be the conversion of records that were originally the product of LC cataloging. It was suggested that all of these records should be flagged and sent to LC by the shared cataloging services as a service to LC. LC representatives agreed to consider the usefulness to LC of this suggestion.

While the Linked Systems Project will result in operating links between the Library of Congress, the Research Libraries Group, and the Washington Library Network, it will be some time before OCLC can become a part of the technical link. Microenhancer or similar techniques using microcomputers should be developed for searching several databases in the RECON process. Since one of the objectives is to reduce duplicative effort, it makes no sense to search only one database when there is some likelihood that similar work may already have been done on one or more others. This suggestion may require more software work on the part of the target databases than they are willing to do, but there was encouragement to explore this avenue as a short-term solution to the lack of operational links among the utilities.

These recommendations form the essence of a nationally coordinated program for retrospective conversion of print form bibliographic records. It is a program that has the chance of reducing the aggregate costs of the RECON process and securing funding for making a very large dent in the inventory of records that need to be converted to machine-readable form in order to better support the work of the scholarly community.

Editor's note: No copyright is claimed on this article, which the author wrote as part of his official duties as an employee of the U.S. government.

Managing automation for results: Completing tasks while participative planning proceeds

By Ellen G. Miller

Director, Library Systems Development
University of Cincinnati

Planning for automation with the end-user in mind.

For many university and research libraries, the lapsed time between starting library automation planning and securing final top management budget signatures is several months. Perhaps it even takes years. The competition in higher education for scarce resources means that library automation managers and CEO librarians must create a careful case for library automation. One method for creating that case, time-consuming but politically and psychologically helpful, is participative planning.

As used in this article, participative planning goes beyond the recent library literature concerning participative management1 because it specifi-

6. Book House is in its fourth generation of automation. Our custom software allows us the flexibility to accept orders generated through your computerized system or in the mail. Our policy is to develop a working compatibility with the automated system in your library to facilitate receiving orders, transmitting open order reports and invoices electronically.

Let's explore interfacing your automation with ours.
locally calls for end-users as well as all levels of library staff to be represented in the groups that identify problems and alternative solutions, evaluate those alternatives, make recommendations and point out implications of the recommended solution. Participative planning of automated library systems brings faculty, students, and librarians (both support and professional staff) together in a non-crisis mode to discuss needs and options and to make a system recommendation. Speaking to librarians, one university president noted the need for greater faculty involvement in library decision-making, including decisions about automating both circulation and bibliographic systems. Experiences at the University of Missouri and the University of Cincinnati suggest that participative planning for library automation results in a better match between user needs and system capabilities.

Selecting the management philosophy of participative planning allows for getting other tasks accomplished during the period required for planning and securing top management support. An example is getting tasks out of the way that will help make the system useful sooner than planned. Many libraries use this lead time for retrospective conversion of older bibliographic records; others undertake self-study, ranging from study groups to site visits.

The University of Cincinnati’s (UC) management methodology for library automation had four parts. First, we began a participative planning process in early 1981 in order to assure the broadest possible discussion by representatives from all library staff and end-user groups prior to their recommending a permanent system. Second, with the fiscal year funding for continued planning in hand by mid-1982, attention turned to tasks that could be accomplished while awaiting selection and installation of the permanent online catalog/circulation-reserve system.

The prime candidate was editing over 600,000 OCLC records collected on archive tapes since 1972. Most libraries choose to review and edit their database after their chosen system’s terminals have arrived; that task may take many months. Given the competition at UC for funds of the magnitude required by library systems development, that delay was politically unacceptable. Hence the third decision, to have a standard database ready for end users as soon as possible. Varying local practices made library staff leery of letting patrons use the OCLC database “as is.” They wanted to review it and bring it up to standards.

Having decided to edit as much of the database as possible prior to system installation, we reached to our last major decision: use software available in the marketplace rather than do local programming. Local programming was expected to be too time-consuming and too expensive.

In summary, UC’s methodology for managing library automation had four parts: use a participative planning process, thus taking at least several months to get top management support; use the intervening time to carry out tasks that would speed up getting the system operational for end users; select as the major task an edit of 600,000 OCLC records; and use software capabilities existing in the marketplace.

**Action plan**

The University of Cincinnati Computing Center is an IBM shop. With the help of our management consultant, Ralph Shoffner, we began a cost/benefit study of IBM cataloging systems. Our goal was to find a software package that permitted us to upgrade all OCLC/MARC fields online. A public access module, to allow experimental use of an online catalog, was of secondary importance.

After several weeks of study, we decided on a two-pronged approach. First, we selected Northwestern University’s Technical Information System (NOTIS) as a cost-effective method to review and edit OCLC records online. However, it was also necessary to obtain the University of Florida’s MVS NOTIS version in order to meet our computer center’s requirements. The UC Computing Center (UCCC) took on the significant task of integrating the Florida (MVS) and Northwestern (DOS) versions of NOTIS.

Second, we selected Solinet to 1) do an AACR2 flip on older OCLC archive tapes, 2) perform subfield editing, 3) prepare management reports of records not processed, and 4) reformat individual records so as to better fit our IBM environment. Due to varying local practice, occasionally undocumented, for inputting and updating OCLC records, we decided to “de-dup” records at UC rather than using Solinet’s record selection capabilities.

With the software capability selected—NOTIS and Solinet—we turned to equipment. Funding

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection or C &amp; D Library</th>
<th>OCLC Symbol(s)</th>
<th>Quantity Loaded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archive &amp; Rare Book</td>
<td>CIN4/5/6#/</td>
<td>5545 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 1971–1972</td>
<td>CINN</td>
<td>6882 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 1973</td>
<td>CINN</td>
<td>12390 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 1974</td>
<td>CINN</td>
<td>10632 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 1975</td>
<td>CINN</td>
<td>16919 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 1976</td>
<td>CINN</td>
<td>28743 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 1977–1978</td>
<td>CINN</td>
<td>14195 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 1979–1980</td>
<td>CINN</td>
<td>22821 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 1981–1982</td>
<td>CINN</td>
<td>23627 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 1983–Part A</td>
<td>CINN</td>
<td>24066 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 1983–Part B</td>
<td>CINN</td>
<td>21443 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clermont College</td>
<td>CIC2</td>
<td>8076 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Collections</td>
<td>CIN3</td>
<td>1278 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serials</td>
<td>CIN7</td>
<td>2787 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical, New</td>
<td>MXC</td>
<td>1944 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central, New</td>
<td>CIN</td>
<td>1583 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing &amp; Health</td>
<td>MXCN</td>
<td>3980 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracted Non-MXCI</td>
<td>MXCI</td>
<td>219 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences Lib.</td>
<td>MXCC</td>
<td>22061 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>CINT/W/Y</td>
<td>35727 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem./Bio. Library</td>
<td>CINB/C</td>
<td>8993 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCM Library, Scores</td>
<td>CINS</td>
<td>10222 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCM Library</td>
<td>CINM/V/F(F 1977 &amp; ON)</td>
<td>17227 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central, Old Codes</td>
<td>CINL/Q/H</td>
<td>11213 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Medical</td>
<td>MXCR/A/B/H/L/P</td>
<td>4575 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology Library</td>
<td>CING</td>
<td>4061 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics Library</td>
<td>CINP</td>
<td>3726 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curric. Resources</td>
<td>CINU</td>
<td>318 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>CIN9</td>
<td>198 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marx Law Library</td>
<td>OML</td>
<td>5434 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics, New</td>
<td>CINT/W/Y</td>
<td>29445 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliston Collection</td>
<td>CINK/8</td>
<td>29777 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;D, Small Colleges</td>
<td>CIND/E/X/2/Z/R/@/@/%</td>
<td>36461 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Walters</td>
<td>ORW</td>
<td>17731 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Collection</td>
<td>CINJ</td>
<td>3310 Singletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central, New Dups</td>
<td>CIN</td>
<td>302 Duplicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical, New Dups</td>
<td>MXC</td>
<td>13 Duplicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central, Reuse Cancel</td>
<td>CIN</td>
<td>297 Duplicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central, Replace UPD</td>
<td>CIN</td>
<td>5715 Duplicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central, @01 in 910</td>
<td>CIN</td>
<td>3749 Duplicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central, 1's in 010</td>
<td>CIN</td>
<td>15113 Duplicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serials</td>
<td>CIN7</td>
<td>6305 Duplicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Collections</td>
<td>CIN3</td>
<td>3335 Duplicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archive &amp; Rare Book</td>
<td>CIN4</td>
<td>1536 Duplicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing &amp; Health</td>
<td>MXCN</td>
<td>2133 Duplicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 1971–1972</td>
<td>CIN</td>
<td>3716 Duplicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 1973</td>
<td>CIN</td>
<td>6471 Duplicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 1974</td>
<td>CIN</td>
<td>6280 Duplicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 1975</td>
<td>CIN</td>
<td>7920 Duplicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Correction</td>
<td>JAN No. of Corr.: Total</td>
<td>JAN Hours: Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics Corrections</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filing Indicators</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong Updates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Theses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Corrections</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Call No.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLINET Report</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lined and priorities revised in order to find the staff time to use NOTIS to get the database ready for the permanent system. Changes in authority procedures were also begun in an incremental fashion; those procedures will continue to be changed after the permanent system, with its authority control capability, arrives.

In the cataloging center described above, staff and unit heads liked the opportunity to make workflow and procedural changes incrementally over several months. They also liked being involved in decision-making about changes and being able to try out changes with just a few staff, adjusting to new learning as they went along. NOTIS permitted a leisurely timeframe for making changes that the permanent system would have required in a highly visible mode over a short period of time. An example is Editors' Catalog staffing.

Table 2, Editors' Catalog Corrections, shows the pace of online editing in University Libraries. In January and February 1984 few corrections were made; the 20-odd staff logged in under 40 hours. In April a plateau of about 255 hours/month to make about 3,500 corrections had been reached. One category, “Review only” took time but resulted in no changes. In six months, over 11,500 corrections had been made, requiring 962 man-hours or about 5 minutes per correction. Initially, all staff took part in the editing process in order that they all would become familiar with NOTIS editing procedures. There was one difficulty—NOTIS editing was not being done very efficiently, as Table 2 indicates.

A new technique is now being used. Four-person teams are assigned full-time to the Editors' Catalog for a 2-week period. They have a limited number of other duties to provide respite from the tedium of long hours spent checking the shelflist or at the terminal. This rotational method seems to combine lack of interruptions with a constantly growing learning curve without running the risk of staff burnout.

University Libraries' experience thus far shows that both existing tasks and the additional workload for the Editors' Catalog are being accomplished by the same staff. It remains to be seen whether this production rate can and will continue.

Campus news about NOTIS

Throughout the planning process, UC's library systems development office used a plan that combined one-way (such as articles in the faculty newsletter) and two-way (such as discussions with the University Library Committee at regular meetings) communications methods. The theme “database under construction” epitomized database editing via NOTIS. While the Editors' Catalog was visible in only 7 of 18 library sites, articles and meetings stressed that library staff were working hard to have a standardized, useful database ready when the permanent system came up.

We also pointed out that we were using a participative management process that included faculty, students, and library staff. These groups were represented when specifications were identified, systems reviewed, and the permanent system selected. We believe that their participation, combined with editing the database prior to installing the permanent system, will help result in faster integration of the online catalog/circulation-reserve system by faculty, researchers, and students into their daily lives.

Costs

There were, of course, costs for the Editors' Catalog. The NOTIS software and equipment are obvious examples, totalling about $125,000 in one-time fees. Next comes billing from the computing center, on whose mainframe NOTIS is run, along with equipment maintenance and personnel time. That totals about $180,000 per 12 months. A third direct cost is for Solinet processing, about $15,000 to date. Library staff time is not known but could include at least 2 FTE supervisor level staff in addition to the man-hours shown in Table 2.

Another cost category is time. We underestimated the time required to mesh the Northwestern and Florida versions of NOTIS. In reality it took six months, from July through December, to fully integrate them and to prepare our record tracking system. Staff had expected to begin editing records on the production file in the fall of 1983, rather than January 1984. This delay resulted understandably in nervous staff who fretted about their ability to edit the 600,000 OCLC records before the permanent system would be installed. Nevertheless, as of this writing, we believe that all but about one-sixth of those records, the most difficult duplicates requiring many changes, will be ready when the first eight libraries are brought up prior to the beginning of fall term, 1985. Early in 1984 it

Input needed on micros

The newly formed ACRL Microcomputers in Academic Libraries Discussion Group is currently compiling policy and procedure statements from libraries that offer any type of microcomputer services to their patrons. A sample collection of these will then be made available to members and others.

If your library has public access microcomputers, circulates software, or offers any other service related to the use of microcomputers by patrons, please send copies of relevant policy and procedure statements to the chair, Linda Piele, Library/Learning Center, University of Wisconsin-Parkside, Box 2000, Kenosha, WI 53141.

was decided to emphasize editing one type of data—bibliographic—on NOTIS. Whereas the accuracy of location information is being reviewed, comprehensive data editing of copy and piece holdings, especially for serials, will await the arrival of the permanent system. Our goal of an entirely edited record will occur later than planned.

Benefits

The benefits of setting up the Editors' Catalog using NOTIS have been many.

- The Editors' Catalog proved a management microcosm for tasks that would also be required by the permanent system. Planning for site preparation; reviewing existing cataloging practices and procedures; experimenting with staff education for an online catalog; training public service staff about OCLC; standardizing divergent cataloging practices; bringing together cataloging staff from all five UC library jurisdictions for the first time—all these things and more were accomplished in a less visible and hence less hectic atmosphere.

- Many staff in both technical and public service areas were trained on the Editors' Catalog. This broadened general knowledge about online bibliographic databases. Others were named to the several systems development committees. One result has been a heightened awareness among catalogers about public service ramifications of database decisions.

- The profiling decisions required to set up NOTIS were a prelude to those now being required by the permanent system. We have learned a lot about the consequences of our NOTIS profiling, such as defining library levels, e.g., system-wide, institution, etc., in descending order of magnitude.

This also means that we have more and deeper questions to ask our current vendor, Bibliotechniques, Inc., of Olympia, Washington. We understand better the consequence of initial profiling decisions.

- Public services staff started to learn about the OCLC/MARC world. This knowledge is essential if one is to understand index construction and how OCLC/MARC fields map into Bibliotechniques Library and Information System (BLIS).

- We learned about subtle MARC/OCLC format implications early, such as the card profile automatically removing unwanted subject headings which, however, occur on the archive tape. An opposite example is automatic stamps, e.g., oversize, that are printed on cards based on the profile but do not occur on the tape.

- We have saved innumerable man-hours due to the Solinet pre-processing for AACR2 flip, subfield checks, and MARC/OCLC subfield 049 (location and holdings information), to name only a few services provided. Personnel in different reporting structures—such as the five independent library jurisdictions, the computing center, campus planning, and physical plant—are learning to work together. This growing communication, done in a relatively low stress environment, will pay large dividends when BLIS is installed and become operational.

- Many library staff now know the difference between technical displays used by database maintainers and the public catalog used by faculty, students, and researchers. Those differences include level and completeness of information and command language.

- Or, to look at it from a more general perspective, the Editors' Catalog has permitted us to start bringing large groups of staff out of a mostly paper records era with all of that medium's characteristics and limitations, into an electronic era. Electronic records permit and create uses which will disturb and stimulate all our staff.

- Finally, and certainly not least, the Editors' Catalog has laid to rest many doubts about meeting standards. One reason that over 400,000 singletons were loaded into the production file in less than six months was because the records were complete. Library staff confidence in the accuracy of UC's database, after its load into BLIS, is essential if staff are to help faculty, students, and researchers transfer their trust to the online catalog.

The University of Cincinnati selected participative management of library automation because it would bring end-users and library staff together in selecting an online catalog/circulation-reserve system. While that selection process was underway, we began the major task of editing 600,000 OCLC records to meet standards. It appears that the benefits of record editing outweigh its costs because both the database and the library staff will be as ready as possible to support faculty and students in the fall of 1985.

Time to plan your posters

The LOEX Clearinghouse has issued a call for abstracts for Poster Sessions to be held at the Second Biennial LOEX Workshop, May 9-10, 1985. The workshop theme is "Teaching the Online Catalog User."

Poster Session presentations—to include graphics, pictures, diagrams, and narrative text—will allow presenters to expand informally and to answer questions relating to the online catalog instruction programs on their own campuses, to report research findings, and to describe innovative ideas or mistakes encountered. Sessions will last 30 minutes, with question and discussion time built in.

Guidelines for the submission of abstracts and forms can be obtained by contacting Carolyn Kirkendall, Director, LOEX Clearinghouse, Eastern Michigan University Library, Center of Educational Resources, Ypsilanti, MI 48197.

The deadline for submission of abstracts is March 1, 1985.
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A FALSE RUMOR GOING ROUND SAYS "LESS IS MORE."

A comprehensive range of services is essential to meeting the exacting requirements of the academic library. Specialized service can only be provided by offering more, not less. Baker & Taylor provides the widest coverage and largest inventories of academic titles from 14,000 publishers including university presses, societies, and associations. Constant publisher follow-up assures that even the most difficult books to acquire will be supplied or reported to the library. In addition, Baker & Taylor offers generous discounts with no service fees or handling charges and the highest fulfillment rate in the industry. Baker & Taylor is the academic specialist that offers more.

For details, contact the Sales Department of the division nearest you.

EASTERN, 50 Kirby Avenue, Somerville, NJ 08876, (201) 722-8000
MIDWESTERN, 501 S. Gladiolus Street, Momence, IL 60954, (815) 472-2444
SOUTHERN, Mt. Olive Road, Commerce, GA 30599, (404) 335-5000
WESTERN, 380 Edison Way, Reno, NV 89564, (702) 786-6700