1978.

Jane: Aged 17 Months In Fostercare for 10 days. New York University, 1968. Black and White 37 min.

Kate: A Two Year Old In Fostercare. New York University 1967. Black and White. 33 min.


Thomas: Aged Two Years and Four Months In Fostercare for 10 days. New York University, 1971. 38 min.

Treatment Techniques, Parts 1-6 (client interview) (Includes counseling sessions with abusive parents) National Institute of Mental Health, 1976. 45 min.

Who Did What to Whom? (Includes positive and negative reinforcement, punishment and extinction -- for use by instructors) Mager Assn., Research 17 min. 1972.

**Computer Software**

In addition to commercially available administrative management software, the academy may provide software for curriculum enhancement.
FIRM (Florida InteRactive Modeler) by C. Michael Levy and Marc Durnin. University of Florida.

This system requires an IBM with two disk drives and utilizes prepackaged software in such areas as psychology and, more importantly, a method to model and experiment. The instructor can set experimental parameters (independent variables) to simulate research or theory. The FGS simulator is included which builds a linear model and does not require programming. University of Iowa. $100


Interpersonal Dynamics: FIRM vol II. Software package that includes experiments in Aggression, Crowding and Conformity. Conduit software. University of Iowa. $130.


WAIS-R: Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised. Southern Micro Systems. $495.
HOUSING THE COLLECTION

Print

Library collections should be located as conveniently as possible for use of the library clientele. If the staff or trainees of the academy need information to support instruction, this information should be readily available to them. Since the academy collection is limited in size and scope, most routine resource materials needed to support or supplement the collection can be housed in the academy. Reference was made in the interim report as to the location of legal documents, HRS documents, and standard reference works. It is suggested that these materials be housed in free standing wooden bookcases in the academy classrooms. A wide, open hallway that runs the length of the academy can also be fitted with bookcases that can house these materials and the remainder of the print collection.

Since access to the resources in the collection is important for use by the academy, limited circulation of materials is necessary. By housing the academy collection separately from the general collection of Gadsden Public Library, availability of resources can be assured. The academy resources will essentially be a limited access special library.

It is suggested that records of the holdings of the academy be interfiled with records of the holdings of the public library and given special designations to indicate location and availability or that a separate catalog of academy holdings be housed in the public library. This not only provides the public library with information about the collection, but more importantly, provides information about academy holdings to trainees who may use the public library when the academy is closed. A catalog of academy holdings should be maintained in the academy. A shelflist of holdings should be maintained by the technical processing department of Tallahassee Community College.
Since windows line both sides of this hallway, shelving should be limited to three foot sections that have three shelves. It is estimated that 60 to 80 volumes can be housed in each bookcase section, estimating 15 to 20 volumes per shelf. Collection growth formulas indicate that print collections double in size in 7.5 years. Since this collection is designed to support a specific curriculum, such growth is not anticipated and the estimate of titles per shelf leaves room for limited expansion of the collection.

Certain general interest print materials may be purchased by the academy. These would be items that relate to general child psychology and development or generalized social work. If such items are purchased they can be located in the collection of the Gadsden Public Library as long as proper identification of the materials is maintained for audit purposes.

**Nonprint**

Nonprint resources or audio-visual resources have evolved over time making some formats nearly obsolete. Currently 1/2 inch (VHS) videotapes and micro computer programs have displaced such formats as slide/tape, 16mm films, filmstrips and transparencies. Since all nonprint collections have the added component of appropriate equipment to utilize the collection, the academy can conserve financial resources by choosing to develop nonprint collections in limited formats. It is suggested that most nonprint resources be selected in VHS format and that VHS playback units be purchased to utilize the collection.

A simple video distribution system that uses cable to connect classrooms and role playing rooms to a central distribution system can be designed. (Approximately $8,000) The central unit should be housed in the audiovisual area behind the role-playing rooms. The video tape collection can be housed on standard shelving in the same area. Video cameras, microphones and other equipment is already in place at the academy. Two audio-visual carts with electrical outlets and two stand alone VHS/Monitor units should also be included. These units are needed because instructors may need to stop and replay programs in the classroom.

**Serials**

A list of suggested periodicals and journals for purchase by the academy was included in the interim report. Display of current issues of these items will increase their use by staff and trainees. It is suggested that only the current issues be housed in the academy. Bookcases that will fit the academy hallway can be purchased with 5 shelves per three foot section. Three sections should shelve 45 titles.

Backfiles of these periodicals should be purchased in microformat whenever possible and the paper copies discarded, because six months to one year elapse before microformat
backfiles are available, storage for recent back issues is necessary. It is suggested that Gadsden Public Library have responsibility for receiving, processing, housing of recent backfiles and housing of microformat backfiles. Subscriptions can be entered by Tallahassee Community College technical services department.

The reasoning for this suggestion is that 1) the periodicals should come directly to the Gadsden Center to avoid delay in receiving issues, 2) the public library serials staff has already been trained in checking in periodicals, placing them in binders, and claiming missing issues; 3) the public library has a planned storage facility for periodicals; 4) the public library has the equipment necessary to utilize microformat backfiles; 5) the public library has indexes that will provide access to periodicals and staff trained in using indexes. There seems no need to duplicate these services already available through the public library, but there is a need to provide financial assistance for the additional storage shelving and cabinets, binders, additional equipment to utilize the backfiles, additional indexes not currently subscribed to by the public library and public library staff time used to maintain the academy periodical collection.

**Suggested Locations for Academy Resources**

**Child Welfare Academy** — Legal resources, curriculum related print materials, computer software (management applications and curriculum materials), current issues of periodicals, video tapes (other nonprint materials)

**Gadsden Public Library** — Periodical indexes, backfiles of periodicals.
COLLECTION MANAGEMENT

General Policy

The role of the Resource Library of the Child Welfare Academy, Gadsden Center, is to support the curriculum of the academy. Materials are selected to provide essential information pertinent to the training of child welfare workers in Florida. Materials about current issues and problems and materials of permanent importance are basic selections of the library.

The first obligation of the library is to provide service to the staff and trainees of the academy. Consideration will be given to the informational needs of the students of Tallahassee Community College, Gadsden Center and the patrons of Gadsden County Public Library insofar as this may be done without detriment to the needs of the academy.

Responsibility for Selection

Selection of materials for the Child Welfare Academy library is a cooperative venture requiring assistance from the staff of Tallahassee Community College (the administrative agency of the academy) and Gadsden County Public Library. Selections recommended by academy staff will be given first consideration.

Criteria -- Selection of Resources

1. Resources must supplement or enhance the curriculum of the academy.
2. Resources will not be disqualified from inclusion in the collection on the basis of violence, sexual explicitness, profanity or other sensitive issues if a need of the academy is supported by these resources. These materials may be non-circulating or otherwise restricted in use.
3. Selections will be based on:
   a. Relevance of the subject matter
   b. Authoritativeness and reputation of the author
   c. Timeliness or permanence of the materials
   d. Cost

Gifts and Requests

Resources obtained as gifts to the academy must meet the same standards of selection as those purchased. In accepting gifts the academy will evaluate costs incurred in processing and housing the resources. Gifts will not be accepted if the donor places restrictions on the gift. It is the responsibility of the donor to furnish an appraisal of the value of the materials.
**Deselection of Resources**

During systematic inventory of academy resources, those items which are obsolete, inaccurate, inappropriate or worn will be withdrawn from the collection. These resources will be replaced with current resources as necessary.

**An annual inventory of library holdings is practical for a small collection. Library personnel from the college could perform this task with final judgment on the removal of materials the responsibility of the academy director.**

**Evaluation**

Satisfaction that the collection supports the needs of the academy will be determined by statistics on the use of the collection and surveys of the staff and trainees.

**Records of the use or circulation of materials can be a simple manual system. Since most materials will be housed in the academy a sign-out-sheet to record use of material may be all that is necessary. Satisfaction with the collection can be determined by a printed survey form included in each trainee's informational packet. There are two reasons to have an evaluation process for the library: 1) to determine guidelines for a budget to maintain the collection and to demonstrate the use of previously allocated funds; and 2) to aid in the selection process of materials for the collection.**

**The policies that have been suggested or similar policies should be formally agreed to by those who have responsibility and authority for the academy. This will protect the academy from any criticism of library holdings or procedures. Additionally, the academy may want to have a statement of adherence to copyright law and to the American Library Association's Library Bill of Rights.**

SPECIAL COMPONENTS

Video Distribution

The concept of videotaping role-playing sessions by trainees to evaluate their work and to use in later training sessions is excellent and this concept can be enhanced by completing the video distribution system in the academy.

Currently the system consists of two video camera systems used to tape the role-playing sessions. In an earlier letter to the academy, it was suggested that the microphones attached to the cameras be dropped inside the classrooms and that taping be performed through the one way mirrors to avoid the distraction of cameras in the role-playing areas. A further development is to distribute the video signal to the classrooms so that staff and trainees can conveniently view the sessions while they are being enacted or replay the sessions at a later time.

1. Examine conduit, coaxial cable, and video taps already in place and upgrade where necessary to provide point-of-origination system. This system provides video distribution from the audio-visual area and from any of the directional taps to the audio-visual area for taping.

2. Install headend, cabinet and wiring in audio-visual area. Install three taps at headend for ease of input output of signal.

3. Install two in-house modulators in audio-visual area.

4. Install one portable modulator. This can be attached to an audio-visual cart if desired.

5. Install 19 in color commercial/industrial television monitors in classrooms and courtroom with swivel wall mounts. (Three monitors)

6. Install amplifiers, filters, mixers, splitters and additional hardware as needed. (Given the limited area of distribution, these components should be minimal.)

7. Wire two VHS recorder/players to the headend for distribution of the video signal. These recorders will be used to playback tapes made by the academy and commercial tapes used to support the academy curriculum.

8. Add two VHS/Monitor combinations for individual use and for classroom playback (when it is necessary to stop and restart the tape for instructional purposes).
Computer Applications

Microcomputers can be used by the academy for several purposes: 1) management applications such as word processing, spreadsheets and data base management; 2) staff and trainee use of commercially produced software that is related to the academy curriculum; 3) online access to state and national electronic databases. The same microcomputers can be used for all applications.

1. Hardware
   2 IBM (or compatible) microcomputers, 2 monochrome monitors and operating systems
   1 IBM (or compatible) microcomputer with color monitor and board
   1 near-letter quality printer and cables
   1 dot-matrix printer, cables and distributor to connect two computers to one printer.
   1 internal modem (Installed) and communications software (Hayes or compatible)
   1 LCD overhead projection display device and cables

2. Software
   1 wordprocessing system (Wordperfect, Word, or Wordstar)
   1 spreadsheet system (Lotus 1,2,3 ) 1 integrated database management system (DBase III)
   1 file management system (PFS File)
   1 communications system (purchased with modem)

As a new agency, the academy has the opportunity to utilize technology to develop and maintain administrative records. The adaptability of microcomputers to various tasks means that the same computers can be used by the academy administration for record keeping and word processing and the academy instructional staff for teaching purposes. One of the monochrome computer systems and the letter quality printer could be located in the administrative offices of the academy and used there by instructional staff as needed. The other monochrome computer system, color system, dot matrix printer and projection device should be located in the academy for use by trainees and instructional staff. A possible location is the area designated as counseling offices. The color system is needed since commercial computer software that may be used for instruction requires this configuration as do computer projection devices.

The modem can be installed in any of the computers but may be most useful in the computer used for administrative purposes. Modems require a single telephone line - that is a line that the computer can access to dial into databases. The academy will want to monitor use of this telephone line. The modem connects to the telephone system via a standard telephone jack. The academy has the opportunity to access special national databases that directly relate to child welfare, additional national databases such as ERIC for staff research, the SUS library
database (LUIS) for resource sharing and state databases such as the DOE Bulletin Board.

An alternative is to locate a microcomputer system with modem in the administrative or computing area of the public library. Public library staff would have the responsibility for accessing databases. The value of this alternative is that the computer system would be available for use by trainees when the academy or administrative offices were closed and that the library staff would perform electronic searches for the academy.
ESTIMATED COSTS = $70,000 ($67,500)

If the academy requests a budget to develop the resource library based on $70,000, the academy will have financial resources for any costs incurred that are not covered in this report such as consumable materials.

Print Resources
A national study is undertaken by CHOICE magazine annually to determine average costs per title for academic books. A current estimate is $25 per title. The titles suggested for inclusion in the Academy collection number just over 200. The academy should be able to purchase these titles for $6000. Journal and other periodical titles can be estimated at a cost of $30 per title for $1400 needed for periodicals. Periodical Indexes will cost an additional $150-$200 per index. If three additional Indexes are required, the academy should plan for $600 in index costs. Backfiles of periodicals vary in cost per title. Using $15 per title per year, the academy should plan $700 per year to purchase backfiles.

Total $9000

NonPrint Resources
Costs vary according to format. Videotapes tend to be much less costly than 16 mm films. The collection of video tapes is under 100 titles. Suggested slide sets are six. There are just under 30 film titles.

Videotapes = $24,000 (80 tapes at $300 each)
Slide Sets = $900 (6 sets at $150 each)
16mm Films = $12,000 (30 films at $400 each)

Total $37,000

Library Furniture and Shelving
Card Catalog: 6 drawer card catalog to contain catalog and shelf list at academy = $300
Shelf List Catalog: 2 drawer for TCC = $175
6 Wood bookcases 42 in. high x 37 in. wide x 12 in. deep = ($350 each) $2100
3 Sections wood periodical shelving (sloping shelf) 82 in. high x 37 in. wide x 12 in. deep ($675 each) = $2000
3 Sections metal single faced shelving to house nonprint collection 66 in. high x 36 in. wide x 12 in. deep ($350 each) = $1050
1 microfiche cabinet for Gadsden Public Library to house backfiles of periodicals, six drawer = $500

Total $5300
**Video Distribution**

Certain labor costs will be incurred in addition to the estimated cost of materials.

Headend, cabinet and three taps = $2700  
2 modulators (in-house) = $1000  
1 portable modulator = $1500  
3 19 in monitors (250 each) = $750  
3 wall mounts (100 each) = $300  
2 VHS Monitor/ Receivers ($450 each) = $900  
2 VHS Recorder/Players ($350 each) = $700  
2 audio visual carts 42 in. electrical ($100 each) = $200  

Total $8000

**Computer Applications**

The suggested computer hardware:  
2 IBM or Compatible computers with monochrome monitors = $1700  
1 IBM or Compatible color computer and color monitor = $1000  
1 Near Letter Quality printer = $450  
1 Dot Matrix Printer = $350  
1 Internal Modem and software = $450  
1 LCD projection device = $1000  
1 Overhead projector = $200

Hardware = $5200

Suggested computer software:  
Applications: wordprocessing, database, spreadsheet = $2000  
Instructional software = $1000

Software = $3000  

Total = $8200
INTERACTION WITH OTHER AGENCIES

Tallahassee Community College

As the administrative agency for the academy, Tallahassee Community College has responsibility to the academy for many services. Included in these services should be library technical services for the resource library at the academy. The purchase and processing of library materials is a fairly routine activity that can be accomplished by the staff of the college if both the college and academy are agreeable. It is suggested that the college and academy develop a letter of agreement for the provision of these services. Additional college library staff time may be required to order and update materials in the future and to remove materials from the collection.

Audio-visual technical services in training academy personnel in the use of audio-visual equipment and in the service and repair of the equipment can also be provided by the college. An agreement for these services should be developed.

The college library will use certain consumable items in processing academy materials. These are items such as book jackets, pockets, catalog cards and other items. It may be necessary for the academy to develop a budget for these library processing items.
Gadsden Public Library

The academy has the opportunity to provide trainees and staff with the use of a public library located in the same building. It is suggested in this report that the public library be compensated for individual use of the public library collections at $5.00 per Child Welfare Academy trainee which is the rate charged by the public library to users who are not residents of Gadsden County. Both the staff and trainees of the academy can benefit from the resources already part of the public library collection.

Additionally, it is suggested that the public library provide indexes to periodicals for use of journals and other periodicals purchased by the academy and that the public library house backfiles of academy periodicals in micro-format. Compensation for the purchase of additional indexes, microformat storage cabinets and any additional microformat reading equipment needed should be agreed upon by the public library and the academy.

It has been suggested that the public library receive periodical subscriptions for the academy. This will require the public library to keep records of receipt of periodicals and place them in binders for use in the academy. This is a routine library function that can be performed by a library clerk. The academy should provide compensation for the purchase of the necessary binders (45 titles x $5 each = $255) and library staff time.

Public library staff are a logical choice to file catalog cards of the academy holdings (both in the academy and in the public library) and to shelve books and generally maintain the academy library. An agreement for public library staff time compensation should be considered by the academy.
Survey Instrument for Child Welfare Academy Trainees

The Child Welfare Academy of Florida exists to provide professional training to guide those who interact on a daily basis with children in need physical, emotional and psychological. A special library has been developed to support this training. Please complete the following survey which will be used to further develop the library and instructional support systems of the academy.

If you did not use the Resource Library, please skip to question 10.

1. Did you use any print (book) resources of the academy?
   Yes _______ No _______

2. If yes, did the material help answer a question, explain a problem area, or otherwise enhance your training?
   Yes _______ No _______

3. Was the information current?
   Yes _______ No _______

4. Did you use any nonprint (audio-visual or computer) resources of the academy?
   Yes _______ No _______

5. Did you experience any difficulty in using these resources?
   Yes _______ No _______

6. How many years have you been employed in working with children for the state of Florida?
   less than 1 year _____ 1 year _____ 2 years _____
   5 years _____ More (How Many Years?) _____

7. Briefly explain your previous child welfare training.

8. The most useful component of the resource library is:
   Legal Documents _____ HRS Documents _____
   General Books _____ Computer Software _____
   Video Tapes _____ Magazines _____

9. Please list any resources you would like to add to the resource library to enhance academy training.

10. Please explain why you did not use the resources of the academy library.
Guidelines -- Use of Gadsden Public Library by the Staff and Trainees of the Child Welfare Academy

Gadsden Public Library has a current circulation policy that allows for the use and circulation of library materials to anyone who is a resident of the county. Additionally, the library allows access to the collection and borrowing privileges for any persons not living in the county. The library charges a modest fee of $5.00 to these users. In line with this policy, a fee of $5.00 per academy trainee is suggested as part of the academy fee structure for use of the public library. An alternative is to charge each trainee for use of the library as a personal expense. This is not suggested because it will certainly mean that fewer trainees will avail themselves of the resources of the public library. To assist the library in retrieving materials checked out to academy trainees, the academy should provide a list of trainees and their addresses for each academy class to the library. The library should have a procedure of notifying the academy director, in writing, of any materials outstanding prior to the end of each academy training session.
Procedure for Use of Gadsden Public Library. (To be given to each Child Welfare Academy trainee at the beginning of the training period):

GADSDEN PUBLIC LIBRARY

The collections of Gadsden Public Library are available to you while you attend the Child Welfare Training Academy.

To use the library:

I. Please check at the circulation desk to make certain that you are registered with the library as an academy trainee.

II. Materials can be checked out for two week periods. Please return materials before you finish your training.

III. New books and books in great demand (usually fiction) are checked out for one week.

IV. You can check out up to six books at a time.

V. Lost or Destroyed materials will be charged to you at the cost to replace plus $1 processing fee.

VI. Magazines, Journals and other Periodicals must be used in the library.

VII. Reference materials such as almanacs, dictionaries, and encyclopedias must be used in the library.

The Library Staff Welcomes You to Quincy and Gadsden County. Please ask us for any assistance you need in library use.
APPENDIX IV

ADDRESSES OF AUDIO-VISUAL DISTRIBUTORS FOR MATERIALS LISTED IN THIS REPORT

Agency for Instructional Television. Box A, 1111 W. 17th St. Bloomington IN 47402.
AIMS. Aims Media. 6901 Woodley Ave., Van Nuys, CA 91406.
Brigham Young University. Media Marketing. Provo UT 84602.
Cornell University. Audio Visual Research Center, 8 Research Park, Ithica NY 14850.
Churchill Films. 662 No.Robertson Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90069.
Disney. Walt Disney Educational Media. 500 South Buena Vista St. Burbank CA 91521.
Media Guild. 18 South Acacia, Box 881 Solana Beach, CA 92075.
MTI. MTI Teleprograms. Division of Simon and Schuster 108 Wilmot Rd. Deerfield, IL 60015.
New York University. 26 Washington Pl. NY NY 10003.
NIMH. National Institute of Mental Health. 5600 Fishers Ave. Rockville, MD 23852.
Pennsylvania State University. University Park PA 16802.
Perennial Education. 930 Pitner Ave. Evanston, IL 60202.
Sterling Educational Films. 241 E 34th ST NY NY 10016.
United States Office of Economic Opportunity. 1200 19TH ST NW Wash. DC 20506
University of Illinois. Chicago Circle. Box 4348 Chicago IL 60680.
University of Iowa. AV Center, Media Library East Hall Iowa City, IA 52242.
University of Minnesota. Media Resources. 540 Rarig Minneapolis, MN 55455.
University of Texas. Film Division. Austin TX 78712.
University of Washington. Seattle, WA 98105.
Appendix v

Interim Report

RECOMMENDATIONS

Development of the resource library for the training academy includes:

1. Recommendations for print and non-print materials to provide a basic reference collection for the academy.
2. Recommendations for housing and maintaining the collection and future collection development.
3. Recommendations for interaction with and support for the academy by the public library including use of the library by academy staff and trainees.

A component of the development of the resource library are recommendations for enhancement of the academy video distribution system, recommendations for the addition of microcomputers for academy staff and trainee use and the software library needed to utilize the microcomputers, recommendation for the use of microcomputers (with modems for telecommunications) to interface with the Florida University System OnLine Data Base (LUIS) and other online bibliographic systems for research such as DIALOG or BRS, and suggestions for the investigation of remote training for future upgrading of the skills of personnel already working in the state child welfare system.

Tallahassee Community College has the stated library objective that "the student's success in achieving his educational goals rests largely upon his access to instructional resources, the College provides through the library a substantial collection of materials appropriate to the curriculum and to student interests." Certainly, this objective can be expanded to include the academy administered by the College. Since the academy reference library deals with a specialized area of training, additional policies to define the reference collection are needed. The academy should provide documentation on the historical and current relationship between child welfare and society both in the state of Florida and elsewhere. Materials chosen should adhere to such criteria as anticipated use, accuracy, authority, cost, and currency or historical relevance. The sensitive nature of certain materials selected for use in the academy will require limited use by other students or the public. These materials should be identified during technical processing and marked physically and in the cataloging system as restricted use. Depictions of violence, sexual incidents and profanity should not disqualify material from selection for this collection since they may directly relate to training child welfare workers. The academy should protect itself from criticism and censorship by developing written statements of collection development (A suggested draft will be included in the final product.) and should subscribe to the tenents of the ALA Library Bill of Rights.

Deselection of materials from this collection requires special attention. Although trainees and instructional personnel
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Deselection of materials from this collection requires special attention. Although trainees and instructional personnel will require access to historical documentation, currency of information in regard to laws and procedures is required.
Legal Aid and Defender Assoc. Wash. Annual

**FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE MANUAL.** 3v D&S Pub 1985. $240

Florida Bar Staff. **ADOPTION, PATERNITY AND OTHER FLORIDA FAMILY PRACTICE.** F1 Bar Legal Ed. 1979 $40

*****CASES AND MATERIALS ON FLORIDA DOMESTIC RELATIONS.** F1 Bar Legal Ed. 1982. $55

*****FLORIDA DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE F1. Bar Legal Ed 2nd ed. 1985 $75

*****FLORIDA GUARDIANSHIP PRACTICE. F1 Bar Legal Ed 1979 $30.

*****FLORIDA JUVENILE LAW AND PRACTICE. F1 Bar Legal Ed 1979 $20

*****FLORIDA PROCEEDINGS AFTER DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE F1 Bar Legal Ed 1983. $45

**FLORIDA FAMILY LAW PRACTICE MANUAL.** 3v D&S Pub 1985 $280

**FLORIDA STATUTES.** Provided by the Dept. of Education or HRS. Commercially available from Harrison Co. GA.

Gilmer, Wesley. **THE LAW DICTIONARY.** Scribner. 1986 $15


Hicks, William M. **TRIAL HANDBOOK FOR FLORIDA LAWYERS** Lawyers Co-Op. With Supplements $80

Hunt, Tann H. **YOUR FLORIDA DIVORCE.** Equity. 1985 $7.95

Keane, Gerald B. **FLORIDA LAW: A LAYMAN'S GUIDE.** Pineapple Press. 1986. $16.95

Macfarlane, G. **LAYMAN'S DICTIONARY OF LAW.** Pergaman 1984 $25

Maloy, Richard H. **YOUR QUESTIONS ANSWERED ABOUT FLORIDA DIVORCE LAW.** Windward Press. Pamphlet

*****YOUR QUESTIONS ANSWERED ABOUT FLORIDA LAW AND FAMILY RELATIONS.

*****YOUR QUESTIONS ANSWERED ABOUT FLORIDA LAW AND YOUR CONTINUING OBLIGATIONS AFTER DIVORCE.

**MARTINDALE-HUBBELL LAW DIRECTORY.** Annual. 7v. Martindale-Hubbell, NY.

West Publishing Company. **THE GUIDE TO AMERICAN LAW EVERYONE'S LEGAL ENCYCLOPEDIA.** 8v. West Pub 1983 $660

**SUBSCRIPTIONS**

The academy should request subscriptions to the following periodicals and insure that indexes to the periodicals are available though the public library. If these indexes are not currently subscribed to by the public library, funds from the academy should pay for the additional services.

**Necessary Indexes are:**

- Education Index (Wilson) Social Sciences and Humanities Index; (Wilson) Psychological Abstracts (American Psychological Association); Public Affairs Information Service Bulletin (Public Affairs Information Service); The Monthly Catalog of United States Government Publications (Superintendent of Documents); Sociological Abstracts (Sociological Abstracts Inc.); and Exceptional Child Education Resources (Council for Exceptional Children).

**Databases:**
Three electronic databases serve as indexes of interest to the academy. Use of these databases requires micro-computers and telecommunications (modems and telephone lines).

CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT (National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, Department of Health and Human Services) ERIC (National Institute of Education) FAMILY RESOURCES (Family Resource and Referral Center, National Council on Family Relations) (Available as database only).

Periodicals and Journals:

The following list of periodicals and journals is suggested for the academy. These suggestions are included in the interim report so that subscriptions can begin as early as possible. Subscriptions should be ordered through a periodical jobber wherever possible and can be included in either the College or public library subscription order. Subscriptions should begin with a calendar year whenever possible and backfiles should be established from the year of initial subscription in microfiche or microfilm format. Access to these backfiles requires readers and printers as well as storage cabinets. The academy should come to an equitable agreement with the public library for purchase of the needed equipment, shelving and storage cabinets.

-- *Starred items are first priority --

ADAMHA NEWS. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health Administration. Rockville, Md. BIWeekly.

*ADOPTED CHILD. P.O. BOX 9362 Moscow ID 83843. Monthly $18.00

AMERICAN FAMILY NATIONAL ACTION. Family and Public Policy. BIMonthly $35

*CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT. Pergaman Press. Quarterly $145.00

*CHILD AND ADOLESCENT SOCIAL WORK JOURNAL. Human Services Press. Quarterly $79

CHILD AND FAMILY BEHAVIOR THERAPY. Haworth Press. Quarterly $65

*CHILD AND YOUTH SERVICES. Haworth Press. Quarterly $65

*CHILD CARE QUARTERLY. Human Sciences Press. Quarterly $83

*CHILD DEVELOPMENT. University of Chicago Press. Quarterly $80.00

CHILD STUDY JOURNAL. SUNY at Buffalo. 1300 Elmwood Ave. Buffalo, NY 14222. Quarterly $30

*CHILD WELFARE. Child Welfare League of America. Monthly. $30.00

CHILDHOOD EDUCATION. Association for Childhood Education International. $40.00

*CHILDREN AND YOUTH SERVICES. Pergamon Press. Quarterly. $100.00

*CHILDREN TODAY. Children's Bureau, Administration for Children, Youth and Families. Office of Human Development Services, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Bimonthly, #14


DAY CARE AND EARLY EDUCATION. Human Services. Quarterly $30

EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF THE MENTALLY RETARDED. Council for Exceptional Children. Quarterly $20

*EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN. Council for Exceptional Children. Bimonthly. $25
EXCEPTIONAL PARENT. Psychology Education Corp. 8/yr $24
FAMILY RELATIONS. National Council on Family Relations. Quarterly. $42
*FROM THE STATE CAPITALS - ASSISTANCE AND WELFARE TRENDS WEEKLY. Wakeman-Walworth Inc. New Haven Conn. $175
JOURNAL OF AUTISM AND DEVELOPMENTAL DISORDERS. Plenum. Quarterly, $162
*JOURNAL OF CHILD AND YOUTH CARE WORK. National Organization of Child Care Workers Association. $10.
JOURNAL OF CHILDREN IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY. Haworth Press Quarterly, $24.00
JOURNAL OF FAMILY ISSUES. Sage Publications. Quarterly $22
JOURNAL OF LEARNING DISABILITIES. Cicero, Ill. Monthly $24
JOURNAL OF MARRIAGE AND THE FAMILY. National Council on Family Relations. Quarterly $50
JOURNAL OF SPECIAL EDUCATION. Quarterly $45
JOURNAL OF YOUTH AND ADOLESCENCE. Plenum Press. Quarterly $185
JUVENILE JUSTICE DIGEST. Annual $99
MENTAL RETARDATION. American Association on Mental Deficiency. Bimonthly $25
NEW DIRECTIONS FOR CHILD DEVELOPMENT. Jossey-Bass. Quarterly $52
NEW ENGLAND JOURNAL OF MEDICINE. Massachusetts Medical Society. Weekly $66.
PARENTS. Parents Magazine Enterprises, Inc. Monthly, $14.00
*PUBLIC WELFARE. Osiris. American Public Welfare Assoc. Quarterly $20
RESIDENTIAL GROUP CARE AND TREATMENT. Haworth, Quarterly $95.00
STEPFAMILIES AND BEYOND. Listening Inc. 8716 Pine Ave. Gary, IN 46403. Monthly $15
YOUNG CHILDREN. National Association for the Education of Young Children. Bimonthly.

NEWSLETTERS -- The following newsletters can be obtained by contacting the sponsoring associations.

Black Child Advocate. National Black Child Development Institute. 1463 Rhode Island Ave. NW. Washington, DC 20005
Caring. National Committee for Prevention of Child Abuse 332 South Michigan Ave. Suite 1250 Chicago Ill 60604
Dimensions. Southern Association on Children Under Six PO Box 5043 Brady Station Little Rock Ark 72215 The Family Day Care Bulletin.
The Children's Foundation 1420 New York Avenue NW Suite 800, Washington DC 20005
Highlights. Family Service America, 44 East 23d St. New York NY 10010
Update: Improving Services for Emotionally Disturbed Children Florida Mental Health Institute USF Tampa FL 33612
CONCLUSION

It is recommended that the Academy begin purchase of suggested legal references and periodical subscriptions as soon as possible. Actual ordering and processing of these items can be accomplished either through TCC or the Gadsden County Public Library, but it is suggested that this process be the responsibility of the College.

1. In order to track expenditures for the Academy reference collection, separate accounts should be established with the selected periodical and book jobbers.

2. A separate shelflist of Academy purchases should be established by the library performing technical processing of Academy materials. This will ensure accountability.

3. Catalog records of Academy holdings can be integrated in the public library and community college library catalogs as long as these records indicate that they are Academy holdings.

4. A separate library catalog of Academy holdings should be established and housed in the Academy. These records can be generated either electronically or in print format. Since the holdings of the Academy will be limited, a print catalog, manually maintained will be adequate. This separate catalog can be located in a hallway or lounge area where staff and trainees can easily access the records.

The suggestions outlined above presuppose trained library personnel to perform these activities. Since the activities do not require selection, a trained library clerk should be able to perform them. Establishing accounts and initial ordering of items suggested for purchase in the interim report can be performed by a trained library assistant in approximately 20 hours. Technical processing of items, duplicating records, filing and other activities will require a minimum of 20 hours. A trained library assistant should be able to maintain the Academy records once they have been established in approximately 8 hours monthly in the College technical services area. Additional purchases and annual deselection of materials will require the services of a professional librarian. Once the staff and trainees of the Academy begin using the reference collection, reference services by a librarian may be required and if electronic databases are utilized, there may be additional work imposed on the Public Library or TCC Library staff. Maintaining the Academy records at the Gadsden site can best be performed by an employee of the Public Library in coordination with College library personnel. A trained library assistant should be able to maintain these records once established in approximately 8 hours monthly including shelving and filing. An agreement for these services should be established between the College, the Public Library and the Academy.

The Academy should begin purchase of library furniture to
house its collection as soon as possible. Library vendors frequently require up to six months to deliver shelving and cabinets. Since the collection will be limited, it is suggested that the Academy purchase enclosed wooden bookcases that can be easily located and relocated. A freestanding wood or fiberboard card catalog should be purchased. Periodical shelving will be the responsibility of the Public Library, but the Academy should recognize its financial responsibility since this requires the Public Library to furnish shelving, covers or binders for the periodicals, and storage placing an additional financial responsibility on the Public Library.

INTERIM REPORT SUBMITTED -- Feb 8, 1988 -- Susan Anderson
Biographical Sketch - Susan M. Anderson

Mrs. Anderson is the Director of Learning Resources (Sept 1, 1988) at Polk Community College located in Winter Haven and Lakeland, Florida. The Lakeland Campus has a joint-use library with the University of South Florida.

Mrs. Anderson was previously the Director of Libraries for Pasco Hernando Community College. Her other library experience was as a children's librarian for the public library systems of Louisville, Kentucky, Washington, DC, and Philadelphia, PA. She also worked as a catalog librarian for Temple University in Philadelphia.

She has served on numerous state and local library committees and boards. She currently serves on the Board of Directors of the Tampa Bay Library Consortium, and is Community College Caucus Chair for the Florida Library Association. She is a member of the New Technologies in Learning Resources Committee of the Community College section of the American Library Association. She is Program Co-Chair for the 1988 FAME (Florida Association of Media in Education) Conference.

Mrs. Anderson received her MLS from Drexel University in 1969. Her undergraduate degree is from the University of Colorado in Journalism and Social Studies.