
Library Models for the Delivery of Support Services to Off-Campus Academic Programs

BARTON M. LESSIN

ABSTRACT

THIS ARTICLE CONSIDERS FIVE library programs as models for the delivery of library services off campus. Webster University has a program which extends library service to international sites. The University of Maine/Community College of Maine is indicative of programming on a statewide basis. The Vermont State Colleges off-campus library program is interesting for the lack of an on-campus library facility. The library services program at the University of South Alabama is noteworthy for its cooperation with a local public library. The services provided off campus by Central Michigan University are examined as an example of a comprehensive service package.

INTRODUCTION

One way to study methods of delivering library services to off-campus constituencies is to examine model programs. This article considers five such off-campus service models, which represent both strengths and weaknesses in the delivery of service to specific constituent groups. While there is no intent to characterize any program as the best or only service provider of its kind, special emphasis is given to the Central Michigan University program as this is one of the oldest and most fully developed of these support programs. The usefulness of these models as appropriate examples of functional delivery systems was the determining factor in their inclusion here. It must be understood that there are many other fine off-campus library service programs with even more under

development. The five programs discussed here were chosen for their usefulness in illustrating these models for service. Each of the models discussed here is located in the United States, but one should note that outstanding programs have also been developed in the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia.

Each of these model programs offers the opportunity for comparison and contrast with other academic environments and locations. Webster University extends its library services internationally. The University of Maine/Community College of Maine model reflects a statewide effort for the provision of off-campus library services and resources. The Vermont State Colleges and the Community College of Vermont provide a program for off-campus library services where an on-campus library is lacking. The University of South Alabama model emphasizes cooperation with the local public library. Finally, Central Michigan University offers an off-campus library services model which emphasizes a comprehensive service package.

In a previous article, this author suggested that there are basically five models for off-campus library services: (1) the branch campus, (2) the use of the on-campus library for all users both on and off campus, (3) the trunk delivery system, (4) the use of local libraries, and (5) some combination of the previous four models (Lessin, 1986, p. 5). The "trunk system," or the distribution of library materials from the trunk of a car, is not so much a model as it is a substitute for appropriate library services and resources. The remaining four models are pertinent to this examination.

WEBSTER UNIVERSITY: AN INTERNATIONAL MODEL

In nontraditional higher education circles, Webster University is known for its academic offerings in fifteen states and six foreign countries. Located in the St. Louis suburb of Webster Groves, Missouri, the university offers both bachelor's and master's degrees at its home campus, at sites throughout the United States, and at selected sites in foreign countries. According to an article prepared by the Dean of University Services and university librarian, the university provides support to its class sites in the United States using a "multi-pronged approach to library services" (Luebbert, 1984, p. 61). Webster meets the library needs of its students and faculty through a mixed assortment of services, including on-site collections—i.e., reserve collections—loaning of on-campus resources, and utilization of local collections. Efforts to avoid the duplication of local library resources are a basic ingredient of the Webster collection-development plan. However, there is no suggestion that the Webster on-campus collections are the central information resource for all Webster

students and faculty. The dean explains that she visits the teaching sites and, while there, meets with the directors of local public and academic libraries. The intent of these visits is to keep the directors apprised of the Webster programs and to seek their cooperation. To date, Webster has been able to operate through informal arrangements with local libraries rather than contractual agreements.

One particularly exciting aspect of the Webster model is its provision for reimbursing Webster's off-campus students for local access fees or fees for database searches charged to them (K. M. Luebbert, personal communication, January 23, 1990). Knowing that their students may well seek the assistance of local library services, Webster University has arranged for its students to obtain required information without a fee. This approach, given the 200,000 volume size of the on-campus Luhr Library and the preponderance of off-campus business courses, is a practical one.

It is the Webster model for international off-campus library support which is perhaps unique among U.S. academic institutions. Webster operates four teaching sites in Europe—Geneva, Switzerland; Leiden, the Netherlands; London, England; and Vienna, Austria. These sites are the equivalent of branch campuses in the United States. The Webster European sites are largely independent from the campus in Webster Groves. Webster Associate Provost for European Campuses and Director of European Operations, William J. Duggan, provides campus-based leadership for these sites (Webster University, 1988, p. 65). Geneva is the oldest of the Webster sites in Europe, and London is the newest and smallest Webster European enclave. Each of these branches of Webster University has its own library collection ranging in size from about 1,500 volumes to around 3,500 volumes depending largely upon the age of the installation and the population served. Library staffing varies from site to site, but two of the sites currently employ local librarians, with the other two relying on support staff for library operations. These individuals report to the director of Webster's local academic program. The staff at these four sites do cooperate with one another and they also work closely with their counterparts in local libraries. While there is a reliance by Webster students and faculty in Europe upon library resources available in the local community, the Webster European operation has not employed contractual agreements with these local libraries. Informal arrangements have proven acceptable to all parties, including such prestigious institutions as the University of Leiden (K. M. Luebbert, personal communication, January 23, 1990).

When Webster first developed this model for off-campus services, it had its on-campus library order and ship library materials to the European sites. This is no longer the case, as each of the four sites

is responsible for its own acquisitions program. However, the library in Webster Groves provides the European branches with copies of its monthly acquisitions lists. As Webster offers the same courses in all locations, the staff in Europe uses these lists to keep up to date with on-campus purchases which might be useful for their collections. The on-campus library staff will also order materials for the European sites and assist with cataloging if the situation requires. Additionally, the dean serves as a consultant to the European libraries, meeting with the directors of those sites once each year and advising the overseas staff as the situation requires. The university has instituted telefacsimile operations between its campus and the European sites and is exploring access of its on-campus computers from Europe via MCI telecommunications (K. M. Luebbert, personal communication, October 23, 1989).

This model for international off-campus library services builds upon a base of branch facilities operated in concert with informal cooperative agreements with local libraries which allow for the use of the latter's collections and services. This is a reasonable and useful model if applied so as to assure that foreign-registered students and teaching faculty both have library services and resources comparable to those they would expect to find on campus at academic institutions offering similar curricula. Systematic monitoring for overuse or abuse of local library collections is imperative. If this model has a weakness, it is the temptation to substitute dependence on local collections for a healthy acquisitions program in the branch libraries.

The Webster application of this model quite aside, it is possible to hypothesize that at its worst the use of this model may merely satisfy local legal and academic requirements while providing minimal resources and services directly and simultaneously reducing possible costs for external services. At its best, it represents an appropriate use of university-provided resources and services augmented by additional library resources and services from the local community, with the full cooperation of all involved parties.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MAINE/COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF MAINE: A STATEWIDE EFFORT

The off-campus library services program of the University of Maine/Community College of Maine is illustrative of a model of considerable sophistication and merit, although this is a relatively new program. The provision of library services to off-campus students on a statewide basis distinguishes this model as one deserving of consideration.

Historical Background

April 1987 marked the release of the preliminary report of the Community College Task Force on Off-Campus Library Services. This document set forth a philosophic foundation for further development and implementation of off-campus library services throughout the State of Maine (University of Maine..., 1987). In the fall of the following year, the university libraries in Maine initiated their Innovative Interfaces-based online computer catalog, URSUS. Those involved with off-campus services met some of the objectives stated in the 1987 report, including the hiring of a statewide coordinator by fall 1989. September 1989 saw the announcement of a system for the distribution of library cards and the invitation of prospective members to participate in the Off-Campus Library Services Advisory Board. Soon thereafter, draft mission, collection development, and services policies were shared throughout the state; the coordinator introduced herself to the faculty of the Community College via memo, outlined off-campus library services, and explained reserve procedures; and the Advisory Board held its first meeting. Implementation of toll-free telephone service for this off-campus library program occurred in January 1990.

Off-Campus Library Services Task Force

The work of this task force deserves attention. Perhaps more than any other factor, this group provided the base for a wide-ranging and thoughtful program for off-campus library support by clearly establishing the intent of library support services:

The strategy for delivery of library services to the Community College of Maine goes beyond the traditional bounds of library services....As we look to the future and the expanded delivery of education to the people of our state, it is clear that the time has come to reach beyond the mere expansion of existing models and services. This proposal does not create branch or field libraries but rather calls for the use of new technologies, cooperatives with local resources, and the development of the coordinated network of service providers. (University of Maine, 1987, p. 1)

A substantive move toward a coordinated network has taken place with the information of an advisory board composed of representatives from several of the libraries of the University of Maine campuses, from public and college libraries, teaching center directors, and teaching faculty. The cooperation this venture enjoys and its progress to date shows that this model for off-campus library services is securely in place.

Administrative Issues

The University of Maine at Augusta serves as the center of Maine's off-campus library efforts; the office of the program coordinator is

located here. The plan calls for the employment of two to three regional librarians plus additional support staff to work with the fifteen academic campuses and serve students and faculty at some forty-six existing or proposed regional centers and extended sites (University of Maine, 1987, p. 6). Librarians, once hired, will be assigned to library program regions on the basis of four factors:

1. the number and geographic position of the teaching locales,
2. the number of students involved at each location,
3. the number of courses offered at these locations, and
4. the anticipated development of additional teaching centers and sites (p. 9).

All of the centers—i.e., those locations with academic employees—and twenty of the teaching sites will have URSUS terminals by summer 1991 (Lowe, 1989). The centers will also have reading room collections, as space permits and as local resources demand. The designers of the *Preliminary Report* (University of Maine, 1989) suggested that evaluation of these library services is a fundamental part of this model and that promotion of the services offered is necessary.

Services and Resources

The task force has proposed a package of services which may result in this program being the most comprehensive of its kind in the United States. Document delivery consists of interlibrary loan service including the use of telefacsimile, the use of URSUS, toll free telephone service, and the availability of University of Maine system library cards by “any degree or non-degree student enrolled in a university program who may be taking Community College/ITV courses as a part of that program” (Lowe, 1989). Core and reserve collections, direct loan availability, and cooperation between the library program and local libraries will provide other avenues to assure that Community College of Maine students gain access to the informational resources needed for their academic work.

As is the case with several other models presented here, bibliographic instruction is an integral part of this model. In October 1989, the coordinator of the program released a statement announcing that “library-use instruction customized to subject areas presented ‘live’ or over ITV,” was available to faculty and students via the off-campus program (Lowe, personal communication to Center/Site Directors, September 14, 1989). The regional librarians have a fundamental role in this instruction program and will work closely with teaching faculty. Their objective is to integrate library instruction into all undergraduate education.

Collection Development

One of the recommendations of the task force was to upgrade the resources at the University of Maine at Augusta so that this member of the university system could adequately meet its obligation to serve as the central site for off-campus services. The principle is that this collection should serve off-campus librarians and staff as well as off-campus students and faculty. University of Maine at Augusta will also be the site for a central reserve collection for the off-campus program. Core collections at the centers will aid ready reference and act as source material to identify and locate additional resources. Librarians will assist in obtaining these latter items through the off-campus library services program. The coordinator of this program has prepared a statement which articulates collection development for the program and covers such topics as scope, selection, gifts, weeding, and evaluation (Lowe, personal communication to Center/Site Directors, September 14, 1989).

Strengths and Weaknesses

This is a potentially strong model for the provision of library services and resources to an off-campus constituency. Although as yet largely untested, the Community College of Maine model pays serious attention to virtually every aspect of off-campus services outlined by the existing ACRL guidelines (ACRL, 1990).

One of the weaknesses discussed in the context of other models is the potential for the abuse of local library facilities. Here is a model which seeks to avoid such situations by actively encouraging the participation of public librarians as members of the Off-Campus Library Services Advisory Board. This is a proactive approach to a difficult problem and one which is certainly applicable to other situations.

It is quite feasible to transfer this model for off-campus library services to other environments, particularly to those requiring statewide cooperation. The University of Maine/Community College of Maine program for off-campus library services is likely to reach its stated goal of national leadership if it can fully implement its well-defined objectives.

VERMONT STATE COLLEGES: OFF-CAMPUS LIBRARY SERVICES WITHOUT A LIBRARY

Statewide, off-campus library support is also a goal of the model offered by the Vermont State Colleges. Development of this model for library service began in 1982 with the formation of a library assessment group and Chancellor Richard Bjork's appointment of Dennis Lindberg to head that group. The Vermont State Colleges,

composed of four-year institutions, a two-year college, and the Community College of Vermont (CCV), faced the challenge of creating a working program for off-campus library services. The community college students were a particular concern, as they had no library facilities or services directly available to them. The library assessment group eventually gave way to a task force on library development. In August 1984, this latter group submitted recommendations to the Priorities (Executive) Committee of the Board of Trustees of the Vermont State Colleges. The recommendations included seven major points:

1. appropriate information competencies;
2. parity between on-campus and off-campus programs in requirements for and use of library/information resources;
3. a single, joint, online catalog including the University of Vermont, Middlebury College, and the State Department of Libraries and the use of OCLC;
4. increased reference services including librarians for the community college;
5. a joint serials list;
6. a coordinated collection development catch up program; and
7. increased funding for collection development renewal (Lindberg & Chalfoun, 1986, pp. 161-62).

Given these objectives, it is easy to understand an interest in automation as a fundamental factor in the development of this off-campus library services program. Fortunately, this particular effort had something of an advantage, as Lindberg's portfolio included both library development and systemwide computing.

The Community College of Vermont

With no campus or library facility, the Community College of Vermont required perhaps more attention to library services off-campus than the other institutional units of the Vermont State Colleges. Planning for services had to consider the twelve CCV sites distributed throughout the state. Chalfoun (1987) wrote that CCV adopted its own set of objectives to help students reach a goal of effective use of library resources. This included the development of topics, the ability to locate and organize resources, the ability to use research data properly, and to report findings in an appropriately formatted research paper (pp. 75-81). These objectives led to the preparation and distribution of several useful publications for students—for example, *Biblio-tech* (1985), an excellent and entertaining handbook of research skills. Additionally, through collection development efforts, the twelve sites had a total of about 7,000 volumes in place by 1989 (Chalfoun, 1989). These are reference

collections and are not intended to satisfy fully the information needs of the CCV students. Another feature of this program is the placement of serials indexes in each of the twelve CCV offices. From there the students can request articles located in any of the four state college libraries and receive a telefacsimile response. WATS service connects the students to the Coordinator of Research and Information Services. While this individual does not facilitate document delivery, she does provide reference assistance. Bibliographic instruction is also largely the assignment of this coordinator.

As of October 1989, Vermont State Colleges had reached its objective of providing online access to bibliographic catalogs throughout the state. Students and faculty can now dial into the online system to browse bibliographic entries. Circulation and media booking are also available.

Strengths and Weaknesses

The Vermont State Colleges' model for the provision of off-campus services pre-dates the program of the Maine community colleges. Here we find a model which concentrates on: (1) assuring that all students, regardless of their location, can determine the library holdings available to them, and (2) a delivery system for the transfer of those materials to the end-user. This is a well-considered model which in one notable aspect is more inward looking than that offered by Maine. While all the state colleges participated in the planning of this program, there was no apparent involvement by public librarians. Although the students and faculty at each of the twelve sites have access to both the coordinator and the online system, it is clear that there will be circumstances where these individuals will use local library facilities. Depending upon several factors such as the number of students at each site, the curriculum involved, class assignments, and so on, the impact on local libraries could be considerable. This model would be strengthened by some form of arrangement or contractual agreement with the local libraries to assure back-up support to the directed services offered by this library program. The use of telefacsimile for all requests may prove impractical over the long term owing to its cost, and because FAX can only be sent to one of the twelve site offices rather than directly to the student in need of the information. Presently, practical use of current technology offers timely response to the information needs of off-campus students.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH ALABAMA: COOPERATION WITH THE PUBLIC LIBRARY

The model for off-campus library services employed by the

University of South Alabama is significant in that its key ingredient, cooperation with the local public library, has application in any number of different situations including in-state, out-of-state, foreign, and statewide off-campus academic programs. Although several of the models here have some level of cooperation with local libraries, the University of South Alabama has a formal understanding based upon a letter of agreement.

The main campus of the University of South Alabama is located in Mobile and enrolls over 10,000 students in bachelor's, master's, and doctoral programs. Its branch campus in Baldwin County offers both undergraduate and graduate classes in Fairhope and in Bay Minette with library services provided by the Fairhope Public Library and the Faulkner State Junior College Library respectively. As of 1989, the University of South Alabama offered about thirty-five courses through the branch in addition to noncredit programs (Bush & Damico, 1989). A librarian with the title Head of Library Branch Operations is assigned to the Baldwin County branch.

Document delivery utilizes interlibrary loan service among the three libraries on a one week turn-around basis. As the Baldwin County branch librarian frequently visits the Mobile campus, she has taken to personally transporting materials between locations. Loans go to the library where the request originated and are there charged out to the patron. Users pay service charges for copying at the circulation desk in the library of request origination. As Bush and Damico (1989) have noted, the University of South Alabama includes a marketing facet as a part of its model, featuring a widely distributed descriptive brochure, news notes in the junior college student newsletter and the Baldwin County newspapers, and communication with county librarians and teaching faculty (pp. 54-55).

It is in the area of interlibrary cooperation that this model establishes itself as notable. While we find that there is no contractual agreement, the University of South Alabama-Baldwin County has a signed agreement which assures that its students and faculty will have local library services. An earlier statement from St. Joseph's College which appeared in *College & Research Libraries News* served as a prototype for the agreement used by the University of South Alabama-Baldwin County (Bush & Damico, 1989, p. 55).

While space does not permit a review of the entire cooperative agreement, it is worth noting that this document is written in such a manner as to facilitate the use of public library facilities and resources by the university patrons without hardship to the library. Both institutions are well-served by such an arrangement. The agreement provides for reference service, borrowing, replacement and

overdue costs, reserve operations, collection development for the public library by the university, interlibrary loan, database searching, and the payment of fees by the university for the services offered based on classes taken and rental for classroom space. This agreement includes a provision for the head of library branch operations to work in the public library two nights a week during the period of the university quarter. This last feature is extremely significant. The university has in effect placed its librarian where it knows its off-campus students are likely to seek information.

In this model, the University of South Alabama Library is not the primary information source for the students in Baldwin County, but it is the primary site for interlibrary loan lending to those students. The need for access to information about on-campus library holdings is therefore quite important. Fortunately, the university has arranged for dial access to its NOTIS-based online bibliographic database, making access from both Bay Minette and Fairhope a reality.

The holdings of the Fairhope Public Library do not meet all the information needs of the University of South Alabama-Baldwin County students. These materials only augment those items available through interlibrary loan. Given the academic environment of the University of South Alabama-Baldwin County and the cooperation between the libraries involved, this is a useful model strengthened by the existence of the online catalog. Increasing enrollments could adversely affect the local libraries' abilities to provide acceptable services. Should this occur, the university might be able to amend its program by establishing a local core collection, offering enhanced delivery services, or by making other adjustments. Future construction of a branch library with its associated service model would likely signal the end of the model discussed here. In the meantime, the University of South Alabama model for off-campus library support on the basis of a cooperative agreement with the local public library is functional, useful, and applicable to other sites.

CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY: AN EFFORT TO ACHIEVE A COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE MODEL

The Central Michigan University (CMU) Libraries off-campus library services program is noteworthy. (In 1987, the CMU library program was honored for excellence by the National University Continuing Education Association at its Region IV conference.) It is this model's effort at comprehensive service, its use of incremental funding, and its emphasis on making the main campus library the primary information resource for all members of its constituency, which set it apart from other service models.

Historical Background

The history of Central Michigan University's involvement with off-campus library services extends back fifteen years. Its beginnings date to two events in the summer of 1975. The first of these was the preparation of a report which summarized a study conducted by the assistant to the director of libraries (Central Michigan University, 1975). The director of libraries then wrote to CMU's Vice President for Administration with recommendations for providing library service off-campus; this correspondence set forth four basic elements of the off-campus library services program which remain very much at the heart of its operation today (J. W. Weatherford, to N. Bucklew, personal communication, July 3, 1975). These are:

1. The University's Institute for Personal and Career Development (IPCD) would receive library support provided by the CMU libraries.
2. The library would prepare a "priority order" budget in consultation with the IPCD.
3. The library would establish funding accounts based on this budget and would assume responsibility for required spending with an obligation of reporting to the IPCD.
4. The library was to receive from the IPCD a listing of names and addresses of the faculty at a very early point in their association with the institution. Requests for library materials and services for off-campus students and faculty would go directly to the library. (This structure was later codified by then Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs, John Cantelon, who wrote a memo on October 4, 1978 to the accounting, purchasing, and personnel offices of the university concerning the role of the library as responsible for the library program; he reiterates the role of the steering committee and states that the provost would act as arbiter for the library and the IPCD in all cases requiring resolution.) The IPCD would pay for the library services it was to receive, but it would have access to CMU collections as a benefit of association with an on-campus academic library.

Access and Services

Central Michigan University's off-campus students and faculty alike can call their on-campus libraries and request materials via toll free wide area telephone service (WATS). These WATS lines receive attention by program staff more than 120 hours per week and answering machines take requests for information and messages at all other times (this is particularly important given the distances between the Central Michigan University campus and its teaching sites which are scattered between New York City and Hawaii). Books

are loaned and articles copied with a working objective of a twenty-four hour turnaround from the time a call reaches CMU until the time the material is out of the library program office. Owing to the institute's use of varied scheduling patterns, this prompt response is necessary in order for off-campus students to get their assigned coursework accomplished. As in the on-campus academic library experience, document delivery alone does not provide for all of the information needs of CMU patrons off-campus. Services offered by the Central Michigan University regional librarians constitute another significant segment of this program model. These individuals are reference librarians with the assignment of providing support exclusively to CMU off-campus faculty and students. Their assignments incorporate the kind of activities that one normally associates with reference librarians, including in-class bibliographic instruction, database searching, the creation of bibliographies and pathfinders, and general reference support. Other aspects of the work of these librarians include the marketing of the Off-Campus Library Services Program and liaison with local librarians. Naturally, given the geographic distribution of the teaching sites, these librarians must sometimes travel considerable distances to visit classes and accomplish virtually all of their reference work over the telephone. The distances involved also influence the efforts that the librarians are willing to make to assist the off-campus faculty. An example of the librarians' commitment to the faculty is the instructional resources collection (Potter, 1987; Garrett, 1989) developed by library program staff to assure that all off-campus faculty are able to examine textbooks for use in their classes.

Off-campus students and faculty of Central Michigan University are also served through contact with local librarians. This contact facilitates the process of CMU patrons gaining access to libraries near their teaching sites. Generally, there is no need for these students to obtain borrowing privileges, as they have access to CMU libraries. It is sometimes helpful for them to have access to appropriate indexes. Contact with local librarians facilitates this process and allows CMU librarians to work with local libraries to meet the resource needs of both students and faculty.

Another quite different and equally significant reflection of this model program was an effort made toward the end of the 1980s to codify library services, procedures, and policies. The program's regional librarians and program manager actively pursued this work to reduce the number of situations where ambiguity might lead to misunderstanding or perhaps conflict between information seekers

and librarians. As of February 1989, the staff had drafted or completed the writing of policy statements regarding database searching, student services, services to faculty, and collection development.

Organization

The organization of this off-campus library program includes a librarian/manager's position, regional librarians, and support staff. The manager has line responsibility for the daily operations of this program. Further, the library administrator responsible for the program serves as a member of the IPCD Director's Advisory Council (DAC). This latter group of administrators is responsible for planning and operating the various components of the off-campus academic program. The library benefits from its inclusion in the planning and implementation of new programs, procedures, and policies. The only negative influence which this latter association represents is a diminution of the importance of the Off-Campus Library Services Program Steering Committee mentioned later.

The incremental funding for this program extends to personnel as well as to other resources and services. The staff of this library program report to the management of the university libraries. This results in an organizational structure with operational responsibility for the library program located in the libraries. Organization aside, if the library administration lacked appropriate communication with the IPCD, it could not adequately address the timely decision-making required to support the off-campus program. The Off-Campus Library Services Steering Committee serves as a formal acknowledgment of this need to communicate. This committee facilitates the communication of issues of interest to both IPCD and library staff. The use of this committee has varied according to the wishes of the IPCD directors.

Evaluation

Administrators at CMU sometimes characterize their off-campus programs as among the most carefully scrutinized academic programs in the United States. They have good reason for doing so. Owing to the desire to ensure that such nontraditional academic programs are capable of meeting academic standards, these CMU programs have been evaluated internally and externally to assure a quality product. Evaluation of the academic off-campus program frequently results in the examination of library services which are a part of this university's overall off-campus offering. The Off-Campus Library Services Program receives attention during regional accreditation visits of the North Central Association and other similar regional bodies. This library program is also evaluated by state licensing bodies.

As the IPCD offers classes in some fifteen states besides Michigan, evaluation of this sort is inevitable (Lessin, 1982). Another level of evaluation emanates from within the university via its academic senate-based board of visitors. This group, which is comprised of CMU faculty, examines the IPCD at seven year intervals (Central Michigan University, 1982; 1989a). Perhaps the closest review which the off-campus library program undergoes is that by the regional librarians and manager as a part of an ongoing process of seeking excellence, stating annual objectives, and reviewing accomplishments. This latter evaluation is an integral part of the model allowing for its improvement and expansion.

Marketing

An important assignment of the regional librarians is the marketing which they do to encourage students and faculty to take advantage of the library resources available to them. They accomplish this marketing in a variety of ways and with several different tools. Examples of marketing devices employed include posters, bookmarks, the *Library Guide* (Central Michigan University, 1989b), a videotape orientation program, and a library materials listing provided with each order placed for printed materials. Marketing is also accomplished through a concerted effort to encourage faculty to advocate the use of program services and resources in the classroom. To this end, the regional librarians attend, whenever possible, faculty meetings sponsored by the institute.

The staff also pursues marketing in the context of the promotion of the CMU academic program to potential corporate and government sponsors. The IPCD administrators have learned that an outstanding library support operation can serve as an attractive asset in the recruitment of new sponsors. These administrators frequently distribute library program information, discuss library services, and incorporate comments by the regional librarians when marketing the CMU off-campus academic program.

Outreach

To improve service to Central Michigan University students and faculty and to encourage the discussion of issues pertinent to the library support of nontraditional adult learners, the CMU Off-Campus Library Services Program has made a conscious effort to look beyond itself. This program has convened four conferences of international scope to promote the interchange of ideas by practitioners. These meetings have resulted in an informal network of librarians who are concerned and knowledgeable about the provision of off-campus library services. Published conference

proceedings are an additional benefit, as they have expanded the scope of available literature concerned with this specific aspect of library service (Lessin, 1983). Admittedly, this facet of the CMU model is more a reflection of this university's aggressive interest in off-campus library services than of the model which provides those services. Nonetheless, the conference appears now to be a basic part of the CMU model, albeit one not easily transferred to other locations.

Strengths and Weaknesses

This is a very interesting model for the provision of off-campus library services. It enjoys the strength of a demonstrable commitment from the on-campus library in the form of document delivery. Of particular note is the organization of this model, which actively integrates this library program with its academic counterpart. The funding design is one which is certainly transferable to other academic situations and environments. However, the use of this particular support model can signal potential challenges for the library and institution employing it. These possible problems fall into two main categories—document delivery and potential for abuse of local libraries.

The model's basic tenet, the provision of printed information from the on-campus library, carries with it certain obligations. A primary requirement is that the program include some method of informing users as to library holdings on campus. Whether by telephone access into an online catalog, a book catalog, a microforms product, or some other method, the institution has an obligation to advise its students and faculty on the extent of its library holdings. Additionally, use of this model assumes timely document delivery. Without this feature, patrons will not receive the service they require. The greater the distances involved, the greater the chances are that one or both of these basic factors will prove unsatisfactory. For example, the experience of Central Michigan University was less than positive regarding library service to Kwajalein Island and the Azores and the delivery service had to be adjusted in those cases.

The document delivery program also has workload implications. The provision of materials with this model is highly labor intensive. The institution employing this model must make a commitment to provide sufficient staff to meet the demands on their service and the planning to meet such demands can be quite challenging. Consider the possible impact of an aggressive library marketing program on document delivery when rapid upward changes in the number of requests for information directly affect the delivery process.

Encouraging such growth has implications for the number of staff required, the space allocated to the program, equipment and consistency, in fact, to virtually all aspects of the model.

An inherent component of this model is the possibility for the abuse of local library resources. If the institution using this model does not work carefully with its constituents and the local libraries, problems of access and use may occur.

CONCLUSION

There are numerous factors influencing the provision of off-campus library services. Among these are the scope and direction of the academic program requiring library support; the manner and degree of funding specifically available for library services and resources away from the on-campus environment; the working relationship of the library with the academic program and the academic administration; and the geographic distribution of off-campus teaching sites. Additionally, there is the issue of evaluation, which can impact the off-campus library services an institution of higher education might offer. Furthermore, for every off-campus library support program there are the issues of management, personnel, facilities, resources, and services suggested by the ACRL guidelines (ACRL, 1990).

The model off-campus library services programs discussed here touch on each of these influences and issues. As a group, they demonstrate creative approaches that attempt to extend library support to off-campus constituencies regardless of the distances involved. They also illustrate in various ways the weaknesses associated with this category of library service.

It is likely that new library service models will emerge to meet the ever-changing challenges of nontraditional higher education. Given the speed at which the computer, telecommunications, and the information industries are changing, it is very likely that new models will continue to be developed. However, future library programs directed off campus may well continue to fall into the five types mentioned at the beginning of this article. The branch campus, the use of the on-campus library for all users both on and off campus, the trunk delivery system, the use of local libraries, and some combination of the previous four models will remain at the heart of future off-campus library programs. It will be most interesting to watch that development and to witness the success of librarians and other academics in creating and developing off-campus library programs capable of offering services and resources comparable to the on-campus library environment.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

A number of individuals were extremely helpful in the development of this article and are deserving of my gratitude. Joyce Rumery, Susan S. Lowe, Karen M. Luebbert, and James A. Damico contributed to this effort with their time and assistance. My wife, Judy, was a particular help with her patience and understanding.

REFERENCES

- Association of College and Research Libraries. Task Force to Review the Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Services. (1990). ACRL guidelines for extended campus library services. *College & Research Libraries News*, 51(4), 353-355.
- Biblio-tech a handbook of research skills, both in and out of the library, for use in college and long afterward: Survival skills for the information age.* (1985). Waterbury, VT: Community College of Vermont.
- Bush, G. L., & Damico, J. A. (1989). Library services for a remote campus. In B. M. Lessin (Ed.), *The Off-Campus Library Services Conference Proceedings* (pp. 51-65). Mount Pleasant, MI: Central Michigan University Press.
- Central Michigan University. (1975). *Proposal for the library support of the Institute for Personal and Career Development*. Unpublished manuscript, Mount Pleasant, MI.
- Central Michigan University, Institute for Personal and Career Development. (1982). *A report from the Board of Visitors to the Academic Senate*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Central Michigan University, Institute for Personal and Career Development. (1989a). *A report from the Board of Visitors to the Academic Senate*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Central Michigan University. (1989b). *The library guide*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Chalfoun, E. (1987). Off-campus library services of the Community College of Vermont. In B. M. Lessin (Ed.), *The Off-Campus Library Services Conference Proceedings* (pp. 75-81). Mount Pleasant, MI: Central Michigan University Press.
- Chalfoun, E. (1989). After automation—What next? In B. M. Lessin (Ed.), *The Off-Campus Library Services Conference Proceedings* (pp. 71-77). Mount Pleasant, MI: Central Michigan University Press.
- Garrett, M. (1989). Going to the head of the class: The development and implementation of an instructional materials support collection. In B. M. Lessin (Ed.), *The Off-Campus Library Services Conference Proceedings* (pp. 134-55). Mount Pleasant, MI: Central Michigan University Press.
- Lessin, B. M. (1982). Libraries and licensure: A preliminary study of the statutes, regulations, standards, and guidelines used in the evaluation of off-campus, out-of-state academic library programs (Proceedings of the fifth annual conference on Quality in Off-Campus Credit Programs: Responsibilities and Realities, October 18-20). *Issues in Higher Education*, 8, 211-231.
- Lessin, B. M. (1986). Keynote address for the off-campus library services conference. In B. M. Lessin (Ed.), *The Off-Campus Library Services Conference Proceedings* (pp. 1-9). Mount Pleasant, MI: Central Michigan University Press.
- Lessin, B. M. (Ed.). (1983, 1986, 1987, 1989). *The off-campus library services conference proceedings*. Mount Pleasant, MI: Central Michigan University Press.
- Lindberg, D., & Chalfoun, E. (1986). Development of off-campus library services in the Vermont State Colleges. In B. M. Lessin (Ed.), *The Off-Campus Library Services Conference Proceedings* (pp. 157-71). Mount Pleasant, MI: Central Michigan University Press.
- Lowe, S. (1989). *Off-campus library services*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Maine at Augusta.
- Luebbert, K. M. (1984). Webster University's library service to extended sites. *Show-Me Libraries*, (October/November), 60.

- Potter, R. H. (1987). Instructional resources support as a function of off-campus library services. In B. M. Lessin, (Ed.), *The Off-Campus Library Services Conference Proceedings* (pp. 200-04). Mount Pleasant, MI: Central Michigan University Press.
- University of Maine, Community College Task Force, Off-Campus Library Services. (1987). *Preliminary report*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Webster University. (1988). *Webster University Graduate School 1988-1989 Catalog*. Unpublished internal document.