

GROUP SUMMARIES

The following is a transcription of the listing of the three most important things for MHSLA to face in the next year as declared by each discussion group during the summary period.

GROUP ONE

Time and staff for educational attendance - have separate workshops including paraprofessionals

Streamline/time effectiveness of MHSLA - statewide emphasis

Online (NLM) update

Board minutes, etc. to areas without representatives

GROUP TWO

Cooperative collection development and survey

Financial aid for OCLC for MISHSULS

MISHSULS continuation? Evaluate concerning ROC's union lists

Cost of tasks, especially ILL - why charge

GROUP THREE

DOCLINE - quality of update of database

Summit conference of local group leadership

Future finances - revenues, expenditures identified

Institutional membership - DOCLINE support

Join mainstream - Michigan Library Assn., etc.

ILL fees

GROUP FOUR

CD-ROM/MEDLINE: standards, training. Full text use?

Other grant - PC's

Responsibilities of committees - shift to MLC, GMRMLN, local?

Cooperative collection development

ILL workshops should include tutoring on DOCLINE table construction

Consumer health special interest group

GROUP FIVE

Increase membership via marketing. Why inactives? Personal interviews with same.
"Hands on" emphasis in workshops
Where \$ for MISHSULS - pressure on ROC's, etc.
Grant \$
Collection development - av's, too
Group purchasing
Timeliness of newsletter

GROUP SIX

Workshops during year and taping conference; traveling workshops
Scholarship \$ for conference
Legislative committee - Inform membership
Job description for local reps

GROUP 1

Facilitator: Dave Keddle
Recorder: Jane Claytor
Members: Eileen Dechow; Lois Hulsman; Norma Powers; Carole Gilbert

Three most important things to consider next three years:

1: Streamline

Staffing problems - unable to attend meeting, not able to attend committee meetings

Bring continuity to committees - office holding positions - committee chairmen

Look at the statewide group level instead of so much locally.

Various workshops devoted to one specific during the year instead of one

Statewide networks instead of local basis

2: Individual congress for support staff

NLM Online Update - not necessarily MEDLINE, but other databases

(Marginal note: 1 workshop for librarians; 1 workshop for support staff along with state convention 2 day plus C.E.)

Listed on separate page with separate numbering:

- 1) 1 day workshop for librarians
1 day workshop for support
in addition to state convention
- 2) Statewide netwide
- 3) Online update problem

Strengths

DOCLINE

Statewide library group in the sharing of cooperation
Annual meeting - educational part
Newsletter - communication
MISHSULS

Weaknesses

Polarization of area
Weakness in certain area
Lack of consultant
Automation - need time
Healthcare field changing - do not have staff to
participate in this new field
Must keep in touch with activities
Do not remove ourselves from inter-working
Synopsis of board meeting in (newsletter?)
Getting information back to libraries from board meeting -
especially where is no local library group

GROUP 2

Facilitator: Diane M. O'Keefe, Wyandotte General
Recorder: Judy Barnes, Ingham Medical Center
Members: Beth Heinlein, Lansing General; Dorothy I. Crist,
Muskegon General; Hildegard M. Joseph, Henry Ford, Detroit.

That MHSLA address the question of collection development to facilitate future sharing including conducting a survey of special collections and create a directory.

That MHSLA address the question of aid to institutions for participation in OCLC.

Address the questions of whether MHSLA should continue MISHSULS; support updating OCLC to produce the best; evaluate the way we are getting information into OCLC and set a standard.

To study the cost of doing things in the library, especially ILL and to survey charging to determine why they charge and report to membership.

Strengths: we exist
we have done things successfully
our cooperative efforts and resource sharing

Weaknesses: meet only once a year
members do not have enough input
we don't truly understand the library that is
different from us
the distance between us

GROUP 3

Facilitator: Sharon Phillips
Recorder: Lynn Sorensen Sutton
Members: Sandra Martin, Nancy Nicholson, Saginaw
Cooperative; Judy Coppola, MSU; Betty Marshall

1. DOCLINE ISSUES:

ROC's - possibility of losing funds
how to fund updating
raising to level 3

Options - have MISHSULS users pay
have individual institutions pay

have been getting free rides, now that they are drying
up, what's it worth to us?

problem with small library

do analysis of who is buying product and how often -
DOCUMENT DELIVERY COMMITTEE

database is the fundamental issue; hard copy is a
by-product that is necessary now, but less so in the future

2. ELIMINATE DUPLICATION AMONG GROUPS

get everyone in a room together
what's duplicated? ILL statistics, by MHSLA and MDMLG
finite group of workers, only so much energy to go
around ("worker bees")

need clearinghouse for communication
*summit conference of group leaders to discuss the
year's agenda of projects

3. Look more closely at FINANCIAL SITUATION

future financial stability
now that we are undertaking other functions, not just
conference, which usually makes **
high balance only because only did conference

4. (Other issues also identified by this group:)

Paraprofessionals:

what is a paraprofessional?
who are we addressing?
secretary playing librarian

Should we restrict membership?
NO!! Just charge more

Institutional
continuity problem without institutional
memberships; and commitment on part of institution when
they benefit from it
seem to have a de facto institutional membership
can raise dues, ours are cheap
institutional memberships could raise funds to pay
for DOCLINE tapes
maybe graduated scale - on journal subscriptions

Strengths:

interinstitutional cooperation, though may be in
jeopardy because of charging for ILL's
visible products: MISHSULS, ILL
enthusiasm of people, perseverance on top of regular

Jobs

conference
activist membership, outspoken

(Marginal notes: "White Pine has Table of Contents for
cooperative professional collection; govton MISHULS and/or
NLM requests for...")

GROUP 4

Facilitator: Yvonne Mathis, St. Mary's, Grand Rapids
Recorder: Barbara Kormelink, Bay Medical Center
Members: Martha Studacker, Hurley; Deborah Adams, Botsford;
Sr. Norma Harvey, Borgess

'Things to do in next 3 years'

1: CD-ROM and MEDLINE

- What point is cost-effective?
- What equipment is out there?
- What will work?
- What is the best?
- Evaluation - current and valuable
- Put backfiles together (unwieldy)
- Send cumulative indexes each quarter
- Gear searching systems to professional searcher

CD-ROM for full-text?

- like encyclopedia company
- for journals like NEJM and/or JAMA, save space

2: COOPERATIVE COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT

- Work with NLM for statistics
- for Michigan number of times titles are requested in Michigan to get an idea of journals not held in Michigan

3: If there are smaller libraries who don't have PC's, maybe a grant for them.

- Class on searching and downloading is needed
- More information on library software

Strengths

Membership survey

continue every other year

comment - a little confusing

not enough time to get it done

Grant proposal for telefacsimile machines

DOCLINE very easy

ILL - every 22 min to 4 min in one library

Let's continue to keep it up

Finances comfortable?

Board or committee should communicate concerns on cost

to NLM

What about AHA health citations?

Can we get usable citation numbers for these UI for

DOCLINE?

Worry about increased telecommunications charges -

suggest talk to legislators

Glad for SERLINE codes in MHSLA newsletter

Too many requests two-thirds more than they send out

Communicate about routing tables - should be

structured to have larger collections in later cells.

Problems of over-burdening

Surveys well-done

Some questions might be deleted

Need more time to design instrument and

More time to fill out

Weaknesses

Look at responsibilities of committees and see if they are appropriate

Should some things be done on a regional level or even on a local level (or MLC): (ex.: MDMLG ILL statistics)

Fewer local committee responsibilities, more time to devote to state

Continue good education programs

Consumer health education

Growing interest

Growing need

Maybe interest group under MHSLA

FINANCES - TREASURER

How many libraries use DOCLINE - DOCUMENT DELIVERY

COMMITTEE

How about splitting the cost among those who use it if necessary - DOCUMENT DELIVERY COMMITTEE

Institutional membership

no interest among this group

no need seen - if benefits accrue in the future, perhaps

GROUP 5

Facilitator: Mildred Kingsbury, Marquette General
Recorder: Doris Asher, Sparrow, Lansing
Members: Robin Mosher, Lella Post; Darla Shackelford,
Rehabilitation Institute; Mary Anne Wallace, McPherson

1: Membership drive
marketing association
how to retain past 'stars'
group buying plan?

2: More of an emphasis on "hands-on" in conference
workshops

3: Support DOCLINE

Others: let's ask former activists/members why not come?
personal interview
make newsletter more timely
increased emphasis on grant resources for
technology
sharing AV's and monographs

Strengths

Union list
Newsletter
Conference
Cooperation-networking
Fiscal strength

Weaknesses

AV sharing
Non-participation
Fees for ILL's

GROUP # 6

Facilitator: Marilyn Schleg

Recorder: Joyce Vigas

Members: Marion Isaacson, Eleanor Lopez, Leslie Behm

1: Three most important things for MHSLA

- Educational workshops/meetings during year perhaps traveling workshops brought to various areas within the state
- Videotape or at least audiotape the educational conferences. Available to mail to local libraries or groups.
- Scholarship funds available to bring librarians with budget problems to educational conferences
- Legislative committee to become more active and to inform MHSLA members of issues involving libraries

2: Strengths

- Educational conference very helpful
- Support group/networking - relationships begun at annual conference
- Production of survey - though will have to see how it will be used; then determine value and if it should be repeated

3: Weaknesses

- Need to work towards reaching all targeted audiences (paraprofessionals as well as professionals) with educational opportunities
- Communication could be improved, perhaps by more frequent newsletters with status reports from committees
- Guidelines/job descriptions are needed for area representatives

Suggestion: send minutes of board meeting to area representatives within 1 - 2 weeks for them to distribute to local group.

COMMENTS ON PLANNING SURVEYS

Questions 1 and 2 re: 'out-state' workshops. 'Out-state' crossed out and 'local' written in. Comment at end of survey: "I do not like the term out state - that's Ohio or Kentucky - Michigan is Michigan - or the east side or west or northern! We have tried to get rid of that term for YEARS!" - Marge Kars

Question 5: Seek more special projects funding via grants. Comment written next to question: "OCLC membership" - Anonymous. Stars or asterisks next to '1' by three anonymous individuals.

Question 7: Collect and distribute state's ILL statistics. Comment: "1" is emphasized with multiple circles, exclamation point - Anonymous.

Question 12: Establish statewide ILL agreement. Comment: "No, guidelines only" - Anonymous Comment: "There is one already in MISHSULS" - Anonymous

Question 14: Establish a collection of sample library policies and procedures, forms, library guides, etc. for circulation to members who are developing/updating same. Comment: "MLA/Hospital Library Section is doing." - Anonymous

Question 17: Provide time for a membership forum at each annual meeting. Comment: "Maybe no every year" - Anonymous

Question 24: Establish a statewide ILL agreement with specific performance goals and methods for arbitrating problems among institutions. Comment: "Performance goals" was underlined, comment was "never happen".

Question 24: Establish a statewide ILL agreement with specific performance goals and methods for arbitrating problems among institutions. Comment: Rating of "1" underlined vigorously - Dave Keddle

Question 25: Provide more programming at local sites for library paraprofessionals. Comment: "Regional workshops" - Norma Powers

GENERAL COMMENTS

Comment: "U of M, WSU, MSU all have access to their catalogs online - direct dial however unless you can go through MERIT." - Anonymous

Comment: "Open forum does help grass roots become active members of our organization." - N. Harvey, S.S.J.

Comment: "Some ROC's have group purchasing" - Anonymous

"Evaluate the creation of our own Union List - is it really necessary - or duplication of effort? Determine cost of information - can libraries afford to continue providing everything for everybody!" - Hildegard Joseph

"This was a good session." - Mary Anne Wallace

"There are too many priorities! But these all sound good."
- Anonymous