A Model for Reviewing Academic Branch Libraries Based on ACRL Guidelines and Standards

Olivia M. A. Madison, Sally A. Fry, and David Gregory

There is a long history of debate and controversy surrounding the existence of academic branch libraries. Although the reasons for reviewing branch libraries are numerous and varied, there is a need for consistency in the review process. Using recent ACRL guidelines and standards as a foundation, the authors propose a model methodology for reviewing academic branch libraries which may be utilized by any institution undertaking such a process.

hile library literature is replete with articles examining the relative merits of centralized and decentralized academic library systems, the academic branch library continues to be an important organizational tool to provide library services. In fact, far from dwindling in numbers, academic branch libraries continue to be maintained and established, particularly in institutions where new dollars have been infused to support specific programs. The 1983 ARL SPEC Kit 99, "Branch Libraries in ARL Institutions," reported that more libraries established branch facilities than closed them during the preceding five years."[1] However, college and university library systems with branch facilities are under increasing pressure, both external and self-imposed, to review them, usually with the goal of reducing costs. The outcome of such reviews may have major impact on locations and types of collections, reference and document delivery services, staff morale, and library relations with the affected academic departments. Because of the potentially serious ramifications of such reviews, the authors believe that the methods employed are pivotal to the quality, acceptance, and consequences of the resulting decisions.

In light of the continuing trend to review academic branch libraries, the authors suggest that a standardized model would be useful to administrators making decisions regarding the continued maintenance, possible closing, or reshaping of branch services and collections. This article offers a model that any academic library might use when faced with the need to review one or more of its branches. While the reasons for initiating a review may vary, much of the review methodology should remain constant and should be based on nationally recognized standards.

This article begins by describing the circumstances that prompt libraries to review their branch facilities. Relevant ACRL guidelines and standards are then

Olivia M. A. Madison is Assistant Director for Public Services, Sally A. Fry is Head of the Branch Facilities Department, and David Gregory is Head of the Access Services Department at Iowa State University Library, Iowa State University of Science and Technology, Ames, Iowa 50011-2140.

discussed, along with the current literature regarding academic branch facilities. The authors then propose a model methodology to be used in the formal review of branch libraries. The article concludes with two appendixes: an outline of the review process, and a sample outline of the written report in which this process culminates.

CIRCUMSTANCES REQUIRING REVIEW OF BRANCH LIBRARIES

The impetus for conducting a review of academic branch libraries may arise from institutional or departmental annual reviews, accreditation processes, or changes in academic programs and curricula. More often than not, however, serious reviews are undertaken for financial reasons, with an eye toward cost savings. Branch facilities are often seen by administrators as duplicative, both in terms of collections and staffing. Campus politics can also precipitate a review of branch facilities. A single faculty member's annoyance at having to trudge across campus to obtain research materials can become the catalyst for a lengthy and complicated review process. As academic programs become more interdisciplinary in nature and acquisitions budgets shrink, the competition for materials—especially journal subscriptions—has become keener. This factor is most pronounced in scientific and technical disciplines, where subscriptions to many serials are so costly that duplication is fiscally impossible.

A single faculty member's annoyance at having to trudge across campus to obtain research materials can become the catalyst for a lengthy and complicated review process.

Advances in library automation, electronic services, and new technologies will continue to influence the need for branch library review. Integrated online catalog systems, including circulation, acquisitions, and serial check-in modules, not only provide easy access to the holdings of branch collections but also eliminate the need for remote locations to keep separate records for their materials. Document-delivery technologies, such as fax and text digitizing, provide better physical access to materials in off-site locations. It is unlikely, however, that these technological advances will soon end the debate over the existence of academic branch libraries. The cost of these electronic services remains relatively high, in both dollars and staff time. And, as scholars will testify, there is no substitute for perusing library stacks in person. Therefore, while helping to ease the day-to-day inconveniences caused by branch facilities for some library users, technology does not eliminate the need to review branch libraries.

ACRL GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS AND THEIR APPLICABILITY

Fortunately for administrators involved in branch library review, the two most relevant sets of ACRL guidelines and standards have both been recently revised. The *Standards for University Libraries: Evaluation of Performance* (hereafter *Standards*), first adopted by ACRL in 1979, was revised and reissued in 1989.[2] The *Standards* has little to say about the physical organization of libraries, but provide valuable insights into the general processes of institutional review. The more directly relevant *Guidelines for Branch Libraries in Colleges and Universities* (hereafter *Guidelines*), first issued in 1975, was revised extensively in 1990.[3] Not surprisingly, the 1990 *Guidelines*—which emphasizes the importance of a unified (if not physically centralized) library system—makes numerous explicit references to the broader 1989 *Standards*. Neither provides a detailed formula for branch library review; in fact, both the *Standards* and the *Guidelines* are intentionally nonprescriptive, with frequent references to the "individual nature" of libraries and library systems. Nevertheless, taken as starting points, the two documents provide both philosophical underpinning and practical advice for the administrator planning a review of branch facilities.

The 1989 *Standards for University Libraries* is no mere checklist of measurable expectations or strict normative figures. Instead, the *Standards* "set[s] forth the process by which expectations may be established, and enumerate[s] the topics that should be addressed in the evaluation of university library performance."[4] This important distinction makes the document a useful foundation for any process of academic library review.

The *Standards* begins with a statement of underlying assumptions regarding the role of the university library in supporting the teaching, research, and public service missions of the university. Four of these assumptions have some bearing on the physical organization and delivery of library services, and merit closer examination.

The first of these is the centrality of the library to the university mission. According to the *Standards*, the library should be perceived as a center of the academy—physically, intellectually, and technologically speaking. Physically, the library is typically close to the center of campus activity. Intellectually, it is the repository of recorded knowledge and a perceived hub of information services. Technologically, it is a primary node on a worldwide network of computing and telecommunications. This concept of library as center does not, of course, mandate physical or geographic centralization; the *Standards*, in fact, refers to the library as "an organic combination of people, collections, and buildings . . .."[5] The assumption does, however, cast an interesting light on the question of centralization, prompting one to question, in the case of a local review: Does the presence of branch facilities on this campus diminish or enhance the perceived centrality of the library to the campus and the university's mission?

The second underlying assumption, with obvious relevance to branch library review, is the significance of the institutional investment in the library. According to the *Standards*, the library represents one of the largest cumulative capital investments on any campus. In the context of branch library review, this assumption raises the inevitable question of fiscal responsibility: Do branch facilities represent a reasonable, cost-effective use of the university's limited financial resources?

The third assumption, with obvious ramifications in the review of academic branches, pertains to the individual nature of each library and its parent institution. According to the *Standards*, each library or library system has a distinctive mix of goals, programs, and expectations, influenced as much by campus geography and history as by academic mission. Thus, the former may play as important a role as the latter in resolving questions of physical centralization of library collections and services.

Indeed, as the focus in academic libraries shifts from ownership to access, new technologies will undoubtedly play a pivotal role in determining the optimal physical organization of future library systems.

The fourth and final assumption set forth by the 1989 *Standards* pertains to the pace of technological change, which "has rendered outmoded any concept of isolation and self-sufficiency [on the part of university libraries]."[6] Thus, although the library is traditionally perceived as the center or nucleus of the university—a fact which in the past has strengthened the case for physically centralized services—the library now also exists "within a complex information world, most of whose participants are not on campus."[7] The latter statement calls into question traditional assumptions regarding the physical organization of libraries and campus geography in general. Indeed, as the focus in academic libraries shifts from ownership to access, new technologies will undoubtedly play a pivotal role in determining the optimal physical organization of future library systems.

Generally speaking, the assumptions that underpin the 1989 *Standards* contain both concepts and language that are useful when formulating criteria for open-

ing or maintaining a branch facility—criteria that in turn give direction and focus to the actual process of branch library review. Beyond this, the document provides a useful summary of the various components of institutional performance evaluation. These include (1) the establishment of appropriate goals and objectives, (2) an inventory of the resources needed to meet these established goals, (3) an overview of the formal review process itself, in terms of participants, mechanisms, and products, and (4) a list of specific evaluative criteria, related to areas of planning, budget, human resources, collections, preservation, buildings and equipment, and services.

The 1990 *Guidelines for Branch Libraries in Colleges and Universities* both complements and supplements the 1989 *Standards* document. The *Guidelines*, more narrowly focused, includes a recommended review process for branch facilities, with four broad components. The first is a description and analysis of a branch library's programs, which must meet the information needs of its primary users as well as the cross-disciplinary needs of the total academic community. The second is a review of those resources—personnel, facilities, and collections—required by branches to effectively perform their mission. Third is the review of communication channels that link the branch facility to its primary clientele, to the central library and other branches, and to any appropriate professional organizations. The fourth and final component is the formal assessment of specific achievement measures. Here, especially, the *Guidelines* provides helpful advice in the form of specific criteria to use in evaluating branch facilities. The criteria, formulated as questions, are arranged in categories such as "adequacy of the budget" (Does the branch librarian have adequate influence in the process of budgetary development?), "size of the collections" (Does the collection profile match the academic programs as described in the collection policy?), "access and availability" (Can the branch library

provide convenient access to materials not owned by the overall library system?), "preservation and conservation" (Does the branch have adequate safeguards against loss, mutilation, and theft?), and "adequacy of services" (What is the ratio of public services staff to the number of primary constituents?).[8]

THE LITERATURE OF ACADEMIC BRANCH LIBRARIES

While ACRL guidelines and standards provide valuable assistance in developing a review process for branch facilities, administrators may also wish to consult the wealth of related literature in this area. The definitive review article by Robert A. Seal summarizes and organizes the literature from the turn of the century through the mid-1980s.[9] The predominant theme throughout this period has been the centralization/decentralization debate, a topic that has received full symposium treatment at least twice—first by *College & Research Libraries* (1961) and more recently by the *Journal of Academic Librarianship* (1983).[10] Most authors have favored centralization, citing a common inventory of arguments: the increasingly interdisciplinary nature of collections; economies of time and effort; consistency, quality, and equity of services to the academic community.

If anything, the literature of polemic and debate appears to have subsided in the eight years since Seal's article was published. Leon Shkolnik recently has attempted to place both sides of the centralization controversy in historical perspective, and discusses the prospects for future physical organization of libraries based on current trends and—more importantly—emerging technologies.[11] While Shkolnik recognizes the tendency toward greater centralization in academic libraries, he is optimistic that technology will permit more creative compromises between totally centralized and decentralized models of organization. More recently, in an article entitled "The Organizational Misfits," Patricia A. Suozzi and Sandra S. Kerbel have suggested that academic branches are not misfits at all, but rather models for the library of the

future—entrepreneurial, flexible, and client-centered, functioning not as isolated units but as interconnected nodes in a sophisticated information network.[12] In light of the new mandate for libraries to serve as client-driven information providers, the authors caution that "the regular call for elimination of departmental libraries may not only be myopic but also illogical and ultimately self-destructive."[13]

If fewer contemporary writers are expounding on the branch library "problem," significantly more have begun to publish studies—both descriptive and analytical—on the effective management and administration of branch facilities. Writing in 1986, Seal decried the lack of "extensive and intensive research relating branch library organization to performance," and called for more systematic and scientific studies of branch library operation.[14] Since then, a number of studies have shed greater light on various aspects of branch library planning, administration, and operation.

In 1986, William E. McGrath applied cluster analysis techniques to circulation data in thirty-seven disciplines, in an effort to study empirically such issues as the interdependence of knowledge and the centralization/decentralization of library collections.[15] Neal K. Kaske published the results of a comparative study of subject searching in an OPAC among branches of a university library system.[16] Lisa Aren Strubbe studied characteristics of serials duplication among twenty branch and divisional libraries at the University of Michigan, demonstrating that decentralization is not the only source of collection overlap.[17] F. W. Lancaster and others studied the relationship between literature scatter—i.e., the predictable distribution of relevant journal articles over journal titles—and the accessibility of these titles in an academic branch library.[18] David Ensign considered the legal implications of using telefacsimile to support sharing of periodical subscriptions among branch facilities of a single academic library.[19]

The literature of the past few years has also produced some interesting case studies involving the opening, closing, or consolidation of academic branches. Katherine E. Clark and William R. Kinyon describe an innovative study at Texas A&M, in which online searching of periodical databases was used to demonstrate the interdisciplinary nature of thirty-six physics journals.[20] The A&M study, which confirmed that the journals in question were critically important to engineers, chemists, and other researchers, influenced the library's decision to not create a separate physics branch library. In related articles, Anita L. Battiste and Alice L. Primack provide an interesting case study of the consolidation of four branch facilities into a central science library at the University of Florida.[21] Similarly, Marianna S. Wells and Richard A. Spohn documented the planning, implementation, and benefits of merging the Geology and Physics Libraries at the University of Cincinnati into a combined facility.[22]

Finally, Helen Gater describes the unusual situation at Arizona State University, where the establishment of an ASU West campus in 1984 included the creation of a state-of-the-art electronic library.[23] Perceived as a branch of the main campus libraries some thirty miles away, it de-emphasizes local collections and seeks rather to excel in access services. Ann Okerson suggests that the ASU West Campus Library and other self-proclaimed "Information Access Centers" resemble special libraries more so than traditional university libraries because of their heavy reliance on electronic information, and rapid delivery of items not housed in the local collections.[24] Similarly, Robert L. Burr and Charlene S. Hurt offer insights into such concepts as the "electronic branch library" and the "distributed electronic library" system.[25] An underlying theme in the work of all these authors, but stated most succinctly by Okerson, is that technology "makes a different sort of library thinkable and do-able."[26]

MODEL METHODOLOGY

The proposed methodology for reviewing academic branch facilities includes four major parts: scope and purpose of

review, decision-making authority and responsibilities, criteria for opening or maintaining branch libraries, and final report and recommendations. Appendix A provides a sample outline for the entire review process. Appendix B provides a sample report outline, based on the criteria for maintaining or opening branch libraries.

Scope and Purpose of Review

Before embarking on a review of one or more academic branch libraries, it is essential to determine specifically the purpose and scope of the review. For example, the review may have been initiated to determine the economic viability of branch collections and services. In this particular type of review, issues involving duplication—of collections, services, and staffing—are frequently paramount. Questions of fairness may also be raised, particularly by faculty and students who tend to use the central library, and may regard the branch facility as a specialized service for a small, privileged clientele. A review may also be initiated as part of an individual academic department/college strategic planning process, and focus on whether or not the branch library's collections and services adequately support the future directions of the department or college. The impetus for the review will in turn influence its scope, which should be clearly established at the outset. In defining the scope, one must determine not only which facilities are being studied, but also the specific areas (e.g., collections, budgets, space, staffing) to be examined.

Decision-Making Authority and Responsibilities

Having established the purpose and scope of the review, the next step is to identify the individual who has final decision-making authority regarding the creation, maintenance, or closing of branch library facilities. In some settings, this will be the provost or vice president for academic affairs; in others, the institutional president. It is imperative to involve this individual in planning the review process, and not merely

in its final resolution. Thus, at various stages, he or she should give final approval to the scope of the review, the designated report writer and other review participants, and the review criteria.

It is also important to identify the individual officially responsible for submitting the final report. This is frequently the library director, sometimes working in conjunction with a college dean. The central criterion to consider, in identifying this individual, is the administrative unit having primary or total budgetary responsibility for the facility under review.

Questions of fairness may also be raised, particularly by faculty and students who tend to use the central library, and may regard the branch facility as a specialized service for a small, privileged clientele.

The identity of other review participants is likewise of critical importance. Normally, the report produced by such a review will include official recommendations. However, there should also be avenues for dissenting opinions. This, in turn, raises questions regarding the organization of the report. Will a single report be issued, perhaps with majority and minority recommendations, or will different constituencies prepare separate reports? The former approach minimizes duplication; the latter may more accurately convey the conflicting concerns of participants. Regardless of the approach taken, the individual in charge of preparing the final report must ensure that all administrative units or individuals with vested interests in the facility have some role in drafting and reviewing appropriate sections of the report. Typically, this will include library and non-library staff and administrators at departmental, college, and university levels.

Criteria to Maintain for Open Branch Libraries

Perhaps the most important part of the entire review process is the creation,

revision or reaffirmation of criteria for maintaining or opening a branch library. It is crucial that these criteria be approved at the outset by the administrator with whom final decision-making authority rests. Basing the review process on predetermined criteria sends a clear message to the academic community at large that the review will be as objective and nonpartisan as possible. In fact, unless such criteria have been pre-established and confirmed by a high-ranking official, the mere mention of a branch library review will bring faculty members out in full force—some to "defend" their branch facilities, others in an obvious posture of "attack." Once these criteria have been agreed upon, an outline of the review's content should be determined, along with a proposed time line for completion.

When establishing criteria for maintaining or opening an academic branch library, it is helpful to draw on the work of objective, external authorities. Libraries will benefit by consulting and adapting portions of the aforementioned ACRL guidelines and standards, augmenting them as needed with material from local mission statements and strategic plans. The following are sample criteria that might be used:

1. **Academic mission and strategic plans.** The academic programs that the branch facility supports are important to the parent institution, as evidenced by its mission statements and/or strategic plans.

2. **Geographic location.** Either the branch facility and its primary users are physically remote from the central library, or there exist special curriculum, research, and/or accreditation requirements for locating a branch facility in close proximity to the central library.

3. **Budget.** The administrative unit responsible for the branch library has an adequate budget and a stable source of income to support the collections, services, equipment, staffing and physical facilities.

4. **Focus, accessibility and utilization of collections and services.**

- The branch library's collections and services are heavily used by primary users, and of limited interest to other university populations. (This distinction is increasingly difficult to maintain as academic programs become more interdisciplinary in nature. For some branch libraries, there will be a heightened demand for shared access to items in the total library collection—both electronically and through improved document-delivery services.)
- The branch library's collections support current and future needs of primary users. The level of duplication is acceptable and in balance with the budgetary constraints of the total library system.
- Bibliographic and holdings access to the collections of the total library system is available at the branch library. Conversely, bibliographic and holdings access to the collections of the branch library is available throughout the library system.
- Physical access to the branch facility's collections and services is adequate in comparison to the central library.
- Branch library's services and equipment support current and future needs of primary users and staff. Either the branch library provides levels of service comparable to those of the central library, or adequate referral and delivery systems are in place. The level of duplication between branch and central library services is acceptable and in balance with the budgetary constraints of the total library system.

5. **Physical environment.** In general, the branch facility's physical environment is adequate in comparison to that of the central library. Specific issues to examine are:
- Public seating and shelving space
- Preservation/conservation of materials

- Lighting, heating, ventilation, and cooling systems
- Staff/public safety mechanisms and evacuation procedures
- Security of the facility and collections
- Access to electrical, telephone and telecommunication services.
6. **Impact on other library facilities.** If a branch facility is closed or opened, the central library system can support this action in terms of collections, services, staffing levels, and/or physical space.

Report and Final Recommendations

The concluding step in this model is the preparation of the report, with its final recommendations. In both content and organization, the report should be based closely on the predetermined review criteria. Likewise, the concluding recommendations must follow logically from these criteria, if they are to appear credible and nonpartisan.

The sample report outline in Appendix B assumes a thorough review encompassing background and historical information; budgetary support; academic program accreditation issues; all library services (e.g., reference, reserve, interlibrary loan, photocopying, processing, etc.), statistical overviews of the collection; analyses of the user population; library hours; on-site usage of the integrated OPAC; stacks and study space; environmental conditions; safety and security systems; usage of the facility and its collection by primary and nonprimary user populations; impact on the rest of the library system and the academic units if the branch facility were to be closed; and final recommendations regarding the review. Depending on the scope and criteria of any given review, the outline should be modified accordingly.

The individual responsible for submitting the final report should also be responsible for establishing the report's outline, and for delegating the tasks of writing and editing specific sections to appropriate individuals or administrative units. Before the actual writing begins, it is advisable that the report's primary author meet with the designated contributors to discuss the purpose and scope of the review, examine the proposed report outline, and answer any preliminary questions. It is also recommended that standardized forms be used to gather data and solicit input. This not only facilitates the compilation and comparison of data but also ensures consistency and equity in the case of a multifacility review.

Only by soliciting input from all relevant parties can one accurately portray the complicated reality of funding for some branch facilities.

In soliciting input for the report, it is crucial to be as inclusive as possible. For example, both the library and an academic department may contribute financially to the support of a given branch facility, and the funding "mix" may be subtle and complex. Moreover, some financial support is ongoing (salaries or serial subscriptions, for example), while other is one-time (such as the purchase of equipment, or a serial backfile). Only by soliciting input from all relevant parties can one accurately portray the complicated reality of funding for some branch facilities. It is also important to provide historical perspectives regarding any given branch, which will contribute to the thoroughness of the report. This can be accomplished by having staff from the branch facility itself, the central library, and the appropriate academic departments all participate in drafting the sections on user populations and historical background.

If the review results in a single report, it is recommended that one person be responsible for compiling and editing the individually written sections. The compiler should strive to represent the multiplicity of perspectives, but at the same time minimize needless duplication. If more than one branch library is being reviewed, it may be desirable to produce a separate report

for each facility, along with a summary report of the entire review process. The latter would include comparison tables.

Included within the report, or issued as a companion document, should be the final recommendations and conclusions of the individual(s) officially responsible for the review process. It may be useful to separate the library recommendations from those of the academic unit(s) involved.

The final report with its recommendations should then be ready for submission to the administrator with decision-making authority. All major participants should receive copies of the complete final report or, in the case of a multifacility review, copies of the relevant individual reports along with the final summary. Distribution of the report may occur concurrently with or immediately following the submission of the report to the administrator, or following any final decision-making process that is required by the review.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The evolving national discussion on academic branch libraries is now firmly centered on how well they meet the needs of a primary clientele, how thoroughly they are integrated into the larger library system, and how capably they are managed. Not surprisingly, there is a growing interest among large, central libraries to replicate some of the specialized, subject-based services traditionally provided by branch librarians. Regardless of their academic interest, philosophical debates regarding the merits of centralized or decentralized library services are increasingly overshadowed by empirical studies and utilitarian discussions of branch library management. For many academic libraries, branch facilities will remain an integral part of their total library service; it is essential for administrators in these settings to understand how to best utilize decentralized resources, staffing and facilities.

Obviously, the best time to conduct a thorough review of branch libraries is not at the request of an outside agency, but as part of a systematic review of the unified library system.

The review model proposed by the authors reflects the current, pragmatic approach to decentralized library systems. Reviews of branch facilities are not usually undertaken voluntarily; nor do library administrators typically have time to develop review methodologies from a blank slate. This model is therefore offered as a springboard, to be used in both designing and implementing a local review process. Obviously, the best time to conduct a thorough review of branch libraries is not at the request of an outside agency, but as part of a systematic review of the unified library system. If, over time, the same model is used for successive reviews, the first review can serve to establish benchmarks against which later data can be compared. Finally, the descriptive and statistical information obtained from such reviews can provide much-needed management data by which services, budgets, and staffing may be objectively compared, and unbiased management decisions made.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. Association of Research Libraries, *Branch Libraries in ARL Institutions, ARL SPEC Kit 99* (Washington, D.C.: Office of Management Services, Association of Research Libraries, 1983), introductory page.
2. Association of College and Research Libraries, University Library Standards Review Committee, "Standards for University Libraries: Evaluation of Performance," *College & Research Libraries News* 50 (Sept. 1989): 679–91.
3. Association of College and Research Libraries, "ACRL Guidelines for Branch Libraries in Colleges and Universities," *College & Research Libraries News* 52 (Mar. 1991): 171–74.
4. Association of College and Research Libraries, "Standards for University Libraries," 680.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid., 681.
7. Ibid.
8. Association of College and Research Libraries, "ACRL Guidelines for Branch Libraries," 173–74.
9. Robert A. Seal, "Academic Branch Libraries," *Advances in Librarianship* 14 (1986): 175–209.
10. "Centralization and Decentralization in Academic Libraries: A Symposium," *College & Research Libraries* 22 (Sept. 1961): 327–40+; and "Centralization or Decentralization of Library Collections: A Symposium," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 9 (Sept. 1983): 196–202.
11. Leon Shkolnik, "The Continuing Debate over Academic Branch Libraries in Colleges and Universities," *College & Research Libraries* 52 (July 1991): 343–51.
12. Patricia A. Suozzi and Sandra S. Kerbel, "The Organizational Misfits," *College & Research Libraries* 53 (Nov. 1992): 513–22.
13. Ibid., 520.
14. Seal, "Academic Branch Libraries," 204.
15. William E. McGrath, "Circulation Clusters—An Empirical Approach to Decentralization of Academic Libraries," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 12 (Sept. 1986): 221–26.
16. Neal K. Kaske, "A Comparative Study of Subject Searching in an OPAC among Branch Libraries of a University Library System," *Information Technology and Libraries* 7 (Dec. 1988): 359–72.
17. Lisa Aren Strubbe, "Characteristics of Serials Duplication within an Academic Research Library," *Library and Information Science Research* 11 (Apr./June 1989): 91–108.
18. F. W. Lancaster et al., "The Relationship between Literature Scatter and Journal Accessibility in an Academic Special Library," *Collection Building* 11 (1991): 19–22.
19. David Ensign, "Copyright and the Use of Telefacsimile among Branch Library Facilities," *Law Library Journal* 83 (Summer 1991): 451–61.
20. Katharine E. Clark and William R. Kinyon, "The Interdisciplinary Use of Physics Journals," *College & Research Libraries News* 50 (Feb. 1989): 145–50.
21. Anita L. Battiste et al., "The University of Florida's Moving Experience," *College & Research Libraries News* 50 (June 1989): 467–71; and Alice L. Primack and Anita L. Battiste, "Training Reference Staff Prior to Consolidating Science Collections," *College & Research Libraries News* 50 (June 1989): 473–74.
22. Marianna S. Wells and Richard A. Spohn, "Planning, Implementation, and Benefits of Merging the Geology and Physics Libraries into a Combined Renovated Facility at the University of Cincinnati," in *Geological Societies and Information Transfer in the Electronic Age* (Alexandria, Va.: Geoscience Information Society, 1991), 173–83.
23. Helen Gater, "Creation of an Academic Library: Lessons from an Empty Slate," *Journal of Library Administration* 10, no.2/3 (1989): 39–48.
24. Ann Okerson, "Married to the Library," *Library Acquisitions: Practice & Theory* 13 (1989): 155–60.
25. Robert L. Burr, "The Electronic Branch Library: Using CD-ROM Technology and Online Services to Support Off-campus Instructional Programs," in *Proceedings of the National Online Meeting, New York, May 10–12, 1988* (Medford, N.J.: Learned Information, 1988), 37–42; and Charlene S. Hurt, "A Vision of the Library of the 21st Century," *Journal of Library Administration* 15, nos.3/4 (1992): 7–19.
26. Okerson, "Married to the Library," 158.

APPENDIX A
OUTLINE OF REVIEW PROCESS

I. DETERMINE *PURPOSE* AND *SCOPE* OF REVIEW
   A. Include only those branch libraries currently administered by central library system?
   B. Include branch libraries administered by other academic departments/colleges?

II. DETERMINE *PARTICIPANTS* IN REVIEW PROCESS
   A. Who will draft the basic "Criteria for Maintaining or Opening a Branch Library"?
   B. Who will compile/draft/edit the Final Report?
   C. Who will review the Criteria and Final Report (draft and final versions), and make recommendations to the administrative official responsible for decision making? Among the reviewers, is there adequate representation of:
      1. university-level administration?
      2. university faculty?
      3. college administration?
      4. departments/colleges directly affected by review?
   D. What administrative official will make final decision to maintain or open a branch library?

III. DRAFT, DISSEMINATE, AND APPROVE "CRITERIA FOR MAINTAINING OR OPENING A BRANCH LIBRARY"

IV. BASED ON PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF REVIEW, AND "CRITERIA FOR MAINTAINING OR OPENING A BRANCH LIBRARY," DETERMINE *OUTLINE* FOR FINAL REPORT AND *TIMELINE* FOR FORMAL REVIEW PROCESS

V. GATHER DATA AND PREPARE FINAL REPORT

VI. SUBMIT FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO DECISION-MAKING AUTHORITY

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICIAL MAKES FINAL DECISION(S)

APPENDIX B
REPORT OUTLINE

I. BACKGROUND OF BRANCH LIBRARY

II. DESCRIPTION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS SERVED BY THE BRANCH LIBRARY

III. RELATIONSHIP OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS TO COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY MISSION STATEMENTS AND STRATEGIC PLANS

IV. GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION
   A. Distance from central library facility
   B. Reasons for current or proposed geographic location
   C. Accreditation requirements of the academic programs
   D. Relationship to any master campus facility plan

V. BUDGETS
   A. Collections
      1. purpose of budget
      2. total allocated budget
      3. source and stability of budget
      4. duplication of serials
      5. binding

   B. Staffing
       1. description
       2. total allocated budget
       3. source and stability of allocated budget
   C. Equipment and supplies; telecommunications
       1. description
       2. total allocated budget
       3. source and stability of allocated budget
   D. One-time purchases (last five years and state source)
   E. Nonadministrative budgetary sources
   F. Potential new sources of budget support

VI. FOCUS, ACCESSIBILITY AND UTILIZATION OF COLLECTIONS AND SERVICES
   A. Collections and processing
       1. serials
          a. total serial titles
          b. total serial subscriptions
          c. total bound serials
       2. monographs
          a. total monograph titles
          b. total monograph volumes
       3. nonbook formats
       4. nonlibrary owned materials
       5. duplication of collection to central and branch library facilities
          a. duplication of current serial titles
             (1) number
             (2) cost
          b. duplication of ceased serial titles
          c. duplication of monograph titles
       6. processing
          a. cataloging/indexing
          b. serials control
          c. materials processing
          d. other
       7. physical access to collection
   B. Local online systems (include central library system, local library or campus area networks, accessibility to external library systems, Internet, etc.)
       1. descriptions
       2. usage
   C. User population
       1. primary
       2. other university users
       3. nonuniversity users
   D. Hours of access
   E. Use of facility and collections
       1. entrance/exit counts
       2. circulation
          a. general
          b. reserve
          c. in-house use

F. Services
  1. reference
     a. description (include database searching and instructional activities)
     b. annual transactions
  2. reserve
     a. annual reserve circulation
     b. annual number of reserve titles
  3. photocopying
     a. annual number of pages photocopied
     b. annual number of pages photocopied for reserve
  4. interlibrary loan/document delivery
  5. referral services
  6. other
G. Relationship of collections and services to curriculum, research and outreach activities
H. Equipment (staff and public)
  1. description
  2. evaluation of current state and future needs
I. Future impact of new technologies
J. Interaction with nonlibrary units (on- and off-campus)

VII. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT
  A. Amount and use of space
  B. Square footage
  C. Usage of space/growth potential
    1. public seating (current and capacity)
    2. shelving (current and capacity)
  D. Environmental control
  E. Quality of physical environment, relative to central library
  F. Safety and security issues

VIII. IMPACT ON CENTRAL FACILITY IF CLOSED/OPENED
  A. Anticipated transfer and shifting of materials to central facility
    1. description
    2. labor and transportation costs
  B. Transfer/reassignment of branch facility seating
  C. Seating and study space (individual and group); office spaces for researchers
  D. Reserve services
  E. Current periodical services
  F. Reference services
  G. Photocopying services
  H. Automation
  I. Processing
    1. cataloging/indexing
    2. serials control
    3. materials processing
    4. other

IX. IMPACT ON ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT(S)/COLLEGE IF CLOSED/OPENED

X. RECOMMENDATIONS
  A. library
  B. academic department(s)/college