Library Services and Technology Act
FY 2002 Grant Application
See Grant Handbook for Complete Instructions

Identification

Funding Area: ___   Library Services to the Underserved
                 _X_   Technology and Networking
                 ___   Collaboration and Partnership

Title of Project: _Michigan Library Exchange (MiLE): The Next Steps_____

Amount Requested: $_____

Applicant Library Name: __OWLS Region of Cooperation_____

Address: (Street/PO Box) _____

City/Zip Code/County: _____

U.S. Congressional District: _____

Michigan Senate District: _____   Michigan House District: _____

Type of Library: ___ Public   ___ School   ___ Academic   ___ Special   _X Multitype

Check all that apply: _X   Have one or more paid staff
                         _X   Have a regular schedule of library service
                         _X   Have a dedicated facility for library purposes
                         _X   Have an annual budget with funds reserved for library materials and services
                         _X   Have a record of multitype library cooperation

User Group Targeted by Project (check all that apply):
    ___ Children   ___ Youth   ___ Adults   ___ Elderly   ___ Other   _X Mixed

Estimated Number of Persons to be Served by the Project: _____

The original and five copies of the application must be RECEIVED at the Library of Michigan
no later than 5:00pm on June 29, 2001.
Library of Michigan, Attn: LSTA Team, PO Box 30007, Lansing, MI 4890-75079

**Library of
Michigan**

Project Administration

Applicant Library Name: _____

Fiscal Agency: _____ Fiscal Agency's Year End: _____

Fiscal Agent Name: _____ Title_____

    Telephone: _____ Telefax: _____ Email: _____

Grant Administrator Name: _____ Title_____

    Telephone: _____ Telefax: _____ Email: _____

Authorized Official Name: _____ Title_____

    Telephone: _____ Telefax: _____ Email: _____

Abstract
Use only space provided

Target Population's Need for Project:

Project Goal(s):

Project Description and Activities:

Federal LSTA Goal (check **one** that applies most closely to the project):

    _X_ Linkages among libraries   ___ Consortia/sharing

    ___ Linkages with others   ___ Computers/telecommunications

    ___ Accessing information   ___ Targeted services

Federal LSTA Purpose (check **one** that applies most closely to the project):

    ___ Make content available in all appropriate media

    _X Enhance access by improving electronic networks and linkages

    ___ Enhance ability of staff to provide electronic services

    ___ Support literacy for children and adults

    ___ Help library users to acquire new knowledge and skills in our rapidly changing society

    ___ Provide services to users in support of learning

    ___ Use adaptive technologies or special services to improve access

    ___ Community outreach targeting the underserved

    ___ Community outreach targeting people not served

    ___ Encourage and support partnerships

    ___ Support and encourage advocacy for libraries and library services

LSTA Goals for Michigan (check **one** that the project most closely works to achieve):

    ___ Goal I: To develop and fund LSTA programs in support of statewide access to the widest possible range of information for all residents of the state through all types of libraries.

    ___ Goal II: To increase equity of information access by providing special assistance to areas of the state where library services are inadequate (underserved rural and urban communities), and to libraries that are working to provide service to persons having difficulty using a library.

    ___ Goal III: To support the continued development of information skills through continuing education on a collaborative basis statewide.

    _X_ Goal IV: To foster innovation and technical improvements in information services by funding leading edge projects in libraries which will serve as models and training centers.

Narrative

Must include all of the following:

1. Relationship to Federal LSTA Goals – Describe how the project meets the goals of the Library Services and Technology Act (see Appendix G of handbook)

2. Relationship to Michigan's Five Year State Plan – Describe the relationship of the project to the Library of Michigan LSTA Five Year State Plan. Describe how the project will contribute toward Michigan's progress in achieving the stated goal(s).

3. Project need – Describe how the need for this project was determined. Describe the current level of service provided to the target population. If project is technology related, include a description of the current technology, technology needs and longer term technology plan. Provide statistical data and demographic information. Cite sources of all data used.

4. Multitype cooperation and resource sharing – Describe the established history of resource sharing and cooperation with other libraries and/or community agencies. Describe the collaborative activities of the proposed project and the contributions of each project partner.

5. Goals and objectives – Describe the goal(s) and objective(s) of the project and clearly relate them to the identified needs.

6. Local resources – Explain the local resources that will be used to assist with the project, such as funding, outreach, or technical support.

7. Continuation and sustainability – Describe the plans to continue the project beyond the Grant period. Include plans for funding, and if applicable, for the use of project evaluation in support of future funding.

8. Awareness – Describe how the target population will be made aware of the improved library service.

Applicant Library Name: _____

Narrative
Reproduce as necessary

One deep and abiding commitment common to all libraries, be they public, private or academic, is the timely delivery of information to their patrons. Information is not a passive thing. It feeds and nourishes the knowledge we already possess. It provides strength and power to conduct our daily lives and as such it gives a purpose to the work libraries undertake daily. Typically we serve our commitment to patrons through strong collection development and well-developed resource sharing relationships. In 2001 the Michigan Library Exchange (MiLE) project brought together participants from more than 160 libraries to work towards taking resource sharing to the next level, that is, to allow for patron initiated interlibrary loan that would seamlessly integrate with local library systems. While this project is still in the early stages of implementation, we have already begun to see positive results. It is hard to remember a library collaboration project that has generated as much enthusiasm and institutional commitment as the MiLE project. In this grant application we make the case for additional funds to allow us to expand the services offered through MiLE as well as to open MiLE up to additional libraries. Part of the need for additional funds is the result of market changes that have impacted the software available to us and part of the need is to introduce new libraries to the project. Whether this project is funded or not, our 2001 MiLE grant will continue as a self-contained project. We have every reason to anticipate MiLE's success.

Relationship to Federal LSTA Goals – Describe how the project meets the goals of the Library Services and Technology Act (see Appendix G of handbook)

This project speaks to the heart of a major purpose of the Library Services and Technology Act as it was re-authorized in 1996. By linking the collections of the members of the three consortia that comprise MiLE (DALNET, OWLS and SLC) we make accessible to the residents of Michigan a vast array of resources. By breaking down barriers that inhibit patron access and agreeing on policies and procedures that will allow maximum access with minimum effort, we increase the likelihood that our residents not only have access to these resources, but they also take advantage of that access and USE these resources.

Federal LSTA goals strongly encourage the use of technology to build and strengthen the linkages among libraries of all types. This project brings together three consortia; each with a successful history of resource sharing and of using technology to access information. From these three consortia we've created MiLE, a new model for resource sharing that we believe has statewide implications. Funding this project is very much in keeping with the goals of the LSTA program on a federal level.

Relationship to Michigan's Five Year State Plan

We address two specific areas identified by the Library of Michigan in the 5 year plan under Goal IV:

- Provide research and development grant funds to support the introduction of new technologies in Michigan libraries ready and able to test them. Work collaboratively with the grantee to evaluate the project and to formally share the findings locally, regionally, and statewide.

- Give priority to projects that use new technology in ways that will assist the library in meeting one or more state goals, such as improving adaptive technology or expanding outreach to remote and underserved areas of the state.

Through this project the participating agencies will enhance the linkages necessary to allow for patron initiated interlibrary loan that would seamlessly integrate with local library systems. With the linkages already in place this allows for a virtual catalog of libraries in six counties creating a one-stop approach to locating and requesting library resources in southeastern Michigan.

We have developed this project because we are committed to provide whatever assistance is required to serve our patrons. Increasing the 'equity of information access' is a fundamental part of every decision we make regarding service delivery in our libraries – not just something we think about when it is time to write a grant.

This project was developed to extend the resources of our libraries to each other in ways that we have not previously attempted and to improve the service mechanisms we use to meet our patron's information needs. This project addresses the Library of Michigan's Program Goal IV because it's a technologically advanced project that, if not on the cutting edge, is certainly on the leading edge. We also address LM Goal II because our focus is on providing library patrons in southeastern Michigan with a unified set of resources and to empower them to access those resources where and when they need them.

50% of the state's population will be served by this project. The funding we are requesting represents an investment of three cents per capita for the population served. Through this project we will provide a unified set of resources to residents in Livingston, Macomb, Oakland, St. Clair, Washtenaw and Wayne Counties serving a combined, highly urbanized population of 4,627,870 (SEMCOG, July 1, 1999).

Project participants believe this project will assist the state in developing its approach to the statewide goal of providing a 'one stop shopping' environment. MiLE members serve on the statewide ATLAS group and have been involved in discussions on use of this developing technology for the last several years. We are able to absorb the challenges inherent in untested technologies and techniques and show our colleagues around the state what a highly developed resource sharing system can look like. In fact, we welcome the opportunity. We only regret that the delay in the release of federal funds this past year resulted in a project start date later than anticipated. For that reason, while substantial progress has been made, we cannot demonstrate as much progress toward our goals as we would have liked.

Project need

This project is an enhancement of a project originally funded in 2001. The needs identified at that time are still relevant and are included here. At the conclusion of the Project Need section we have included additional need statements developed over the last year.

Patron Need

Libraries, regardless of type, have many things in common -- especially our patrons. While we have traditionally recognized many of these similarities, we are only recently coming to an understanding of what it means when we say, for example, that our patrons are shared. More and more the people we serve in the public library are also being served by an academic and, perhaps, a special library. Our participating libraries are identifying new ways that we can serve these shared patrons with a minimum of rules and procedures. It is interesting to note that in studies of borrowers, DALNET estimates shared patrons as high as 30% of the total 676,818 borrowers. This number will clearly continue to rise.

OWLS members have created a virtual union catalog built around addressing the needs of our shared patrons. To better understand the nature of these shared patrons it is important to understand who they are. In a previous grant we targeted the adult learner as a significant part of that shared patron group.

Adult learners comprise an increasingly greater proportion of the student population, and these older students (24+) differ from traditional college students in significant ways. Statistical reports which profile current student populations found that 48% of all students were classified as financially independent or as an adult student who is head of a household. More likely to be part time students (41%) these reports further indicate that 81% of the independent students are single-parent women providing for a family. These reports document what many of us assume, that adults who return to college tend to be in transition and are either passing through a life crisis or just passed through a life changing experience (e.g. divorce, unemployment, geographic relocation). These students tend to be sacrificing more than traditional students to attend college and are highly motivated. Most of these students are employed full time, carry additional outside responsibilities and have a broader range of outside commitments than do traditional students. They have different learning characteristics about which little is yet known as are their requirements for support in study skills, research skills and library activities. To complete the picture, most of these students commute some distance to the college that offers the programs that fit their needs. The significance of the last point – often the closest and most convenient library is their public library or the library at work. In serving the adult student there is a greater need than ever before for libraries of different types to cooperate and provide access to the widest possible range of materials.

The adult learner, while certainly presenting unique needs, helps illustrate the changing needs of many library patrons. We see a need to develop "holistic" library services. We must serve the information needs of the whole person with service delivery mechanisms that break down our tradition of categorizing information delivery. In today's society the student researching current marketing trends, the parent taking a child to story hour, the child seeking assistance in caring for a parent and the entrepreneur developing a business plan are all the same person – yet we often send them to different libraries for each information need, or expect them to rely on mediated mechanisms such as interlibrary loan. All of our libraries share mission statements focusing on serving life long learning needs. Indeed, our Governor often identifies life long learning as a necessary element in enriching Michigan's economic base. We believe a key to serving life long learning needs lies in developing an understanding of the context in which life long learning, both formal and informal, occurs. Through this grant we wish to redesign our service delivery to respond more directly to the needs expressed by our patrons.

In DALNET's Vision for the Next Generation, they identify patron information needs similar to those identified by OWLS and the Suburban Library Cooperative. Specifically:

- One Stop Shopping for Information
- Desktop Delivery
- Customizable and Specialized User Interfaces
- Easy Access and Prompt Delivery

The use of technology to improve service delivery in libraries has been around as long as bookmobiles and telephones, although the last 50 years have seen its most dramatic impact. And yet we are often unable to embrace and implement new technologies as quickly as we might like – often because innovations are costly and bring with them the necessity of re-examining protocols and procedures which have been relied upon for some time.

Our patrons must be able to get the information they need when they need it and in the format that is most useful to them. When OWLS introduced a virtual union catalog in 1999 it was greeted enthusiastically by

librarians and patrons alike. But the most frequent comment was " When can we request materials directly from these other libraries?" This proposal acknowledges that a union catalog, in today's information driven economy, is not fully functional without a direct request mechanism that empowers the patron to request materials unassisted and delivers said materials to the appropriate library for pick up.

Library Need

Library staff are used to the 80/20 rule. We know that we will fill 80% of requests for materials we do not own within our local region (based on current resource sharing agreements) and that we will spend 80% of our resource sharing budgets trying to fill the remaining 20% of our patron's needs. We also know that traditional interlibrary loan is one of the most costly things we do. A 1998 study by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) found that, on average, college libraries spend $12.08 to obtain an item for a patron. Generally it takes about 11 days to obtain the item, which we do 91% of the time.[1]

But this study looked at more than the averages. It looked at what common elements could be identified in libraries with high performance/low cost operations. This type of cost/benefit analysis is unusual, although the common elements were there (just waiting to be identified). ARL Senior Program Officer for Access & Delivery Services, Mary Jackson identified several common elements among high performance/low cost ILL operations; [2]

- User-Initiated Ordering. As noted in the study "Systems that pass electronic patron request forms directly to the potential lender … eliminate the need for ILL staff in these initial steps of the borrowing process. Staff costs represent two-thirds of the borrowing unit cost, so by increasing user-initiated ordering staff costs are lessened and the borrowing unit cost is thus lowered."
- Maximizing Technology. High performing libraries require electronic submission of requests; ILL messaging systems; and ILL fee management systems.
- Delivery Technologies. High performing libraries are supported by, typically, several delivery systems (electronic and courier).

So we are up against the unassailable conclusion that those very technologies our patrons want, in order to improve service, are the very technologies that studies indicate will allow us to maximize efficiency and lower costs.

When this project was originally envisioned it was intended as a one year project that members participants would sustain through local budgets. Current participants are, in fact, developing a cost sharing plan for the post-grant period. It is important to note that this grant request doe NOT contain a request for fund to help sustain this project. We are requesting funds to purchase additional software that was not identified as necessary by our potential vendors but is now clearly needed. We would also like to expand this project to other libraries.

The software funded in the initial MiLE grant (available at that time) was early in the development cycle but we believed it would do the job. Once the grant was funded and the project begun, we discovered that the kind of software that would do what we needed it to do had, in a manner of speaking, come into its own. The market has become highly competitive and the software costs have skyrocketed. We can still achieve the goals of the original project, however to fully realize the potential there are additional software programs and hardware that we need. These represent a significant burden for the project participants and grant funds are sought in order to defray these unanticipated start-up costs.

Multitype cooperation and resource sharing

To accommodate the multiple consortia in this project it seemed more logical to include the current levels of technology data, requested in the above section, in this section.

To address the current level of service and cooperation it is useful to discuss each of the project partners.

DALNET

DALNET is a consortium of academic, public and special libraries located in Southeast Michigan. Founded as a non-profit corporation in 1985, DALNET enables its members to better serve the information needs of their users through cooperative efforts among multi-type libraries in the seven southeast Michigan counties by sharing advanced automation applications.

DALNET members serve 676,818 borrowers. Combined collections total more than 4.4 million volumes and support annual circulation of nearly 2.8 million. DALNET members include the following:

Botsford Hospital
Detroit Medical Center (7 locations)
Detroit Institute of Arts
Detroit Public Library
Detroit Public Schools-Professional Library
Henry Ford Museum & Greenfield Village Library
Macomb Community College
McGregor Public Library of Highland Park
Rochester College
Oakland Community College
Oakland County Law Library
University of Detroit Mercy
John Dingell Veterans Administration Medical Center
Walsh College
Wayne County Community College District
Wayne State University
William Beaumont Hospital

DALNET members agree to share an online system, contribute to its database and are committed to resource sharing. Recognizing that patrons demand access to information beyond the walls of their local library or campus, the DALNET Board has an established committee and a working taskforce assigned to investigate, recommend and implement actions related to access management and resource sharing in today's world of networked digital resources.

The DALNET libraries are all equipped with a new system called Im@gine, which uses Horizon© software, a product of *epixtech* (formerly Ameritech Library Services).

Suburban Library Cooperative and Region of Cooperation

The Suburban Library Cooperative is a network of public libraries in the Macomb County area which have joined together to secure services which can be performed more effectively and economically as a group. Established in 1978 under Michigan Public Act 89 of 1977, the Cooperative provides member libraries with several important services, ranging

from automated circulation of library materials to access to the Internet. The Suburban Library Cooperative also assists member libraries in a variety of ways in their efforts to better serve the public. The Suburban Library Cooperative serves over 808,100 residents of Michigan.

Libraries in the following communities are members of the Suburban Library Cooperative: Armada, Center Line, Chesterfield, Clinton Township, Eastpointe, Fraser, Harper Woods, Lenox, Macomb Township, Mount Clemens, New Baltimore, Richmond, Romeo, Roseville, Shelby, St. Clair Shores, Sterling Heights, Troy, Utica, Warren, and Washington.

The Suburban Library Cooperative manages the *epixtech* online system for its members. A shared database of over 2,000,000 items provides over 400,000 registered patrons with easy access to information sources. Annual circulation exceeds 3.5 million. The Cooperative has been online with this system since May 1991. By using this system, libraries throughout the cooperative can access the holdings of all of the participating libraries, check out items to patrons, place holds on items, process library materials, and access the Library of Michigan and the University of Michigan.

The Region of Cooperation, which includes the Suburban Library Cooperative, has recently joined this project. We are looking forward to the inclusion of a school library within this ROC and see that as an important part of the next step for MiLE. Finding school libraries with both the technology needed to participate and the willingness (and available staff) to implement the project was a challenge when the project was first envisioned. We are pleased to be in discussions with the Troy Schools as a future participant. We have much to learn about how this type of project impacts school libraries.

OWLS Region of Cooperation

The membership of the Oakland Washtenaw Wayne Livingston St. Clair Library Network, (OWLS) is as varied as it is resource-rich. Membership is comprised of four large academic institutions, twelve small universities and colleges, five community colleges, fifty three schools, fifty two special libraries, and sixty four public libraries in ninety two buildings. The total population served by OWLS is over 2.5 million. It is a fast growing, well educated area.

The libraries within OWLS have a strong history of, and commitment to, multi-type resource sharing and document delivery. The OWLS ROC has provided a coordinated interlibrary loan service, which permitted libraries of all types access to OCLC if they did not have access themselves. In addition, OWLS started a network of ARIEL workstations within its boundaries to facilitate the document delivery capabilities of the Region, as well as furthering its long range goal of using emerging technologies for the improvement of multi-type resource sharing.

In 1999 OWLS introduced the OWLS Regional Catalog. The OWLS regional catalog is a collection of library catalogs that you can search simultaneously. Currently the OWLS catalog uses Z39.50 technology to connect the collections of:

- The Library Network Shared Library System(58 library buildings; 3.4 million volumes; 6.5 million annual circulation)
- Eastern Michigan University (890,000 volumes; 163,000 annual circulation)
- University of Michigan – Dearborn (317,000 volumes; 94,000 annual circulation)
- Baldwin Public Library (149,000 volumes; 368,000 annual circulation)
- Orion Township Public Library (101,000 volumes; 249,000 annual circulation)
- Schoolcraft College (94,000 volumes; 25,000 annual circulation)

- Bloomfield Township (214,000 volumes; 527,000 annual circulation)
- Plymouth District Library*
- Cromaine District Library*
- Oakland University*

*Added in 2000.

Each of the organizations participating in this project has a long and accomplished history of resource sharing. This history reflects each of our members' institutional commitment to resource sharing. This is perhaps typified by the comments of David Murphy, Director of the Walsh College Library:

> Given the expected economic growth in our immediate area, Walsh College and particularly its two libraries are ready to supply information needs to any individual or company that looks for our help. We maintain an open-door policy; anyone may come in to use our facilities and ask for assistance finding information on any subject. We maintain 18 databases, which anyone is entitled to use. We have nearly 40,000 volumes, mostly in the areas of economics and business finance. Our librarians and technical staff are active in their professional associations and lend their experience to the services we offer.
>
> A patron-initiated interlibrary loan system, such as is described elsewhere would be in tune with our philosophy of empowerment coming from knowledge. We want our collections in the hands of as many individuals as possible. Our hopes for a virtual information sphere for Troy would be enhanced greatly with this new initiative speared-headed by so many agencies. Building a system where the collections of every library in six counties in southeast Michigan would be at once a basis for a state-wide information network and the envy of other states across our nation.

Appended to this proposal are the technology plans for The Suburban Library Cooperative and The Library Network, the OWLS Strategic Planning Retreat report and the DALNET Vision for the Next Generation Information Services and System. Each of these documents addresses the use of technology to meet the resource sharing needs of our patrons and is consistent with this proposed project.

Goals and Objectives

In 2000 we said:

> *This project was developed for the purpose of addressing several goals:*
> - *To share resources among libraries of all types in southeastern Michigan, building upon existing resource sharing practices;*
> - *To provide a quicker and more efficient way to share holdings and availability information;*
> - *To provide patrons with the ability to initiate interlibrary loan requests on their own;*
> - *To provide for the delivery of requested materials into the hands of patrons more quickly, and;*
> - *To develop a prototype system that would provide the above and provide a forum to successfully address issues related to the internal library policies and procedures required for such a system to be successful.*
>
> *Software is now available which builds on three technologies necessary to achieve our vision: Z39.50, the NISO ILL protocol and the Circulation Interface protocol (CIP II). We will use all of these standards to provide seamless interoperability among the databases of the Library Cooperative of Macomb, The Library Network, the DALNET member libraries and the other members of the OWLS Regional Virtual Catalog (owls.mlc.lib.mi.us).*

We've learned a few things since then, but the goals remain unchanged. We've learned that to fully realize the benefits of the NISO ILL protocol and full integration with local systems, we need Z39.50, NISO 10160 and 10161, SIP, SIP2 (formerly referred to as CIP) and NSIP. The latter are needed on the local system end as well as within the middleware software. When envisioning the original project we understood the needs from the middleware end, but not from the local system end. (Indeed at that time some local system vendors were not charging for this type of interface). So, our goals are unchanged, but we've learned a lot about how to accomplish them in the last 4 months.

In 2000 we identified the following objectives:

- *Integration of the Library Cooperative of Macomb database with the OWLS Regional Virtual Catalog;*
- *Use of third party software to provide patron authentication, and integration of ILL requests with local library systems on both the OWLS and DALNET servers;*
- *Linkage of the OWLS server with the DALNET server;*
- *Improved delivery of physical materials (extending existing delivery to additional libraries).*

Our current objectives are:

- To use third party software to provide a union catalog, patron authentication and the integration of ILL requests with local library systems for the catalogs of participating members of DALNET, OWLS and SLC.
- To upgrade existing participants' local systems with the interfaces required in order to take full advantage of the middleware software.
- To add additional participants with a high priority on inclusion of at least one school library, two members of the Suburban Region of Cooperation and one member each of OWLS and DALNET.
- To demonstrate to the state, as well as to other regional collaborative groups, that the use of third party software to link local systems is a viable solution to the need for a statewide union catalog resource. To further demonstrate that a set of policies and procedures can be developed that meets the needs of a wide variety of libraries.

Our goals and objectives relate directly to both the patron and library needs identified previously. From one stop shopping and desk top delivery to user-initiated ordering and maximizing the use of technology, this project remains focused on the needs identified in our previous grant.

Local Resources, Continuation and Sustainability

We are, justifiably, proud of the organization of the MiLE project. Early on the original project team identified the need to include a wide variety of people on this project. A kick off meeting was held in January and library staff were asked to make a one year commitment to the project. Based on the volunteers, whose time is contributed by their organization, we have established the following:

Steering Committee (2 representatives from each consortia and the chair of each committee) – meets twice a month.

Technology Committee (one representative at a minimum of each local system included in the project)

ILL/Circ Committee (our largest committee, this group works on establishing policies and procedures as well as assisting in the selection of the software) -- meets at least monthly.

Design Committee (works on the user interface and design issues).
Training Committee (will coordinate the training of staff and developing materials for patron training.

Promotion Committee (coordinates all promotional activities and the project's web page).

Our Steering Committee is chaired by Louise Bugg of Wayne State. Louise's dedication to the project has brought us a long way in a few short months. All participants have complete confidence in our ability to succeed with this project. Local contributions in staff time alone are extensive as the list of committee participants in the appendix attests. As an example, the Steering Committee has met about 11 times since January. In staff hours that amounts to about 303 hours for this committee alone and this does not include time working on the project outside of committee meetings. Using an average of $25/hour (which is probably low) that would represent about $7500 in 5 months. More definable local contributions include:

- Agreement of Wayne State (and all project participants) to waive transaction-based ILL fees to MiLE members during this project;
- Contribution to the project of the OWLS server;
- Contribution of DALNET's software credits towards the purchase of software;
- Contribution of OWLS and the Suburban ROC of the last year of LSTA funding;
- Contribution of meeting costs for two all day meetings to evaluate software by the University of Michigan Dearborn, TLN and SLC;
- Contribution by TLN and Wayne State of $1000 each to support a continuing education program, sponsored with MLC, to focus on similar projects outside MI (as well as to focus attention on the standards relating to ILL and circ).

Project participants are prepared to absorb ongoing costs related to software licensing, hardware maintenance and staffing. All project participants already maintain substantial budgets in support of resource sharing initiatives. Assuming the success of this project, we do not see difficulties with ongoing costs. Reviewers should note that each consortia has an established history of resource sharing and of managing/supporting large multi-library automation systems.

Additionally, as demonstrated in the budget included in the appendix, we have already begun planning for the costs associated with maintaining this project. We estimate that we will need about $100,000 annually to sustain this project. Although the actual cost sharing mechanism is still being worked out, all members of the MiLE Steering Committee feel this is achievable. Shared evenly (which may or may not be the case) the costs would be about $1000/library. We will continue to refine our cost estimates as well as our cost sharing plans. One recent addition to our budgeting projects is a part time staff person to maintain the software and servers. As we have learned more about what is involved we realized that we needed to fund a position rather than rely on the contribution of a member participant.

Awareness

We are currently focusing on developing awareness of MiLE within the library community and, especially, our member libraries and to educate them on the potential for the project. Thus far we have:
- Established a website (XXXXX);
- Sent out a press release announcing the project;
- Hosted an organizational meeting in January;
- Hosted a meeting for software finalists to demonstrate their products (attended by about 75 people).

We plan to use a combination of promotional materials and training to orient the public to this new service. We will start by asking each organization to determine a target population for this project. Implementation plans for each target population will be developed complete with training and promotional elements. Although we will work together on the look and feel of promotional materials, each organization will be responsible for developing the implementation plan that best suits its needs. Timelines will be coordinated so that our implementation plans are in tandem.

We will also coordinate press releases so that all parts of our service area are covered.

We will be doing a program on this project for the MLA conference and have been asked by MLC to allow the project to be highlighted in their newsletter (as it was in LM's Access). We expect to widely share the results of our project on a regional, statewide and national basis. We are committed to sharing what we learn so that statewide efforts to create a union catalog and ILL system can benefit from our experience.

[1]Measuring the Performance of Interlibrary Loan and Document Delivery Services, by Mary L. Jackson, ARL Access & Delivery Services Consultant (195, December 1997).

[2]A Spotlight on High-Performing ILL/DD Operations in Research Libraries, by Mary Jackson, ARL Access and Delivery Services Consultant (198, June 1998).

Applicant Library Name: _____

Project Objective
Reproduce as necessary

Objective# __1__ : To use third party software to provide a union catalog, patron authentication and the integration of ILL requests with local library systems for the catalogs of participating members of DALNET, OWLS and SLC.

Project Activities:

- Use of third party software to provide patron authentication, and integration of ILL requests with local library systems on both the OWLS and DALNET servers. This software is being purchased under another grant. Currently it will be installed on the OWLS server. Technical specifications now recommend two servers, one to serve the ILL function and one to serve the union catalog function. Increases in software costs mean that the current project will use the upgraded OWLS server rather than purchase a new server.

- Creation of a test and training server. All vendors seriously considered by MiLE have recommended the establishment of a test/training server. This will be used so that the implementation of software enhancements (this software changes rapidly) can be accomplished in a test environment insuring that we will only go to production after installations issues are resolved and training has occurred.

Budget for this Objective:

Budget Category	Explanation	Amount Requested
	Provide supporting calculations, e. g., 1,000 brochures @ .03	
Technology	Server for ILL software	$ 22,558
	Server for Union Catalog (will allow existing server to be used as a testing and training server).	$ 17,500
		Total $ 40,058

Applicant Library Name: _____

Project Objective
Reproduce as necessary

Objective# ___2__ : To upgrade existing participants' local systems with the interfaces required in order to take full advantage of the middleware software.

Project Activities:

- Installation of local system interfaces required for full integration with the ILL software. This includes 2 DRA interfaces; one each for Horizon, III, SIRSI and 2 for Endeavor systems.
- Installation of local system interfaces required for full integration with the ILL software for new participants.

Budget for this Objective:

Budget Category	Explanation	Amount Requested
	Provide supporting calculations, e. g., 1,000 brochures @ .03	
Technology	Software to upgrade local systems to be able to take full advantage of features that integrate the ILL software with local circ data.	$ 50,000
	(This will not cover the full cost, but we are developing an incentive plan that would use these funds as a match to local funds. This would provide assistance but require The library to contribute as well, thus helping all).	
		Total $ 50,000

Applicant Library Name: _____

Project Objective
Reproduce as necessary

Objective# ___3___ : To add additional participants with a high priority on inclusion of at least one school library, two members of the Suburban Region of Cooperation and one member each of OWLS and DALNET.

Project Activities:

- Finalizing specifications for new libraries joining the project
- Final selection of new participants based upon the above criteria
- Installation of profiling required for new libraries

Budget for this Objective:

Budget Category	Explanation	Amount Requested
	Provide supporting calculations, e. g., 1,000 brochures @ .03	
Technology	Software license upgrades and profiling for new members @ $10000/site	$ 40,000
Professional Services	Contracted delivery services for the new participants as well as some of the current participants. (10 libraries with one stop/week)	$ 15,600

Applicant page   of   pages.

Applicant Library Name: _____

Total $ 55,600

Project Objective
Reproduce as necessary

Objective# ___4__ : To demonstrate to the state, as well as to other regional collaborative groups, that the use of third party software to link local systems is a viable solution to the need for a statewide union catalog resource. To further demonstrate that a set of policies and procedures can be developed that meets the needs of a wide variety of libraries.

Project Activities:

- Continued maintenance and expansion of the MiLE web site
- Participation in continuing education meetings to demonstrate the project
- Continued participation in the statewide ATLAS project

Budget for this Objective:

Budget Category	Explanation Provide supporting calculations, e. g., 1,000 brochures @ .03	Amount Requested
No project funds are requested for this objective.		
		Total $

Applicant Library Name: _____

Summary Budget for the LSTA Project

Budget Categories:	Amount:
A. Communications	_____
B. Library Materials and Supplies	_____
C. Professional Services and Costs	___$ 15,600____
D. Promotion and Outreach	_____
E. Technology	___$130,058____
F. Training	_____
G. Miscellaneous	_____
TOTAL	$ __145,658_____

Applicant Library Name: _____

Timeline
Reproduce as necessary

Include a step-by-step chronological list of all project activities, including steps in the evaluation.

Include a step-by-step chronological list of all project activities, including steps in the evaluation.

Month One:
- Announce grant award in local newspapers and library publications, including campus publications

Month Two:
- Purchase hardware and software
- Prepare local systems for software upgrades

Month Three:
- Install local system hardware

Month Four:
- Install new hardware
- Migrate ILL software to new server
- Load union catalog interface on new server
- Set up test server

Month Five:
- Begin configuring software for new participating agencies

Month Six:
- Train new participating libraries' staff

Month Seven:
- New libraries train public
- Begin patron use of the new software in new libraries
- Monitor use of the system
- Evaluate and make corrections to any software problems
- Begin delivery service to additional libraries

Month Eight:
- Begin distributing patron surveys in each ILL item delivered. This will include all libraries, even those that participated in similar evaluation activities in the first project.
- Develop web based survey
- Evaluate and make corrections to any software problems

Month Nine:
- Continue monitoring use of the system

- Evaluate and make corrections to any software problems

Month Ten:
- Develop and implement staff surveys for all participating libraries
- Reconvene Focus Groups (ILL Staff)

Month Eleven:
- Compile results from staff and patron surveys
- Gather post-implementation data from participants
- Compare the results from the evaluation data assembled in the first project

Month Twelve:
- Get statistical reports from software
- Final narrative report
- Develop final evaluation report

Applicant Library Name: _____

Evaluation
Reproduce as necessary

Evaluation Method – Check all that apply:
____ Impact study
____ Outcome
____ Tell-It
____ Other

Include:
(1) a description of what is to be measured;
(2) data collection methodology;
(3) target benchmarks used to determine success (quantifiable ways of measuring the impact of project objectives); and
(4) a plan to share evaluation results.

1. Our evaluation process will begin with focus groups of ILL staff at the participating member libraries. The questions we will ask them will relate to their levels of comfort with the new system. First, we will identify issues of concern for them and secondly, how the system can be used in their current workflow.

2. Develop a survey in the form of a bookmark.

Ask the following questions:
- Have you used this service before?
- Was this service helpful to you? / Did this service meet your needs?
- Would you use this service again?
- How did you hear about this service?
- Did you use this service – from home, at the library, at work?
- Was this service easy to use?
- Did you receive the material you needed in a timely fashion?
- What would you suggest to make this service better?
- Comments

Other side of bookmark: explain the project, funding, groups involved.

Put this same survey on the same web page to initiate more responses

3. Develop another survey for the staff of the libraries that are involved in the project (both paper and web based):

Ask the following questions:
- Is this service helpful to your patrons? / Does this service meet their needs?
- Do your patrons use this service – at the library / at home / at work?
- Are patrons commenting favorably about the timeliness of delivery?
- What would you suggest to improve this service?
- Comments:

4. Meet with the ILL staff focus group again. Determine if we met their needs and their patrons needs. Does this system improve their workflow?

5. Accumulate statistics from the software and participating libraries:
- We expect that this project will show an increase in the number of ILL requests at each new participating location of at least 10%.
- We expect that this project will show a decrease in the amount of staff time necessary to fill ILL requests.
- We expect that this project will show a decrease in the cost per ILL, comparing pre-grant costs and post-grant costs.
- We expect that this project will show a decrease in the amount of time it takes to get an ILL item to a patron.
- We expect that this project will show a decrease in the participating libraries' OCLC costs.

The results of this project will be reported to various library groups in Michigan, including the Michigan Library Association annual conference, Cooperative Directors, Council of Library Deans and Directors – ILL Committee, ACRL – ILL Discussion Group.

Applicant Library Name: _____

Project Partners

_____DALNET – See Attached List_____

_____OWLS – See Attached List_____

_____Suburban ROC – See Attached List_____

_____

Board Resolution Statement of Assurances

This is to certify that the (Legal Entity) _____

Governing Board passed a resolution at its meeting of (Date) _____ for (Name of library applicant) _____
to become an applicant and participant in the Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) contract/grants program administered
by the Library of Michigan.

Note: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the
awarding agency. Further, certain Federal awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is
the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance, and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project costs) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of the project described in this application.
2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States, and if appropriate, the State, through any authorized representative, access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the award; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.
3. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.
4. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.
5. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§ 4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards for merit systems for programs funded under one of the nineteen statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).
6. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§ 1681-1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. § 794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of disabilities; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§ 6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§ 523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. 290 dd-3 and 290 ee-3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. § 3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.

7. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal or federally assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.
8. Will comply with the provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§ 1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.
9. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. §§ 276a to 276a-7), the Copeland Act (40 U.S.C. § 276c and 18 U.S.C. §§ 874), and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. §§ 327-333), regarding labor standards for federally assisted construction subagreements.
10. Will comply, if applicable, with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is $10,000 or more.
11. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §§ 1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clean Air) Implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. § 7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe

Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, (P.L. 93-523); and (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, (P.L. 93-205).

12. Will comply with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. §§ 1271 et seq.) related to protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.

13. Will assist the awarding agency in assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470), EO 11593 (identification and protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 469a-1 et seq.).

14. Will comply with P.L. 93-348 regarding the protection of human subjects involved in research, development, and related activities supported by this award of assistance.

15. Will comply with the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-544, as amended, 7 U.S.C. 2131 et seq.) pertaining to the care, handling, and treatment of warm blooded animals held for research, teaching, or other activities supported by this award of assistance.

16. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. §§ 4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.

17. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act of 1984, the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996, and OMB Circular A-133.

18. As required by Executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 85, for prospective participants in primary covered transactions, as defined at 34 CFR Part 85, Sections 85.105 and 85.110-A. The applicant certified that it and its principals;
(a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any Federal department or agency;
(b) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State or Local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property;
(c) Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (Federal, State, or Local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1)(b) of this certification; and
(d) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application had one or more public transactions (Federal, State, or Local) terminated for cause or default; and

B. Where the applicant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, he or she shall attach an explanation to this application.

19. As required by Section 1352, Title 31 of the U.S. Code, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 82, for persons entering into a grant or cooperative agreement over $100,000, as defined at 34 CFR Part 82, Sections 82.105 and 82.110, the applicant certifies that:
(a) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making of any Federal grant, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal grant or cooperative agreement;
(b) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal grant or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form - LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," in accordance with its instructions;
(c) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including Grants, contracts under grants and cooperative agreements, and subcontracts) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

20. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations and policies governing this program.

21. Will comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act, P.L. 101-336, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability.

22. Will comply with all regulations, guidelines, and standards lawfully adopted under the above statutes by the United States Institute of Museum and Library Services.

23. Will comply with all LSTA guidelines and regulations, and will ensure that LSTA funds will be used to supplement and not supplant local funds expended for library service purposes.

24. Declares that all information presented in this LSTA Grant application is truthful to the best of the knowledge of the undersigned. Proposals of applicants who knowingly present untruthful information will be rendered ineligible for funding.

The Applicant agrees that compliance with this Assurance constitutes a condition of continued receipt of Federal financial assistance, and that it is binding upon the applicant, its successors, transferees, and assignees for the period during which such assistance is provided. **(All *four* signatures must be provided and dated.)**

The Applicant understands that expenses for the approved project that are not covered by the LSTA award will be the responsibility of the Applicant Agency.

Board Chairperson Name (Type)	Signature	Date
Authorized Official (Type)	Signature	Date
Grant Administrator Name (Type)	Signature	Date
Fiscal Agent Name (Type)	Signature	Date