
Library Support for Off-Campus and Distance Education Programs in Canada: An Overview

ALEXANDER L. SLADE

ABSTRACT

THE ISSUE OF LIBRARY SUPPORT for off-campus programs in Canada has come into prominence in the last ten years primarily as a result of developments in the field of distance education. The unique features of Canadian distance education are outlined in the context of a discussion of the literature on off-campus library services in Canada. The findings of a national survey indicate that, while the majority of Canadian universities and colleges are willing to provide library support for their off-campus students, most have a low volume of business in this area and tend to offer services on an ad hoc basis. The current professional development activities of Canadian librarians are outlined and issues for future attention are identified.

INTRODUCTION

The nature of library support for postsecondary off-campus education in Canada is strongly influenced by the unique characteristics of the geography and educational system of the country. Large amounts of nonmetropolitan area combined with decentralized control of education have necessitated diverse approaches to serving learners who take courses and study away from the main campus of the parent institution.

There are significant geographic barriers to participation in postsecondary educational institutions in many parts of Canada (Statistics Canada, 1987). Universities tend to be located in major urban areas and are virtually inaccessible to people living in remote

communities. Very few Canadian universities have branch campuses in smaller centers. Even community colleges are too distant for some Canadians, despite these colleges' wider use of the branch campus system. As Canada has a history of continuing education (Rothe, 1986; Sweet, 1986) and there is a growing demand for part-time postsecondary education (Statistics Canada, 1987; 1989), many universities and colleges are developing or expanding outreach services in order to include these remote learners.

Because there is no federal control over education in this country and universities and colleges are supported primarily by provincial governments, educational outreach varies from one area to another. In some provinces such as British Columbia and Saskatchewan, specific monies have been allocated by the government for off-campus postsecondary education. In other cases, institutions must fund this type of education entirely out of their base budgets. Where government support is strongest, off-campus education has become more prominent.

Each province and each postsecondary institution in Canada has developed its own approach to off-campus education. Library initiatives to support these programs are equally as varied. Until recently, little information has been available on off-campus library services in Canada. There has been a lack of research studies on the library needs of the off-campus learner and on the policies and practices developed to respond to those needs. The last few years have seen a steady growth of literature, studies, and professional development activities concerning this area of librarianship. Some of this growth stems from institutional initiatives to create new off-campus programs and librarians' attempts to respond effectively to these developments. In 1990, considerable literature exists which outlines current models and practices of off-campus library support in Canada. This article will provide a descriptive overview of the field with particular reference to the findings of a national survey on off-campus library services.

OFF-CAMPUS EDUCATION

There are two primary ways in which off-campus education is provided in Canada. The first of these methods involves traditional face-to-face classroom instruction. Farrell and Haughey (1986) have labeled this model as "teacher-dependent." The most common approach to this type of instruction is itinerant faculty traveling to a variety of off-campus locations to teach specific courses. In some cases, faculty from campus commute to the course site at regular intervals. In other cases, part-time instructors from the local area are employed to teach specific courses. In many cases, the course

site varies depending on local interest. In other cases, a fixed center is used for classroom instruction. Colleges tend to use fixed centers more than universities in Canada. However, the concept of "extended campus" is not as common or widespread as it is in the United States. This is partly due to the geographic dispersion of the Canadian population.

DISTANCE EDUCATION

The second major means of providing off-campus education in this country is through *distance education*. This term is sometimes used synonymously with "off-campus education," but in Canada it is employed in a more restrictive sense. Canadian usage tends to correspond to Borje Holmberg's (1981) definition of distance education: "Those teaching methods in which, because of the physical separateness of learners and teachers, the interactive as well as the preparatory phase of teaching is conducted through print, mechanical or electronic devices" (p. 11). In Farrell and Haughey's (1986) model, this form of instruction is labeled "teacher independent." The most distinctive feature of this type of education is that it is not classroom based. Students tend to work independently at home and rarely, if ever, assemble as a class. Learning materials are prepared in advance and contact with the institution is normally done by mail and telephone. Ellis (1986) identifies three essential characteristics of distance education as a form of education outreach: (1) the use of comprehensive and carefully prepared and mediated instructional materials; (2) the provision of feedback to learners by appropriate means; and (3) no reliance or minimal reliance on face-to-face interaction between teachers and learners. "Thus, the establishment of remote campus centres, or the practice of having instructors fly to distant communities to teach classes indeed bridge educational distance but they are not, technically, distance education" (p. 27).

Traditional correspondence courses fall under this category and are still prominent in Canada today. However, the 1980s have seen an increased use of communications technology to deliver or enhance distance education courses. Today, a wide range of media and methods are employed, including print materials, audio and video cassettes, television broadcasts, radio, teleconferencing, and computer communications. From an international perspective, Canada is a major innovator in the use of communications technology for teaching (Bates, 1989) and has been a pioneer in using both satellite and terrestrial long distance communication systems to link students and instructors (Helm, 1989).

The development of distance education in Canada reflects a number of social and educational themes. One such theme is universal

accessibility, advocated by such authors as Haughey (1989): "Genuine involvement in distance education means acceptance of the principle that learners, regardless of their geographic location and personal or employment situations, have a right to a university education" (p. 165). Another pervasive theme in distance education is "open learning" which encourages learner participation by removing traditional institutional barriers and providing more flexible and innovative systems for acquiring and transferring credit and for scheduling courses to accommodate the lifestyles of working adults with families.

A third broad theme influencing the development of distance education in Canada is the emphasis which governments and institutions have placed on creating innovative learning systems through use of emerging communications technologies (Sweet, 1989). These systems have been regarded by politicians and educators both as a means to increase accessibility and to reduce educational costs and also as distinct goals unto themselves (Daniel, 1986). The creation of innovative learning systems in Canada was exemplified by the establishment of three open universities in the 1970s: Athabasca University in Alberta, Télé-université in Quebec, and the Open Learning Institute (subsequently renamed The Open Learning Agency) in British Columbia. All three of these institutions deliver their courses entirely by distance education methods with little or no reliance on face-to-face classroom instruction.

OFF-CAMPUS LIBRARY SERVICES

Overview of the Literature

Library support for off-campus education in Canada has come into prominence in the last ten years primarily as a response to developments in the area of distance education. However, the continuing education and distance education literature are generally silent on the issue of off-campus library services. As an example, two significant monographs have been published on distance education in Canada in the last four years, but each work only contains a one line reference to library matters (Mugridge & Kaufman, 1986; Sweet, 1989). Unlike the United States, Canada generally does not have licensing boards and accrediting agencies to scrutinize its off-campus and distance education programs. As a result, there is little external pressure on Canadian colleges and universities to enhance library support for these types of programs. It has been left up to librarians to stress the importance of library issues and to disseminate information in this area.

Since developments in off-campus library services have paralleled developments in distance education, most of the Canadian library literature on this topic dates from the late 1970s. A number of Canadian academic libraries have been serving off-campus classroom courses for many years through the provision of depository or core collections, but it is only recently that some of this activity has been documented. Examples of institutions providing this type of long-standing service are The University of British Columbia (Whitehead, 1987) and Laurentian University in Sudbury, Ontario (Kelly, 1987). A directory compiled in the United States in 1973 indicates that the University of Alberta and the University of Montreal were also involved in providing extension library services at that time (MacDougall, 1973).

Early Studies

The first major Canadian publication to address the issue of off-campus library support was an article by Orton and Wiseman (1977) which describes three surveys conducted in 1974/75 to assess the library needs of part-time students at Queen's University and Trent University in Ontario. The surveys included both on-campus and off-campus students. A more detailed account of the Trent report was also released as a separate document (Wiseman, 1976).

In the following eight years, only three accounts of Canadian involvement in off-campus library services appeared in the literature. Soules (1979) discusses the University of Windsor's approach to serving off-campus students and its cooperative arrangement with Chatham Public Library. Mount and Turple (1980) describe the model of service used at the Laurentian University in Ontario. Carrière (1982) compares the types of off-campus library services offered at l'Université du Québec à Rimouski with those provided by selected other North American libraries. In addition to these published sources, an unpublished Masters of Education project by Dancik (1984) assesses the library services for off-campus students at the University of Alberta and presents a proposal for new and enhanced services.

In 1985, Canadian librarians began in earnest to conduct research studies, write, and publish in the area of off-campus library services. From this point, the volume of literature is sufficient to discuss the various works by theme.

Institutional Studies

There have been several recent articles and papers describing "model services" at specific institutions. These studies are similar in tone to the Mount and Turple article (1980). One such paper has appeared in each of the three sets of proceedings of the Off-Campus Library Services Conferences sponsored by Central Michigan

University between 1985 and 1988. The institutions represented in these proceedings are Lakehead University in Ontario (Bishop & Clinton, 1986), Athabasca University in Alberta (Appavoo, 1987), and Mount Royal College in Alberta (Fu, 1989).

In 1986 and again in 1987, *Library Acquisitions: Practice and Theory* published a series of articles under the collective title of "Collection Development and Acquisitions in a Distance Learning Environment." Off-campus library services at three Canadian universities are described in this series: the University of Manitoba (Angel & Budnick, 1986), Laurentian University in Ontario (Kelly, 1987), and the University of British Columbia (Whitehead, 1987).

In 1987 there were two examples in Canadian educational journals of academics describing library support in specific off-campus activities. Montgomerie (1987) discusses library services as one of the components in the University of Alberta's "Extended Campus" graduate program. Davie (1987) briefly describes library use while reporting on the effectiveness of a graduate course conducted by computer conferencing from the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Area Studies

Off-campus library services in Canada have been discussed on a larger scale in four sources. Slade et al. (1987) outline the development of this type of library support in British Columbia. Affleck (1987) presents a model for the provision of library services to academic distance programs in Saskatchewan. Conley (1988) documents current activities in Ontario. Unfortunately, the Affleck and Conley papers are as yet unpublished, since they were produced for specific in-house purposes. In a document submitted to the National Institute for Higher Education in Dublin, Ireland, Nettlefold (1988) reports on his cross-Canada investigative tour of eight university libraries which provide off-campus support.

Distance Education Issues

Four Canadian authors have moved beyond descriptive accounts of model services to discuss the unique features of providing library support for distance education courses. A key paper in this area is an article by Howard (1985) which presents both a theoretical and practical perspective on the issue without reference to any particular institution. Two successive papers by Appavoo (1985) and Slade (1987a) also deal with the theoretical and practical while acknowledging the library support provided at their respective institutions—Athabasca University and the University of Victoria. A major study

by Burge et al. (1988; 1989) also discusses distance education issues in the context of a survey conducted in Northern Ontario. This study will receive further attention in the following sections.

Research Studies

There was a long gap in Canadian research on off-campus library services following the publication of the Orton and Wiseman article in 1977. In 1985, the results of two research studies were released. Slade and Webb (1985) present the results of a national survey of off-campus library services (to be discussed later in this article). Latham (1985; 1987) reports on a study in Alberta concerning library services for the Chinook Educational Consortium which included surveys of library collections and services available from participating institutions and local public and school libraries.

In 1988, Canadian librarians conducted three research projects on off-campus library services. Librarians at Athabasca University (AU) in Alberta completed a two-stage research project to determine the use of libraries by AU students and to identify the subjects and kinds of materials borrowed by these students (Appavoo & Hansen, 1989a; 1989b). Researchers from the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education designed and conducted an extensive study of library relationships for distance education programs in Northern Ontario (Burge et al., 1988; 1989). Four different groups were included in this study: distance education students, faculty/instructors, public library staff, and academic library staff. The third major research project completed in 1988 was the Second Canadian Off-Campus Library Services Survey (Slade, 1988). The results of this survey will be presented in the sections which follow.

The most recent Canadian work of note is a literature review by Shklanka (1990) which discusses the relevance of the aforementioned studies and selected other publications to the international study of off-campus library services.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Specific Studies

With the exception of the national surveys conducted by Slade (1988) and Slade and Webb (1985), the other Canadian research studies on off-campus library services have been limited to particular institutions or geographic areas. While the objectives, methodologies, and results of these studies are quite different, there are some common denominators.

One significant feature which the studies by Orton and Wiseman (1977); Latham (1985; 1987); Appavoo and Hansen (1989a; 1989b);

and Burge et al. (1988; 1989) have in common is that they all have surveyed off-campus students to determine library use characteristics and problems. Emerging from the results of these surveys is a composite profile of the off-campus student in Canada. The average student is mature, female, often married, with a full-time job. This student tends to take off-campus courses for work-related reasons. Many of these students are able to complete their courses without the need of additional resources, and therefore, overall library use is low. Supplemental information is sometimes acquired directly from the course tutor (Appavoo & Hansen, 1989a; 1989b) or through the purchase of books (Orton & Wiseman, 1977). When library materials are needed, students tend to turn first to their local public library. Where students live within reasonable commuting distance of the campus library, there is a preference to use these facilities directly. For students further away from campus, there is a preference for having a core collection deposited in a local library. Common problems faced by these students are: distance from libraries, limited access hours, availability of appropriate materials, restrictive loan periods, difficulties with renewal of materials, and "time pressures."

The studies by Orton and Wiseman (1977) and Burge et al. (1988; 1989) point to the need for greater cooperation between public and university librarians in order to serve the off-campus student more effectively. Burge et al. expand the concept of cooperation to advocate closer connections between librarians and distance education faculty and administrators. Based on their findings in Northern Ontario, these authors propose a conceptual framework for improving library services to distance education students and present specific recommendations for enhancing the working relationship among various librarians, faculty, administrators, and students involved in this type of education. This is the first Canadian work to propose a detailed model of library support derived from original research.

The National Surveys

The most comprehensive source to date on the status of off-campus library support in Canada is the Second Canadian Off-Campus Library Services Survey (Slade, 1988). Based on an earlier, more limited survey conducted in 1984/85, the study provides a descriptive account of off-campus library services at thirty-five universities and thirty-nine colleges in this country.

The First Canadian Survey. The first survey evolved informally. In British Columbia (B.C.), the four postsecondary institutions, the University of Victoria, the University of British Columbia, Simon Fraser University, and the Open Learning Agency (formerly the Open

Learning Institute), all provide comprehensive library services to their off-campus students. At a meeting in 1983, the librarians responsible for those services decided to send a letter of inquiry to universities across Canada to determine the types of off-campus library services provided at other institutions. Since the Canadian library literature in this area was limited at that time, the B.C. librarians were curious as to whether the model of service developed in their province was unique. In total, forty-two letters were sent and thirty-one replies were received (a 74 percent response rate).

The responses to the letter of inquiry confirmed that a number of other Canadian universities were indeed providing library support for their off-campus students. Many of the respondents supplied detailed information on the services offered at their institutions. On the basis of the information received, the B.C. librarians decided to establish categories to classify and compare the service levels at the different universities. By using the B.C. services as models and analyzing the information contained in the letters, the librarians identified thirteen categories or "ingredients" of off-campus library services (Slade, 1987b).

These thirteen categories were converted into a basic questionnaire which was sent to the respondents to confirm and clarify the initial information. Once the questionnaires had been returned, data were available on off-campus library services at twenty-four Canadian universities, including the four B.C. institutions. Tabulation of the results using a spreadsheet approach with ranked values revealed that six institutions had a high level of involvement in off-campus library services, fifteen ranked as "active," and three institutions had a low level of involvement (Slade, 1985). The significance of the thirteen categories in off-campus library services has been discussed in a paper by Slade (1987b).

The Second Canadian Survey. The second survey was initiated through the Canadian Library Association (CLA) Interest Group on Library Services for Distance Learning in 1987. The decision was made to replicate the 1984/85 survey, with more detailed questions, to determine whether there had been any significant changes to the types of services previously reported. In redesigning the questionnaire, the original thirteen categories and the wording of the questions pertaining to them were kept consistent. However, to probe for a greater degree of information, two new categories were added and a number of additional questions were introduced under each of the categories. The two new categories addressed the areas of funding and library support for curriculum development.

The objectives of the second survey were:

1. to obtain more detailed data on off-campus library services in Canada;
2. to compare the levels of off-campus library services provided at different institutions across the country;
3. to determine whether colleges in Canada are providing off-campus library services similar to those offered by the universities;
4. to determine whether the universities which responded to the first survey had altered their library services to off-campus students and courses in the intervening four years;
5. to obtain information on off-campus library services from those universities which did not respond to the first survey.

The following definition of off-campus library services was used in the second survey: "Library support provided by the campus library for registered students who are either studying independently or taking credit/certificate courses at a distance and are not able to visit the main or branch libraries on a regular basis" (Slade, 1988, p. 1).

Questionnaires for the second survey were distributed by representatives of the CLA Interest Group within each province. The representatives decided which institutions to include in their province and to whom the questionnaire was to be sent. The coverage in the survey was intended to be exhaustive; however, a number of institutions were excluded for reasons known only to the provincial representatives.

Questionnaires were sent to 199 institutions: 55 universities and 144 colleges and technical institutes. The response rate was 60 percent: 78 percent for universities and 53 percent for colleges. Quebec and Ontario had the lowest response rates at 22 percent and 63 percent respectively. All the other provinces had nearly a 100 percent response rate.

Of the institutions which responded to the questionnaire, thirty-seven universities (86 percent) and forty-six colleges (60 percent) indicated that they offer off-campus or distance education courses. Of those institutions, thirty-five universities (95 percent) and thirty-nine colleges (85 percent) provide some level of library support for their off-campus students.

In comparing institutional responses from the two surveys, it was found that nine universities (38 percent) represented in the first survey had increased their level of library support for off-campus programs, eight (33 percent) had maintained the same level of support, and five (21 percent) had decreased the level of support. No reasons were apparent for these changes.

A different ranking system was used in the second survey (the Off-Campus Library Services Index will be discussed later in this section). As a result, exact comparisons of institutional activity levels

between the two surveys are not readily available. However, using ranked and unranked figures, the following comparisons can be made: the number of institutions with high levels of involvement increased from six to eight; the number of "active" institutions decreased from fifteen to thirteen; the number of institutions with low levels of involvement decreased from three to one. Two universities which participated in the first survey did not respond to the second survey.

The questionnaire for the second survey was divided into fifteen categories, each representing a specific area of off-campus library services. In each category, there was one basic question requiring a "yes" or "no" response plus a number of secondary questions to probe for additional information.

An institution qualified as providing some level of off-campus library support if it responded "yes" to any of the fifteen basic questions. The average number of "yes" responses was nine for universities and seven for colleges, indicating that many institutions are active in several areas of off-campus library services. Following is a brief summary of the responses to the basic questions and selected secondary questions in each of the fifteen categories. All percentages given are based on the number of institutions identified as providing some level of off-campus library support ($n = 74$). Numbers and percentages in these sections reflect the total responses from both colleges and universities. In many of the secondary questions, respondents were instructed to check all the choices that applied to their institution. Multiple choices are reflected in the percentages cited in the following sections.

1. *Core Collections.* A core collection refers to a selection of library material placed on site to support an off-campus course or program. When asked if the library sends such collections to off-campus sites, fifty-five institutions (74 percent) which were identified as active in off-campus library support indicated that they provide core collections on request. Eighteen (24 percent) maintain a separate library or section within the main library from which core collections are extracted. Thirty-seven (50 percent) assemble core collections from regular library holdings.

When asked how the core collections are selected, fifty-one institutions (69 percent) reported that the course instructor selects the material and twenty-two (30 percent) indicated that library staff select the collections. Eighteen institutions (24 percent) revealed that core collections are handled outside the library by other campus departments.

Overall, the category for core collections received the third highest affirmative response rate in the survey. Core collections represent library support for an off-campus course as a whole

rather than support for individual off-campus students. The provision of these collections is only appropriate for institutions which have a concentration of students in a particular geographic area. It was initially assumed that institutions which offered only distance education courses would not supply core collections due to geographic dispersion of the students. However, of the ten universities and colleges which offer only distance education courses, five (50 percent) indicated that they do handle core collections.

2. *Specific Requests.* This category identifies an institution's willingness to supply specific library material directly to individual off-campus students on request. Of the institutions involved in off-campus library support, sixty (81 percent) indicated a willingness to send monographs, articles, and other library materials to students. Twelve (16 percent) indicated that they provide substituted material automatically if the requested items are unavailable and a further thirty-nine (53 percent) responded that they supply substitutes on request. Twenty-six institutions (35 percent) reported that they send library material to off-campus students by first-class mail, twenty-three (31 percent) use book rate, and twenty-three (31 percent) send items by private courier services.

This category received the second highest overall affirmative response rate in the survey. However, only forty-nine institutions (66 percent) were able to provide any statistics on the number of items sent to off-campus students. Some respondents indicated that they were prepared to supply material, but there had been little or no demand in the past twelve months. A few institutions reported that they were gearing up for a forthcoming program, but the courses had not yet started.

3. *Reference Queries.* This category determines an institution's willingness to answer reference questions and conduct subject searches for individual off-campus students on request. Sixty-four (86 percent) of the "active" institutions reported that they are prepared to undertake this work for off-campus students. When asked how the library responds to this type of request, forty-four institutions (59 percent) indicated that a librarian chooses a selection of books and articles and sends this material directly to the student. Thirty-four (46 percent) of the institutions reported that they send bibliographies or lists of references to enable the students to select their own items.

This category received the highest overall affirmative response rate in the survey. The intent behind the basic question in this category was to determine which institutions send library

material, bibliographies, and database search results to off-campus students to answer reference questions and provide sources of information for course topics. Responses to the secondary questions in this category indicate that a number of institutions used a limited interpretation of the basic question. Some institutions apparently responded "yes" solely on the basis of reference questions from off-campus students which could be answered over the telephone and not on the basis of material supplied, as was the intent behind the question. Since most libraries will respond to telephone reference questions from any type of patron, this interpretation of the question changes the significance of the results in this category. The confusion over the basic question was exemplified when one respondent replied with the following statement to the secondary question about the number of reference items sent out: "Our reference collection is non-circulating!" Only thirty-three institutions (45 percent) could provide any statistics for items sent to off-campus students in response to reference and subject queries. This indicates that the reliability of the high rate of affirmative responses to the basic question in this category is questionable.

If another Canadian survey is conducted in the future, the basic question in category 3 needs to be revised to avoid this misunderstanding. In addition, secondary questions should be added to determine if an institution's off-campus students have access to an online or microfiche catalog of the campus library's holdings and access to bibliographic resources at local libraries. These factors would reduce the off-campus student's dependence on the campus library for assistance with reference queries and subject searches.

4. *Telephone Access.* The telephone is often the off-campus student's only access to the main library. The basic question in this category asked if the library has a dedicated "toll free" telephone line for off-campus students to use to request library material. Toll free was defined as including the acceptance of collect calls on a regular telephone line. Twenty-eight (38 percent) of the institutions which provide off-campus library support replied that they have a special telephone line. A further seven (10 percent) indicated that there is a toll free telephone line for off-campus students available elsewhere on campus and that calls are routed to the library as appropriate. Combining the above data, thirty-five institutions (48 percent) accept telephone requests from off-campus students at no cost to the student.
5. *Advertisement of Services.* An indication of the degree to which off-campus library support is institutionalized is how well services

are advertised and marketed. Forty-four (60 percent) of the institutions involved in this type of support replied that library services for off-campus students are publicized in brochures, handbooks, and other literature. When asked which type of publication is most commonly used, thirty-five (48 percent) indicated brochures and leaflets, ten (14 percent) mentioned calendars, and nine (12 percent) listed handbooks.

6. *Librarian*. This category determines whether at least one librarian has full-time or part-time responsibilities for off-campus library services as part of their job description. Forty institutions (54 percent) responded in the affirmative to this question. Eight (11 percent) indicated that they have one full-time librarian for this area and thirty-two (43 percent) reported the presence of a librarian with part-time responsibilities for off-campus library services.
7. *Support Staff*. In addition to professional staff involvement, support staff assistance is usually necessary to provide library materials to off-campus students. Thirty-nine (53 percent) of the institutions active in serving these students reported that at least one member of the library support staff has either full-time or part-time responsibilities for off-campus services as part of the job description. Nine institutions (12 percent) indicated that they have at least one full-time support staff member assigned to this area and thirty-four (46 percent) indicated that at least one staff member has part-time responsibilities for these services. The highest number of full-time support staff reported was four for one university. The highest number of part-time support staff was six for one college.

Eleven institutions (15 percent) indicated that they use primarily clerical employees for off-campus library services, seven (10 percent) reported using library technicians, and twenty-eight (39 percent) reported using library assistants of various levels.

8. *Bibliographic Instruction*. Bibliographic instruction is a process designed to teach library users how to locate information efficiently and effectively. Thirty-two (43 percent) of the institutions involved in off-campus library services indicated that they provide some form of bibliographic instruction to off-campus students. When asked about the most common method of instruction, thirteen institutions (18 percent) cited use of print materials, nine (12 percent) mentioned site visits, and six (8 percent) reported conducting lectures on campus. Four (5 percent) indicated that they use other means such as videotapes and teleconferencing. Twenty-four institutions (32 percent) reported

that library initiative is the basis for offering bibliographic instruction and twenty (27 percent) indicated that this service is provided primarily in response to requests from faculty.

9. *Computerized Literature Searches.* Because the CD-ROM technology was relatively new when the second survey was conducted, this category does not differentiate between CD-ROM literature searches and online searches. When asked if automated literature searches are conducted for off-campus students, forty-two institutions (57 percent) replied in the affirmative. Thirty-four (46 percent) indicated that student requests are the basis for initiating these searches, and nineteen (26 percent) reported that they are initiated by library staff to facilitate the subject search process. Twenty-eight institutions (38 percent) indicated that the availability of automated literature searches is advertised to off-campus students.
10. *Interlibrary Loans.* Since an interlibrary loan (ILL) service is traditionally available to on-campus students, this category determines the degree to which ILL requests are placed for off-campus students. Forty-five (61 percent) of the institutions which are involved in off-campus library services reported that library staff place ILL requests on behalf of off-campus students. Thirty-nine institutions (53 percent) indicated that this service is usually requested by the students while thirty-one (42 percent) reported that librarians initiate the requests on behalf of the students to obtain information in sources not held by the library. Thirty-one (42 percent) of the institutions indicated that books obtained from another library through the interlibrary loan service are sent on from the main library to the student's home address.
11. *Charges for Service.* In this category, the emphasis is on whether libraries charge students for off-campus library services. Fifty (68 percent) of the institutions involved in this area indicated that all library services to off-campus students are provided free of charge. Sixteen (22 percent) reported that they charge for online searches, ten (14 percent) charge for photocopies, and five (7 percent) charge for interlibrary loans. Only one college (2 percent) reported that it charges its off-campus students for postage.
12. *Needs Assessments.* Conducting a needs assessment is a formal or informal process of determining the library requirements of the various off-campus and distance education programs. This category had the second lowest affirmative response rate in the survey. The basic question asked was whether the library staff conducts needs assessments for off-campus courses and programs and uses this information to plan library services. Only twenty-two institutions (30 percent) replied in the affirmative to this

question. Further information was obtained from the secondary questions: only ten institutions (14 percent) indicated that they had a written statement of goals and objectives for off-campus library services which served as a basis for needs assessments. Only three institutions (4 percent) stated that they had a formal mechanism to link needs assessments to the funding for off-campus library services. When asked about the frequency of needs assessments, only three institutions (4 percent) reported that they conduct the assessments on a regular basis.

13. *Evaluation.* Evaluation refers to the process of reviewing and assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of library support systems currently in place for off-campus programs. When asked if library services and resources are periodically reviewed and evaluated, thirty-four institutions (46 percent) responded in the affirmative. Twenty-six (35 percent) indicated that the library conducts the evaluations, twelve (16 percent) reported that faculty handle this process, and seven (10 percent) identified a central campus agency as the source of evaluations. Only ten institutions (14 percent) reported having a written statement of goals and objectives for off-campus library services which serves as a basis for evaluation. With regard to the frequency of evaluations, twenty-one institutions (28 percent) indicated that library services are evaluated as a separate ad hoc process while ten (14 percent) stated that services are evaluated as part of the regular course evaluation procedure.
14. *Finances and Funding.* Categories 14 and 15 were added for the second survey. Category 14 identifies institutions which have a designated budget or a clearly defined financial process to fund the provision of off-campus library services as recommended by the ACRL guidelines (ACRL, 1982). Twenty-seven institutions (36 percent) replied that they do have such a mechanism. Fifteen institutions (20 percent) reported that funding is allocated entirely from the library's operating budget, four (5 percent) identified a funding source outside the library, and nine (12 percent) indicated that funding is provided partially from the library and partially from an outside source. When asked about the allocation of separate amounts for the different areas of off-campus library services, relatively few institutions replied in the affirmative to any of the twelve areas identified in the secondary questions. The only area which received a relatively high affirmative response rate was "core collections," identified by twenty institutions (27 percent).
15. *Curriculum Development.* As mentioned above, categories 14 and 15 were added for the second survey. The intent of the basic

question was to investigate the involvement and contributions of librarians in the development of new off-campus courses and programs. Such involvement, so important to the effective provision of library services, was regarded as evidence of a proactive approach to off-campus library services. The affirmative response rate to the basic question in this category was the lowest in the entire survey. In response to the question of whether a librarian is usually involved in the development of a new off-campus or distance education course, only ten institutions (14 percent) responded in the affirmative. The comments of one respondent who replied in the negative provide an indication of the problems in this area: "The answer to #15 is by far one of the most frustrating to admit. Because of this, we constantly get requests for a subject for which we have little or nothing... I have tried continuously without much success here to emphasize this most important matter." With regard to the types of input reported, fourteen institutions (19 percent) conduct literature searches, thirteen (18 percent) order materials for off-campus course use, and nine (12 percent) offer advice on library resources available for student assignments.

Commentary on the Survey Results

For both universities and colleges, the categories which had the highest affirmative response rate were those which pertained to the provision of library material for off-campus students (categories 1 through 3 above). Over 80 percent of the universities ($n = 35$) and over 70 percent of the colleges ($n = 39$) with some level of off-campus library support reported that they are prepared to supply specific library items, answer reference questions, and conduct subject searches for off-campus students. In addition, over 80 percent of the universities and over 60 percent of the colleges indicated that they will provide core collections for off-campus courses upon request.

For the purposes of this survey, it was decided that a basic library outreach service exists when an institution advertises that it will send specific library material to off-campus students and will conduct literature searches for these students on request. Based on this criteria, forty-three (58 percent) of the institutions which have some level of off-campus library support qualify as having an established outreach service. This total includes twenty-five universities (71 percent) and eighteen colleges (46 percent). In addition, twenty-two institutions (30 percent) which do not have a library outreach service do supply core collections to off-campus sites. Included in this total are nine universities (26 percent) and thirteen colleges (33 percent). These data indicate that library outreach services and core collection

services are the two primary means of off-campus library support in Canada. Sixty-five institutions (88 percent) with some level of off-campus library support provide either one service or the other or both. By type of institution, this total includes thirty-four (97 percent) of the universities and thirty-one (79 percent) of the colleges.

The categories which received the lowest affirmative response rate from both universities and colleges were those which dealt with the planning and administration of off-campus library services (categories 12 through 15 above). Less than 50 percent of the universities and less than 30 percent of the colleges with some level of off-campus library support indicated that the library conducts needs assessments, has separate funding procedures, and is involved in curriculum development for off-campus courses. The fact that this latter category received the lowest affirmative response rate in the entire survey substantiates some of the findings and comments of Burge et al. (1988; 1989). Responses to the secondary questions in categories 12 through 15 indicate that many Canadian institutions tend to provide off-campus library support on an ad hoc basis.

The information obtained in this section implies that the planning process for off-campus library services in Canada is relatively underdeveloped. The ACRL "Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Service" (ACRL, 1982) stresses planning and finances as important considerations in providing off-campus support. Categories 12 and 14 are largely based on these guidelines since Canada does not have its own set of guidelines or standards in this area. It is apparent that Canadian universities and colleges are, for the most part, not actively involved in the process of anticipating the library needs of their off-campus programs.

In order to compare the levels of off-campus library support provided by the different institutions, two measurements were created especially for the survey data. One measurement was entitled the Off-Campus Library Services Index. This is a composite score combining the number of affirmative responses to the fifteen basic questions with a ranking system representing the volume of material supplied to off-campus courses and students. The other measurement was entitled the Item/Student Ratio. This ratio was derived by dividing the total off-campus enrollment into the total number of library items supplied to off-campus students.

These two measurements provide an approximate picture of an institution's activity level in off-campus library services. Based on the Off-Campus Library Services Index, only eleven institutions (15 percent) can be categorized as having a high level of involvement in this area. This total includes five universities (14 percent) and six colleges (15 percent). Based on the Item/Student Ratio, only eleven

institutions (15 percent) serve one-third or more of the off-campus student population. Included in this total are eight universities (23 percent) and three colleges (8 percent). These results indicate that while many institutions have outreach services and/or core collection services and are willing to support their off-campus students, relatively few of them are supplying large quantities of library material.

The enrollment statistics provided by the various institutions confirm that, on the whole, a small proportion of the off-campus students are taking advantage of the library services available to them. Some of the factors which the author identifies as contributing to this phenomenon are: students' proximity to the campus library; instructors supplying library material directly to students; library resources not being appropriate or required for the course; and adequacy of local collections (Slade, 1988, p. 83). One area which the survey did not address is the use of local libraries and the existence of contractual arrangements between parent institutions and other libraries. Due to the geographic dispersion of the population, the use of contractual arrangements is not as common in Canada as it is in the United States and it was not considered as an item for inclusion when the questionnaire was compiled.

In general, the results of this survey indicate that the issue of library support for off-campus students is being taken seriously by the majority of Canadian universities and colleges with off-campus and distance education courses. The degree to which these institutions serve this body of students varies considerably. While this survey identifies the existence of the variations, the results do not reveal the reasons behind them. The author recommends further investigation and research in this area.

CURRENT CANADIAN ISSUES

Professional Development

Library support for off-campus and distance education programs in Canada is still very much a developing field. As indicated in the preceding discussion, Canadian literature in this area has grown considerably in the last five years. Professional development activities of librarians have also been expanding in the same period. Three workshops on off-campus library services have been held as part of Canadian Library Association (CLA) conferences between 1985 and 1990. In 1987, an interest group was formed through CLA and continues to meet at the annual conferences. This group also produces an occasional newsletter to summarize developments in the field. Librarians have made presentations on off-campus library services

at the conferences of professional associations such as the Canadian Association for Distance Education and the Canadian Association for University Continuing Education. Canadian librarians have also been participating in American forums including the past three off-campus library services conferences sponsored by Central Michigan University.

The most recent accomplishment of Canadian librarians has been the compilation of a comprehensive annotated bibliography on library support for off-campus and distance education. The first of its kind, this monograph lists over 500 international works published between 1930 and early 1990 (Latham, et al., 1991).

Models of Service

The outreach/document delivery model of service described by such authors as Mount and Turple (1980); Bishop and Clinton (1986); and Slade et al. (1987) continues to be the most common approach to off-campus library support in Canada. This is partly due to the geographic decentralization of students who take courses through distance education delivery methods and do not have local access to adequate library collections. The key features of this model service are: telephone access to the campus library (often through a special toll free line), provision of library material by mail, literature searches on demand, interlibrary loans, and access to the services of a part-time or full-time librarian who is responsible for off-campus requests. Evidence of the popularity of this model is the fact that three Canadian university libraries have recently hired librarians specifically to coordinate this type of service.

The other aspect to the issue of service models is the development of conceptual models for supporting distance education programs as discussed by Burge et al. (1988; 1989). These authors and others—such as Howard (1985), Appavoo (1985), and Slade (1987a)—point out the unique library problems presented by prepackaged courses and recommend, among other things, that librarians form closer working relationships with distance education personnel. The ideal relationship is one in which the librarian is consulted on course planning and is able to provide input into the most effective ways of supplying supplemental information and resources to students. However, at present, Canadian librarians are still a long way from achieving this ideal. The comments of one librarian writing in the CLA Interest Group newsletter exemplify the current state of affairs in Canada:

The University of Calgary hosted a one-day Conference on Distance Education in February (1989). Speakers from a variety of institutions across the country addressed what they saw as the major issues for the further development and success of distance education. I only saw a

handful of librarians in the large audience. The lack of library representation was mirrored by the lack of reference by all but one speaker to library services when discussing program support. One speaker talked about the importance of maintaining quality in programs and delivery, yet still no word was said about customizing library service as an integral part of the educational function. It was an interesting, challenging conference, but I left with the feeling that we librarians who have a commitment to distance education have a long way to go to make our presence felt. (Bailey, 1989, p. 5)

A related area which is receiving attention in this context is bibliographic instruction for distance education students. The fact that students do not meet as a class poses extraordinary problems for providing this form of instruction. Some of the proposed ways for overcoming these difficulties are: teleconferencing, audio- and videotapes, self-study exercises or workbooks, and computer assisted instruction. The use of videotape to deliver bibliographic instruction sessions to distance education students is becoming common in Canada (see, for example, Fu, 1989). Bibliographic instruction is another area in which librarians need to work closely with distance education personnel to encourage the effective use of libraries and library material as part of the educational process.

Trends

As in other countries, the use of technology in libraries will influence the future directions of Canadian support for off-campus and distance education programs. More and more libraries are introducing online public access catalogs (OPACs) which can be accessed by the off-campus user. As individuals and smaller libraries acquire personal computers and modems, there will be the potential for the average off-campus student to become self-sufficient in searching library catalogs. Some Canadian universities are currently experimenting with adding selected databases such as ERIC to their OPACs. This will eventually provide the off-campus student with even more independence. Complementing these trends are advances in communications technologies, such as telefacsimile (FAX), electronic messaging systems, and computer downloading capabilities, which will facilitate the access to library materials, resources, and services. The challenge for librarians in the years ahead will be to educate off-campus students about the new technologies and to provide sufficient bibliographic instruction to enable these students to use the technology in their local communities to effectively locate references and information.

Another area which Canadian librarians need to address is the issue of guidelines and standards. Of the four English-speaking countries most active in off-campus library services (the United States, Canada, Great Britain, and Australia), Canada is the only one which

lacks any guidelines or standards for this field endorsed by its national library association. The ACRL guidelines (ACRL, 1982; 1990) are occasionally cited by Canadian librarians, but they are not formally recognized by the Canadian Library Association and its division, the Canadian Association of College and University Libraries. It is time that librarians begin to lobby for Canadian guidelines in this area in order to encourage nationwide recognition within the library community of the importance of service standards for the quality of off-campus and distance education.

A third important trend which should be mentioned in this context is the emphasis which provincial governments are placing on the development of distance education programs. Some politicians see distance education as a means both to reduce the costs of continuing education and, at the same time, to respond to demands for increased accessibility (Farrell & Haughey, 1986). As a result, these types of programs are being encouraged and supported in most of the Canadian provinces. Another challenge facing librarians will be to advocate the importance of allocating special funding for library services when budgets are being prepared for distance education programs and to recommend the participation of library staff in the planning of such programs.

CONCLUSION

While Canada has several unique characteristics which influence the nature of its off-campus education, it shares many of the same concerns and issues about library support that are common in other countries, especially in the United States, Australia, and Great Britain. Examples of common issues and concerns are:

- obtaining administrative and financial support for off-campus library services;
- encouraging faculty recognition of the importance of library support for the quality of off-campus programs;
- developing cooperative working arrangements with faculty, part-time instructors, and distance education personnel;
- developing cooperative working arrangements with other libraries which are used by off-campus students;
- planning effective bibliographic instruction for off-campus students;
- adapting new technologies to the library needs of the distance learner;
- promoting the image of librarians as academic colleagues in the planning and delivery of off-campus programs.

Canadian librarians are slowly making some progress in these areas, but there is obviously a long way to go. The recent professional

activities of Canadian librarians emphasize the interest and concern which exists in the field. Some academic libraries in this country are demonstrating leadership in developing effective models of support for off-campus programs. It is important that librarians continue to share information on these activities and models of service with their colleagues, both nationally and internationally, to promote more awareness and development in this area. However, it is equally important that Canadian librarians share their knowledge and information with faculty, administrators, and distance education personnel, because it is these people who will ultimately influence the future and effectiveness of off-campus library services in this country.

REFERENCES

- Affleck, D. (1987). *A proposed model for the provision of library services to academic distance and other off-campus educational programmes in Saskatchewan*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Angel, M. R., & Budnick, C. (1986). Collection development and acquisitions for service to off-campus students. *Library Acquisitions: Practice and Theory*, 10(1), 13-24.
- Appavoo, P. J. (1985). *Library and information access in distance education: The role of technology*. Athabasca, Alberta: Athabasca University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 285 608)
- Appavoo, P. J. (1987). Athabasca University Library comes of age—A case study of planning for and coping with change. In B. M. Lessin (Ed.), *The Off-Campus Library Services Conference Proceedings* (Reno, Nevada, October 23-24, 1986) (pp. 11-23). Mount Pleasant, MI: Central Michigan University Press.
- Appavoo, P. J., & Hansen, L. (1989a). Profile of the distance education library user. In B. M. Lessin (Ed.), *The Off-Campus Library Services Conference Proceedings* (Charleston, South Carolina, October 20-21, 1988) (pp. 13-42). Mount Pleasant, MI: Central Michigan University Press.
- Appavoo, P. J., & Hansen, L. (1989b). Profile of the distance education library user. *Research in Distance Education*, 1(3), 14-15.
- Association of College and Research Libraries. Standards and Accreditation Committee. (1982). Guidelines for extended campus library services. *College & Research Libraries News*, 43(3), 86-88.
- Association of College and Research Libraries. Task Force to Review the Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Services. (1990). Guidelines for extended campus library services. *College & Research Libraries News*, 51(4), 353-355.
- Bailey, M. J. (1989). University of Calgary Conference on Distance Education. *CACUL—Library Services for Distance Learning Interest Group Newsletter*, (April), p. 5.
- Bates, A. (1989). Diversity or chaos in distance education? A view from overseas. In R. Sweet (Ed.), *Post-secondary distance education in Canada: Policies, practices and priorities* (pp. 133-44). Athabasca, Alberta: Athabasca University and Canadian Society for Studies in Education.
- Bishop, B. A., & Clinton, M. (1986). Delivery systems for remote communities: Off-campus library services at Lakehead University. In B. M. Lessin (Ed.), *The Off-Campus Library Services Conference Proceedings* (Knoxville, Tennessee, April 18-19, 1985) (pp. 10-22). Mount Pleasant, MI: Central Michigan University Press.
- Burge, E. J.; Snow, J. E.; & Howard, J. L. (1988). *Developing partnerships: An investigation of library-based relationships with students and educators participating in distance education in Northern Ontario*. Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and Contact North.

- Burge, E. J.; Snow, J. E.; & Howard, J. L. (1989). Distance education: Concept and practice. *Canadian Library Journal*, 46(5), 329-335.
- Carrière, F. (1982). Les bibliothèques universitaires et l'enseignement décentralisé. *Documentation et Bibliothèques*, 28(3), 111-118.
- Conley, P. (1988). *Some observations on off-campus library services in Ontario in 1987*. Unpublished manuscript. Peterborough, Ontario: Trent University.
- Dancik, D. B. (1984). *University of Alberta academic library service to off-campus students*. Unpublished master's project. Edmonton, Alberta: University of Alberta.
- Daniel, J. S. (1986). Preface. In I. Mugridge & D. Kaufman (Eds.), *Distance education in Canada* (pp. iii-vi). London: Croom Helm.
- Davie, L. E. (1987). Learning through networks: A graduate course using computer conferencing. *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education*, 13(2), 11-26.
- Ellis, J. F. (1986). Government policies. In I. Mugridge & D. Kaufman (Eds.), *Distance education in Canada* (pp. 25-29). London: Croom Helm.
- Farrell, G. M., & Haughey, M. (1986). The future of open learning. In I. Mugridge & D. Kaufman (Eds.), *Distance education in Canada* (pp. 30-35). London: Croom Helm.
- Fu, Y. S. (1989). Don't plan around it! Plan for it! A Canadian approach to solving some off-campus library services problems. In B. M. Lessin (Ed.), *The Off-Campus Library Services Conference Proceedings* (Charleston, South Carolina, October 20-21, 1988) (pp. 121-33). Mount Pleasant, MI: Central Michigan University Press.
- Haughey, M. (1989). Involvement with distance education: Issues for the university. In R. Sweet (Ed.), *Post-secondary distance education in Canada: Policies, practices and priorities* (pp. 161-69). Athabasca, Alberta: Athabasca University and Canadian Society for Studies in Education.
- Helm, B. (1989). Distance learning using communications technologies in Canada. In R. Sweet (Ed.), *Post-secondary distance education in Canada: Policies, practices and priorities* (pp. 121-31). Athabasca, Alberta: Athabasca University and Canadian Society for Studies in Education.
- Holmberg, B. (1981). *The status and trends of distance education*. London: Kogan Page.
- Howard, S. (1985). Libraries in distance education. *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education*, 11(1), 45-58.
- Kelly, G. J. (1987). The development of acquisitions and collection services for off-campus students in Northeastern Ontario: An important library collection development issue or merely an issue of a more efficient materials handling and delivery system? *Library Acquisitions: Practice and Theory*, 11(1), 47-66.
- Latham, S. (1985). *Study on library services for the Chinook Educational Consortium*. Lethbridge, Alberta: University of Lethbridge. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 278 396)
- Latham, S. (1987). Library services for an educational consortium in the Canadian Rockies. In B. M. Lessin (Ed.), *The Off-Campus Library Services Conference Proceedings* (Reno, Nevada, October 23-24, 1986) (pp. 143-64). Mount Pleasant, MI: Central Michigan University Press.
- Latham, S.; Slade, A. L.; & Budnick, C. (1991). *Library services for off-campus and distance education: An annotated bibliography*. Ottawa: Canadian Library Association; London: Library Association Publishing Limited; Chicago: American Library Association.
- MacDougall, F. C. (1973). A directory of university extension libraries in the U.S. and Canada. *Continuing Education for Adults*, No. 186 (July-August), 1-6.
- Montgomerie, T. C. (1987). Facilitating "extended campus" graduate education through electronic communication. *Canadian Journal of Educational Communication*, 16(3), 239-256.
- Mount, J., & Turple, J. (1980). University library service for off-campus students. *Canadian Library Journal*, 37(1), 47-50.
- Mugridge, I., & Kaufman, D. (Eds.). (1986). *Distance education in Canada*. London: Croom Helm.

- Nettlefold, B. A. (1988). *Library services for off-campus students: A study of Canadian practice and its potential for Ireland*. Dublin, Ireland: National Institute for Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 293 553)
- Orton, L., & Wiseman, J. (1977). Library service to part-time students. *Canadian Library Journal*, 34(1), 23-27.
- Rothe, J. P. (1986). An historical perspective. In I. Mugridge & D. Kaufman (Eds.), *Distance education in Canada* (pp. 4-24). London: Croom Helm.
- Shklanka, O. (1990). Off-campus library services: A literature review. *Research in Distance Education*, 2(4), 2-11.
- Slade, A. L. (1987a). Library services for distance education courses. In B. M. Lessin (Ed.), *The Off-Campus Library Services Conference Proceedings* (Reno, Nevada, October 23-24, 1986) (pp. 274-84). Mount Pleasant, MI: Central Michigan University Press.
- Slade, A. L. (1987b). Thirteen key ingredients in off-campus library services: A Canadian perspective. In B. M. Lessin (Ed.), *The Off-Campus Library Services Conference Proceedings* (Reno, Nevada, October 23-24, 1986) (pp. 285-305). Mount Pleasant, MI: Central Michigan University Press.
- Slade, A. L. (1988). *The second Canadian off-campus library services survey, 1988: Final report*. Victoria, B.C.: University of Victoria. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 305 074)
- Slade, A. L., & Webb, B. (1985). *The Canadian off-campus library services survey, 1985*. Victoria, B.C.: University of Victoria. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 291 382)
- Slade, A. L.; Piovesan, W.; & Webb, B. (1987). The evolution of library services for off-campus and distance education students in British Columbia. *PNLA Quarterly*, 51(2), 34-38. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 278 418)
- Soules, A. (1979). Off-campus library services: Those inbetween years. In R. D. Stueart & R. D. Johnson (Eds.), *New horizons for academic libraries* (Papers presented at the First National Conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries. Boston, Massachusetts, November 8-11, 1978) (pp. 568-76). New York: K. G. Saur. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 176 730)
- Statistics Canada. (1987). *Canada year book, 1988*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply & Services Canada.
- Statistics Canada. (1989). *Education in Canada: A statistical review for 1987-88*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply & Services Canada.
- Sweet, R. (1986). University programmes. In I. Mugridge & D. Kaufman (Eds.), *Distance education in Canada* (pp. 169-84). London: Croom Helm.
- Sweet, R. (Ed.). (1989). *Post-secondary distance education in Canada: Policies, practices and priorities*. Athabasca, Alberta: Athabasca University and Canadian Society for Studies in Education.
- Whitehead, M. (1987). Collection development for distance education at the University of British Columbia Library. *Library Acquisitions: Practice and Theory*, 11(1), 67-74.