University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers

Graduate School

1995

Textbook Management System survey

Neil A. Rixe The University of Montana

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Rixe, Neil A., "Textbook Management System survey" (1995). *Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers*. 8944. https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/8944

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.



Maureen and Mike MANSFIELD LIBRARY

The University Montana

Permission is granted by the author to reproduce this material in its entirety, provided that this material is used for scholarly purposes and is properly cited in published works and reports.

******Please check "Yes" or "No" and provide signature**

Yes, I grant permission _____ No, I do not grant permission _____

Veil a Rill Author's Signature: _____

Date: ____7/25/95

Any copying for commercial purposes or financial gain may be undertaken only with the author's explicit consent.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TEXTBOOK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SURVEY

By Neil A. Rixe B.S. Montana State University, 1988

Presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Masters of Business Administration

The University of Montana

1995

Approved By:

<u>Clepcle w Alex</u> Chairperson

Dean of Graduate School

August 1, 1995 Date

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

UMI Number: EP39745

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP39745

Published by ProQuest LLC (2013). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC. All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC. 789 East Eisenhower Parkway P.O. Box 1346 Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

RIXE, NEIL A.B.S., JULY 1995

Results of a survey conducted to determine the interest in a Gateway Software Corporation's Textbook Management System. (107 pages)

Director: Dr. Clyde Neu Cur

Gateway Software Corporation of Fromberg, MT wished to find out whether there was interest in an enhanced version of its Textbook Management System. The company designs and supports computer systems for K-12 schools. Its systems are designed for IBM AS/400 computer systems. The Textbook Management System allows schools to automate the process of managing textbooks. Gateway has a marketing arrangement with National Computer Systems (NCS) of Minneapolis, MN. NCS supplied the mailing list for the survey.

The survey was divided into three sections. The first section provided background data on each district. Data was provided for the average number of schools per district, teachers per district, enrollment and annual cost of losses associated with lost or damaged textbooks. Section I of the survey also generated information on who the respondents were and where they were from.

Section II of the survey captured data from respondents using automated textbook systems. Questions in this section dealt with what types of systems respondents were currently running, and the features included with those systems. Respondents also were asked whether a system with the same primary features as Gateway's was appealing, and whether their district was considering buying a new system. Districts responded to questions regarding funds availability, too. Responses to these questions helped build a prospecting list for the company.

Section III captured data from districts with manual systems. Respondents ranked the importance of the primary features included in the Textbook Management System They answered questions regarding the appeal of a system with features like Gateway's. Respondents were also asked what types of student management systems they were running, and they were asked to rank the importance of having an interface between their student management system and their textbook management system. Finally, respondents confirmed whether they were considering buying a new system, and when they might consider buying a new system. Data from this section also helped build prospect lists for Gateway.

Table of Contents

| TABLE OF CONTENTS | iii |
|--|-----|
| LIST OF TABLES | v |
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Thesis Statement The Company Textbook Management System Method of Study | |
| SECTION I RESULTS – BACKGROUND DATA | 4 |
| RESPONSE RATE ENROLLMENT NUMBER OF SCHOOLS TEACHER COUNT COST OF TEXTBOOK LOSSES DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS AUTOMATED VERSUS MANUAL | |
| SECTION II RESULTS – AUTOMATED GROUP | 13 |
| Limitations With Current System Hardware/Software in Use Rank of Features Availability of Funds The Appeal of the System | |
| SECTION III RESULTS MANUAL GROUP | 21 |
| Make Up of Manual Respondents Student Management Software/Hardware Importance of Interface Features Ranking Appeal of System Considering Purchase | |
| PROSPECT LISTS | |
| PROSPECTS FROM AUTOMATED GROUP Prospects from Manual Group INTEREST IN THE SYSTEM | |
| | |
| LIMITATIONS | |
| SAMPLE SIZE PRE-TESTING PROSPECT LISTS | |
| SUMMARY | 41 |
| APPENDIX 1 - SURVEY APPENDIX 2 - COST REGRESSIONS APPENDIX 3 - AUTOMATED RESULTS | |

| APPENDIX 4 - MANUAL RESULTS | 58 |
|----------------------------------|----|
| APPENDIX 5 - AUTOMATED PROSPECTS | 67 |
| APPENDIX 6 - MANUAL PROSPECTS | 75 |

iv

List of Tables

| TABLE 1 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES ACROSS STATES | 5 |
|---|-----|
| TABLE 2 SAMPLE ENROLLMENT VS. US CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS | 6 |
| TABLE 3 NUMBER OF SCHOOLS | 7 |
| TABLE 4 TOTAL OF TEXTBOOK LOSSES/DAMAGE PER STUDENT | 9 |
| TABLE 5 AVERAGE LOSS BASED ON ENROLLMENT GROUP | 9 |
| TABLE 6 TYPES OF DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS UTILIZED. | .10 |
| TABLE 7 TYPES OF SYSTEMS IN USE BY ENROLLMENT SIZE | 11 |
| TABLE 8 JOBS CLASSIFICATIONS FOR THOSE COMPLETING THE SURVEY | 12 |
| TABLE 9 TITLES OF THOSE COMPLETING SURVEY BROKEN DOWN BY ENROLLMENT SIZE | 12 |
| TABLE 10 FEATURE OF SYSTEMS CURRENTLY IN USE | 15 |
| TABLE 11 RANKING OF IMPORTANCE OF POSSIBLE SYSTEM ENHANCEMENTS | .17 |
| TABLE 12 CONSIDERING CHANGING TEXTBOOK SYSTEM CROSS TABULATED WITH FUNDS AVAILABILITY | 18 |
| TABLE 13 SUMMARY OF HOW APPEALING SYSTEM IS | 19 |
| TABLE 14 APPEAL OF SYSTEM WITH LOSSES PER DISTRICT | 21 |
| TABLE 15 IMPORTANCE OF INTERFACE WITH USER OF MANUAL SYSTEMS | 23 |
| TABLE 16 RESULTS OF RANKING OF FEATURES BY THOSE USING MANUAL TENTBOOK SYSTEMS | 24 |
| TABLE 17 APPEAL OF SYSTEM TO THOSE CURRENTLY USING MANUAL SYSTEMS | 25 |
| TABLE 18 APPEAL WITH COST PER DISTRICT | 27 |
| Table 19 When Might District Consider Change | 29 |
| TABLE 20 PROSPECTING CRITERIA FOR USERS OF AUTOMATED SYSTEMS | 31 |
| TABLE 21 CRITERIA FOR PROSPECTS FROM THOSE USING MANUAL TENTBOOK MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS | 33 |
| TABLE 22 APPEAL OF SYSTEM WITH MANUAL AND AUTOMATED GROUP COMBINED | 34 |
| TABLE 23 CONFIDENCE LEVELS FOR PERCENTAGE OF PROSPECTS AT 95% CONFIDENCE | 36 |
| TABLE 24 SAMPLE SIZE USING PROPORTIONS | 38 |
| TABLE 25 SAMPLE SIZE USING STANDARD DEVIATION OF TOTALS SCHOOLS | 39 |
| TABLE 26 SAMPLE SIZE USING STANDARD DEVIATION ADJUSTED FOR FINITE POPULATION FACTOR | 40 |
| TABLE 27 APPEAL CROSS TABLUATED WITH ENROLLMENT FOR AUTOMATED GROUP | 52 |
| TABLE 28 APPEAL CROSS TABLUATED WITH NUMBER OF SCHOOLS FOR AUTOMATED GROUP | 53 |
| TABLE 29 APPEAL CROSS TABLUATED WITH CONSIDERING CHANGE FOR AUTOMATED GROUP | 54 |
| TABLE 30 APPEAL CROSS TABLUATED WITH FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR AUTOMATED GROUP | 55 |
| TABLE 31 APPEAL CROSS TABLUATED WITH FUNDS FORTHCOMING FOR AUTOMATED GROUP | 56 |
| TABLE 32 APPEAL CROSS TABLUATED WITH FUNDS MADE AVAILABLE FOR AUTOMATED GROUP | 57 |
| TABLE 33 SOFTWARE/HARDWARE CROSS TABULATED FOR MANUAL GROUP | 50 |
| FABLE 34 APPEAL WITH ENROLLMENT FOR MANUAL GROUP | 51 |
| TABLE 35 APPEAL WITH NUMBER OF SCHOOLS FOR MANUAL GROUP | 52 |
| FABLE 36 APPEAL WITH NUMBER OF TEACHERS FOR MANUAL GROUP ϵ | |
| TABLE 37 APPEAL WITH COST PER STUDENT FOR MANUAL GROUP | |
| FABLE 38 APPEAL WITH CONSIDERING CHANGE FOR MANUAL GROUP | |
| FABLE 39 APPEAL WITH WHEN CONSIDERING A CHANGE FOR MANUAL GROUP | 56 |

INTRODUCTION

Thesis Statement

"A market exists for an enhanced version of Gateway Software Corporation's textbook automation software."

The purpose of this project is to conduct primary research to determine the level of interest in an enhanced version of Gateway's new Textbook Management System. This project assesses the interest and need for an efficient automation system for the circulation, control and tracking of textbooks at K-12 schools.

The Company

Gateway Software Corporation designs, maintains, and supports software for K-12 schools/districts. Its customer base spans across the United States. The smallest district served by Gateways has only 970 students, and the largest has 178,000 students.

Gateway's product line has two distinctive groups -- Distribution Management Systems & Information Retrieval Systems. The information below summarizes products offered in each group:

Distribution Management Systems Warehouse Management System Vehicle Maintenance System Work Order System Information Retrieval Systems Textbook Management System Library Management System Media Management System Each of these systems satisfies a similar market need for a product that can interface with other administrative software sold in the industry.¹ They also represent product line extensions of software systems sold by National Computer Systems (NCS) of Minneapolis, Minnesota. NCS markets Gateway's products under a special marketing arrangement.

Gateway is also an IBM Business Partner. It writes all its products for the IBM AS/400 computer. The AS/400 is a midrange computer with great flexibility. This flexibility allows districts to modify the system to satisfy their needs.

Besides development and programming of software, Gateway also markets its products and provides customer support. The company provides toll-free telephone access to this support, and furnishes on-site training and installation services.²

Textbook Management System

The corporation recently introduced a Textbook Management System. It is designed to provide K-12 schools/districts with a highly efficient way of managing textbooks. The system provides users with instant access regarding the status of textbooks.

Textbooks usually are distributed using one of three systems:

- 1) From -- Central Warehouse--to--School--to--Teacher--to--Student
- 2) From--School--to--Teacher--to--Student
- 3) From--Central Warehouse--to--School--to--Student

¹Gateway Software Corporation -- Business Plan, November 15, 1994, Gateway Software Corporation, P.O. Box 367, Fromberg, MT 59029-0367. Copyright 1994.

²<u>Textbook Management System, Capabilities Overview</u>, Gateway Software Corporation, P.O. Box 367, Fromberg, MT 59029-0367. Copyright 1993.

Gateway's system is flexible enough to accommodate all three methods. If a school has a unique system, modification can be made.

Bar code scanning eases check-in and check-out of textbooks. Districts can scan at a central location, or in the classroom using hand held scanning equipment. The system also tracks the book's condition. If damage is discovered during check in, a fine can be posted to the student's account.

The system includes features that allow users to track textbooks, and provides information on availability. For example, if a teacher is contemplating introducing a unit on Earth Science, he or she can check for availability of Earth Science textbooks on-line. If the books are available, an order can be placed with the distribution center. If the book is not in the warehouse, orders may be placed with Gateway's **Work Order System**. Users can search for books using specific titles, authors or by subject. The system also stores bibliographies and abstracts.

Gateway's software also can interface with computerized student management systems. The program can track key information regarding the borrower including but not limited to -- name, ID number, address, phone number, guardian information, amount of fines due and textbooks assigned to each student. The administration side of the system also helps improve management of accounts receivable. Users can enter fines, process payments, enter refunds, delete charges, and perform inquiries while on-line.³

³Ibid.

The Textbook Management System also has built-in reports. Five key reports are automatically generated by the system:

- ✓ A Holding Report
- ✓ Overdue Report
- ✓ Circulation and Borrowers Report
- ✓ Maintenance Report
- ✓ Daily Processing Activity Reports

Method of Study

To measure customer interest in the new system, a mail survey was sent to 931 schools/district that use the *IBM AS/400*, *IBM System 36* or *IBM Enhanced System 36* computers. NCS's customer base served as the foundation for the mailing lists. Appendix 1 contains a copy of the survey and the attached cover letter. A self addressed postage paid return envelope accompanied each survey.

There were three sections in the survey. The first section gathered background information and data useful in building prospect lists. The second section collected information specific to those currently using an automated textbook management system. Section three was designed for districts currently using non-automated systems.

SECTION I RESULTS -- BACKGROUND DATA

Response Rate

One hundred ninety-five surveys were returned for a response rate of 21 percent. Survey's came from 41 states. Table 1 shows where the responses originated.

| State | AR | AZ | CA | FL | GA | IL | IN | KS | KY | MI | MN | MS | NM | OH | OK | SC | TN | TX | VA | VT | w | NR | Total |
|--------------|-------|---------|--------|---------|---------|-----|------|---------|---------|-------|------|--------|------|-----|---------------|---------|-----|-----|--------|------|-----|------|-------|
| Count | 1 | 14 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 14 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 104 |
| Publish List | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yeş | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 22 |
| | ***** | 811.119 | H.1.11 | ijinski | 1.24.10 | | 4.90 | S.///// | 1.5.5.5 | 11.10 | 1200 | siinii | 6.75 | - | in the second | ¥195,88 | | | 88.99% | **** | | **** | |
| State | AK | co | CT | IA | ID | IL. | KS | MA | MO | NE | NH | NJ | NV | NY | OR | PA | RI | WI | WY | NR | | | Total |
| Count | 11 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 11 | 7 | 10 | | | 91 |
| Publish List | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | | | 20 |
| NR = nonres | ponse | • | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | |

Table 1 Distribution of responses across states

Table 1 also lists which states publish approved textbook lists. A total of 104 respondents -- representing 53 percent -- indicated their states publish approved lists. These responses came from 22 states. This represents 52 percent of the states in the survey.

Enrollment

The average district enrollment is 8,057. However, there is an extremely wide variance within these data. The largest district -- located in Los Angeles -- has over 312,000 students, while the smallest -- located in Alaska -- has only 109 students. Similarly, the standard deviation for enrollment is 23,801.

The enrollment data provides an excellent measure of the strength of the data gathered in the sample. For example, we can test data from the sample against data from the U.S. National Center for Education Statistics' to test whether the sample is representative of the total population of schools. Table 2 provides a comparison of the distribution of responses of these two sets of data.

| District Size | Number of Districts in Sample | % of Sample | US National Center for Education Data | % of USNCE Data |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|--|--------------------|
| Below 2,000 | 50 | 26% | 12,248 | 73% |
| 2,000-3,999 | 51 | 26% | 2,305 | 14% |
| 4,000-4,999 | 21 | 11% | 515 | 3% |
| 5,000-9,999 | 35 | 18% | 945 | 6% |
| 10,000-14,999 | 14 | 7% | 301 | 2% |
| 15,000-19,999 | 6 | 3% | 122 | 1% |
| 20,000-24,9999 | 4 | 2% | 71 | 0% |
| 25,000-49,999 | 6 | 3% | 125 | 1% |
| 50,000-99,999 | 2 | 1% | 45 | 0% |
| 100,000 and up | 1 | 1% | 22 | 0% |
| Non Response | 5 | | | |
| | 195 | 100% | 16,699 | 100% |

Table 2 Sample Enrollment vs. US Center for Education statistics

Utilizing the percentages from the USNCE data we can perform a Chi-Square test to determine if the sample data is representative of *all* schools. The following formula was used to calculated the Chi-Squared (X^{2}) test statistic:⁴

Hypothesis: H_o the distribution of the sample drawn from NCS is consistent with the distribution of the National Education Center data.

Formula: $X^2 = (O - E)^2 / E$

Where: O = Observed Sample E = Expected Sample

Result: Reject H₀ if $X^2 > X^2_{.05df}$ or 256.88 > 21.6 (Table value using 95% CI)

From this data we conclude there is little consistency between the two sets of data. This is the expected result, because larger districts tend to use automation more than smaller

⁴ <u>Introduction To Business Statistics, A Computer Integrated Approach</u>, Alan H. Kvanli, C. Stephen Guynes, Robert J. Pavur, North Texas State University, West Publishing Company, 1986, pages 300-302.

districts.⁵ Since all of NCS's customers have some level of automation, we would expect that our sample would contain more schools with over 2,000 students. The percentages in Table 2 verify that this is an accurate assumption.

Number of Schools

| High Schools | Junior/Middle | Elementary | Total Schools |
|--------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 1.88 | 2.14 | 7.43 | 11.46 |
| 1.00 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 7.00 |
| 24.00 | 24.00 | 67.00 | 101.00 |
| - | - | - | 1.00 |
| 2.50 | 3.12 | 9.84 | 14.24 |
| 0.35 | 0.44 | 1.38 | 2.00 |
| - | 1.88 1.00 24.00 - 2.50 | 1.88 2.14 1.00 1.00 24.00 24.00 2.50 3.12 | 1.88 2.14 7.43 1.00 1.00 5.00 24.00 24.00 67.00 2.50 3.12 9.84 |

Table 3 Number of Schools

Table 3 provides a summary of the data regarding the number of schools in each district. The average district has 11.4 schools. On average there are 1.8 high schools, 2.1 Junior/Middle schools and 7.4 elementary schools. The median for total schools is 7.0. The confidence level given at the bottom of Table 3, provides an understanding of the range of error for these statistics. For instance, we can be 95% confident that the average of *total schools* within our population is between 13.5 and 9.5.

⁵ See results for automated group.

Teacher Count

The variance for teachers also is quite large. The standard deviation of total teacher count is 1,355. The largest district reports having over 15,000 teachers, while the smallest reports only 9. The median for teacher count is 230. On average there are 15.6 students for each teacher.

Cost of Textbook Losses

Respondents also were asked to estimate the total amount of annual cost associated with lost or damaged textbooks. Table 4 and Table 5 provide summations of these results. Only 127 respondents answered this question. The average loss per district is \$5,435. The largest loss for a district is \$100,000, and the smallest loss other than no response is \$50. The average loss per student is \$1.75. Total losses per district is dependent of the districts size. Appendix 2 contains the results of simple regressions run between district size and estimated losses, enrollment size and estimated losses, and teacher count and estimated losses. In each case a positive relationship exists between the two variables. Therefore, we can conclude larger districts have larger losses.

| | Losses P | er Student | Total Losses | School | Total Losses Per All Schools Aggregated | | |
|--------------------|----------|------------|--------------|--------|--|---------|--|
| Average | \$ | 1.70 | \$ | 919 | \$ | 7,907 | |
| Median | \$ | 0.80 | \$ | 469 | \$ | 3,000 | |
| Max | \$ | 25.00 | \$ | 14,167 | \$ | 100,000 | |
| Min | \$ | 0.03 | \$ | 13 | \$ | 50 | |
| Standard Deviation | \$ | 2.82 | \$ | 1,740 | \$ | 13,734 | |
| Confidence Level | \$ | 0.48 | \$ | 298 | \$ | 2,343 | |

Table 4 Total of textbook losses/damage per student

| Enrollment Group | Count | Average Cost for Enroliment Group |
|------------------|-------|--|
| Below 2,000 | 44 | \$ 931 |
| 2,000-3,999 | 47 | \$ 3,009 |
| 4,000-4,999 | 18 | \$ 4,539 |
| 5,000-9,999 | 31 | \$ 6,489 |
| 10,000-14,999 | 9 | \$ 16,444 |
| 15,000-19,999 | 6 | \$ 7,142 |
| 20,000-24,9999 | 3 | \$ 3,833 |
| 25,000-49,999 | 2 | \$ 10,000 |
| 50,000-99,999 | 0 | \$- |
| 100,000 and up | 0 | \$- |
| Nonresponse | 5 | \$ 7,400 |
| Average | | \$ 5,435 |

| Table 5 Average loss based on enrollment grou | Table 5 | Average | loss | based o | n enrollment | grou |
|---|---------|---------|------|---------|--------------|------|
|---|---------|---------|------|---------|--------------|------|

Distribution Systems

Districts use one of two textbook distribution methods 94 percent of the time. The most popular method is: School -- to -- Teacher -- to -- Student. Sixty percent of the districts use this approach. The second most popular system is: Central Warehouse -- to -- School -- to -- Teacher -- to -- Student. This approach is used by 34 percent of the districts. Table 6 provides a break down of the other systems in use.

| Distribution System | Number | % of Total |
|---|--------|------------|
| School, Teacher, Student | 117 | 60% |
| Central Warehouse, School, Teacher, Student | 67 | 34% |
| Central Warehouse, School, Student | 3 | 2% |
| Central Warehouse, Teacher, Student | 1 | 1% |
| Materials Center, Student | 1 | 1% |
| Library, Student | 1 | 1% |
| School, Department Head, Teacher, Student | 1 | 1% |
| Non Response | 4 | 2% |
| Total | 195 | 100% |

Table 6 Types of Distribution Systems Utilized

| Enrollment Grouping - Total count by category | Total | School, Teacher, Student | Warehouse, School, Teacher, Student | Warehouse, School, Student | Warehouse, Teacher, Student | Other Systems |
|--|-------|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|
| Below 2,000 | 50 | 36 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 2,000-3,999 | 51 | 36 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 4,000-4,999 | 21 | 15 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5,000-9,999 | 35 | 19 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 10,000-14,999 | 14 | 1 | 13 | Ō | 0 | 0 |
| 15,000-19,999 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20,000-24,999 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 25,000-49,999 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 50,000-99,999 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100,000 and up | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nonresponse | 5 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 195 | 116 | 67 | 3 | 1 | 8 |

| Enrollment Grouping As % of Row Total | Total | School, Teacher, Student | Warehouse, School, Teacher, Student | Warehouse, School, Student | Warehouse, Teacher, Student | Other Systems |
|--|-------|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|
| Below 2,000 | 100% | 72% | 20% | 2% | 0% | 6% |
| 2,000-3,999 | 100% | 71% | 22% | 2% | 2% | 4% |
| 4,000-4,999 | 100% | 71% | 29% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| 5,000-9,999 | 100% | 54% | 37% | 0% | 0% | 9% |
| 10,000-14,999 | 100% | 7% | 93% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| 15,000-19,999 | 100% | 67% | 33% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| 20,000-24,999 | 100% | 25% | 75% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| 25,000-49,999 | 100% | 17% | 67% | 17% | 0% | 0% |
| 50,000-99,999 | 100% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| 100,000 and up | 100% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Nonresponse | 100% | 40% | 60% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Total | 100% | 59 % | 34% | 2% | 1% | 4% |

| Enrollment Grouping As % of Col. Total | Total | School, Teacher, Student | Warehouse, School, Teacher, Student | Warehouse, School, Student | Warehouse, Teacher, Student | Other Systems |
|---|-------|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|
| Below 2,000 | 26% | 31% | 15% | 33% | 0% | 38% |
| 2,000-3,999 | 26% | 31% | 16% | 33% | 100% | 25% |
| 4,000-4,999 | 11% | 13% | 9% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| 5,000-9,999 | 18% | 16% | 19% | 0% | 0% | 38% |
| 10,000-14,999 | 7% | 1% | 19% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| 15,000-19,999 | 3% | 3% | 3% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| 20,000-24,999 | 2% | 1% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| 25,000-49,999 | 3% | 1% | 6% | 33% | 0% | 0% |
| 50,000-99,999 | 1% | 0% | 3% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| 100,000 and up | 1% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Nonresponse | 3% | 2% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

Table 7 Types of systems in use by enrollment size

Table 7 details the impact of district size on the types of systems in use. Larger districts tend to use : Central Warehouse -- to -- School -- to -- Teacher -- to -- Student more than smaller districts. The smaller districts favor using the School -- to -- Teacher - to -- Student method.

The survey asked for a contact name at the school/district for purposes of building a prospecting list. Respondents also provided their title. Ninety-three percent of those listing themselves as the contact completed the survey. A total of 105 titles were given. These were grouped into 11 classifications. Table 8 shows the different groupings and the percentages for each. Table 9 provides a breakdown of the title classifications based on the enrollment size of the district. Smaller districts' surveys were completed more by principals and superintendents.

| Title Classification | Count | % of Total |
|---------------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Superintendents/Asst. Superintendents | 39 | 20% |
| Curriculum/Instructional Coordinators | 37 | 19% |
| Business/Finance Personnel | 30 | 15% |
| Computer/Technology Managers | 23 | 12% |
| Textbook Coordinators | 17 | 9% |
| Administration Personnel | 14 | 7% |
| Unclassified | 12 | 6% |
| Media/Library Personnel | 11 | 6% |
| Principals | 8 | 4% |
| Elementary Education Coordinators | 3 | 2% |
| Curriculum/Instruction Coordinators | 1 | 1% |

Table 8 Jobs classifications for those completing the survey

| | | | | S | chool | Size E | ased | on En | rollme | ent | | |
|--|-------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|------|-----------------------|--------|-----|-------|-----------------|
| Title Classification | Total | Below 2,000 | 2,000- 3,999 | 4,000- 4,999 | 5,000- 9,999 | - | - | 20,000 - 24,999 | - | - | 0 and | Nonres ponse |
| Administration Personnel | 14 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | 2 | | | |
| Business/Finance Personnel | 30 | 15 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| Computer/Technology Managers | 23 | 1 | 10 | 2 | 7 | | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Curriculum/Instruction Coordinators | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | _ |
| Curriculum/Instructional Coordinators | 37 | 8 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 1 | | | | 2 |
| Elementary Education Coordinators | 3 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | |
| Media/Library Personnel | 11 | 1 | 5 | | 1 | 3 | 1 | | | | | |
| Principals | 8 | 4 | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | 1 | |
| Superintendents/Asst. Superintendents | 39 | 10 | 12 | 6 | 8 | 3 | | | | | | |
| Textbook Coordinators | 17 | 3 | 1 | | 3 | 2 | - | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 2 |
| Unclassified | 12 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | | | 1 | | | | |
| Total | 195 | 50 | 51 | 21 | 35 | 14 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 5 |

Table 9 Titles of those completing survey broken down by enrollment size

Automated Versus Manual

Manual textbook management systems are in place at 84 percent of the districts in the sample. Only 30 -- approximately 16 percent -- of the districts are using automated systems. From this information we can conclude with 95 percent confidence that between 86.6 and 81.3 percent of NCS's customers have no automated system for textbook management. Hence, between 806 and 757 customers of NCS do not have automated systems.

Districts using automated systems tend to be larger. For instance, the average number of schools per district in the automated group is 20 compared to only 10 for those using manual systems. The median number of schools per district in the automated group is 11 compared to for 7 those using manual systems. Enrollment at automated districts averages 25,014 and the median is 8,869. Average teacher count is 1,417, and the median is 438. Districts with manual systems average 5,004 students, and 339 teachers. The median enrollment at district with manual systems is 3,200, and the median teacher count is 218. The average number of teachers per student is 19.3 at districts in the automated group versus 14.3 for those in the manual group. The average loss per district for those using automated systems is \$10,638, versus \$4,364 at schools with manual systems.

SECTION II RESULTS -- AUTOMATED GROUP

At this point the focus will turn to a summary of the responses for those in the automated group. Respondents in this group completed Section I and Section II of the survey. It is necessary to deal with this data separately due to variances in the questions. As previously stated, only 16 percent of the respondents -- 30 districts -- use automated textbook management systems.

Limitations With Current System

Sixty percent of the districts in the automated group noted limitations with their current systems. The range of limitations was varied. The most frequently mentioned limitation was lack of an interface with their student management systems. However, this was only mentioned three times. Other limitations referred to included: cost, lack of flexibility, no fee tracking, no tracking books to teacher level, and poor reporting capability. Appendix 3 contains a complete listing of the comments regarding limitations.

Hardware/Software in Use

| CIMS III Dease 4 Developers Edition Financial Management System/NCR Follet Textbook Plus 6.3 Hayes Textbook Inventory Hayes Textbook Inventory Hayes Textbook Inventory Hayes Textbook Inventory Hayes Textbook Inventory | Text Hardware IBM AS/400 IBM PC OR Compatible IBM AS/400 IBM PC OR Compatible IBM PC OR Compatible IBM PC OR Compatible | Yes No No Yes | Inventory Yes Yes No | Teacher Track Yes No | Student Track Yes No | inter Loan No | with Student Yes | On⊣ine Yes | | Total Festures |
|---|---|------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|-----|-------------------|
| CIMS III Dase 4 Developers Edition Financial Management System/NCR Follet Textbook Plus 6.3 Hayes Textbook Inventory Hayes Textbook Inventory Hayes Textbook Inventory Hayes Textbook Inventory Hayes Textbook Inventory | IBM AS/400 IBM PC OR Compatible IBM AS/400 IBM PC OR Compatible IBM PC OR Compatible IBM PC OR Compatible | Yes No No Yes | Yes Yes | Yes No | Yes | | | | | |
| Dease 4 Developers Edition Financial Management System/NCR Follet Textbook Plus 6.3 Hayes Textbook Inventory Hayes Textbook Inventory Hayes Textbook Inventory Hayes Textbook Inventory Hayes Textbook Inventory | IBM PC OR Compatible IBM AS/400 IBM PC OR Compatible IBM PC OR Compatible IBM PC OR Compatible | No No Yes | Yes | No | | No | Yes | Vaal | | |
| inancial Management System/NCR Follet Textbook Plus 6.3 Hayes Textbook Inventory Hayes Textbook Inventory Hayes Textbook Inventory Hayes Textbook Inventory HS Circulation Plus | IBM AS/400 IBM PC OR Compatible IBM PC OR Compatible IBM PC OR Compatible | No Yes | | | No | | | res | | |
| Follet Textbook Plus 6.3 Hayes Textbook Inventory Hayes Textbook Inventory Hayes Textbook Inventory Hayes Textbook Inventory HS Circulation Plus | IBM PC OR Compatible IBM PC OR Compatible IBM PC OR Compatible | Yes | No | | | No | No | No | Yes | 2 |
| Hayes Textbook Inventory Hayes Textbook Inventory Hayes Textbook Inventory Hayes Textbook Inventory HS Circulation Plus | IBM PC OR Compatible IBM PC OR Compatible | | | No | No | No | No | No | No | 0 |
| Hayes Textbook Inventory Hayes Textbook Inventory Hayes Textbook Inventory HS Circulation Plus | IBM PC OR Compatible | | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | 5 |
| Hayes Textbook Inventory Hayes Textbook Inventory HS Circulation Plus | | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 |
| Hayes Textbook Inventory HS Circulation Plus | | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | 4 |
| IS Circulation Plus | IBM PC OR Compatible | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | 6 |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | Macintosh | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | 7 |
| n House Software | IBM PC OR Compatible | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | 3 |
| | 200/500 Unysis | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 5 |
| n House Software | IBM AS/400 | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | 1 |
| n House Software | IBM AS/400 | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | 5 |
| n House Software | IBM RISC 6000 | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | 1 |
| n House Software | In-house System | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yeş | 4 |
| MacSchool | Macintosh | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | 3 |
| Aicrosoft Office | IBM PC OR Compatible | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | 1 |
| Duattro Pro | IBM PC OR Compatible | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | 1 |
| 5&S | IBM PC OR Compatible | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Ö |
| System Developed In-House | IBM 9221 | No | Yeş | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | 3 |
| ennessee Instr. Res. Center System | IBM PC OR Compatible | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | 4 |
| Fext Trak (K-8) And Excel | IBM PC OR Compatible | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | 2 |
| extbook Inventory - Hayes Associates | IBM PC OR Compatible | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | 7 |
| Trims | IBM PC OR Compatible | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | 6 |
| Jnknown | IBM PC OR Compatible | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | 5 |
| Jnknown | IBM PC OR Compatible | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | 4 |
| | IBM PC OR Compatible | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | 0 |
| | IBM PC OR Compatible | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | 2 |
| | IBM PC OR Compatible | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | 1 |
| | Macintosh | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | 1 |
| Total Including Fea | | 9 | 24 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 10 | 11 | 17 | |
| % of Total that have this | | 30% | 80% | 30% | 30% | 17% | 33% | | 57% | |

Table 10 Feature of systems currently in use

There is little consistency in the choice of hardware and software currently in use for managing textbooks. Table 10 provides a complete breakdown of systems currently in use. The 30 respondents identified 24 separate systems. IBM compatible personnel computers operate 19 of these systems. Five districts use software developed in-house, and four use Hayes Textbook Inventory. None of the software systems currently in use have all the features included in Gateway's system. Eighty-three percent of the programs include tracking of inventory. Ability to check the district inventory level before ordering books is included with 57 percent, and 33 percent of the programs include tracking

textbooks to individual teachers. On-line textbook requisitioning is included with 40% of the programs. The Hayes' Textbook Inventory program has the most features in comparison to Gateway's. This system has seven of eight key features included in Gateway's, and it includes a purchasing database. Several respondents also indicated their system contained features not listed in the answers. These other features include:

- Purchase Orders for Textbooks
- Purchasing Database
- Automated State Reports & Requisitions
- Fines for Schools
- Ordering/Receiving
- Membership Reports

Respondents also use a wide variety of student management software. Fifteen different student management systems are in use. The SIMS program is in place at 20 percent of the districts, and 17 percent are using CIMS III. Ten percent use the package offered by Columbia MacMillan McGraw Hill. Only 33 percent of the textbook management systems interface to the districts' student management systems.

Rank of Features

Question 9 in Section II asked respondents to rank the importance of possible enhancements to their systems. Table 11 provides a summary of the responses. The highest ranking enhancement was the ability to track textbooks to individual teachers. Fifty percent of respondents included this feature in their rankings. Tracking to the student level, inputting using bar coding and having an interface with the student management system were each mentioned 40 percent of the time.

| | | | | | | | 1 | Rank | king | Posit | ion | · | |
|----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|-------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|
| | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | 9th | 10th | Total Times Ranked | % of Times Category Was Ranked | Average Ranking |
| Teacher Track | 4 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | ō | 0 | 0 | 15 | 50.0% | 2.62 |
| Student Track | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 40.0% | 2.91 |
| Bar Coding | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 40.0% | 2.64 |
| Interface with Student | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 40.0% | 2.09 |
| Online | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 36.7% | 3.10 |
| Inventory | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 30.0% | 1.50 |
| Fees/Fines | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 26.7% | 3.14 |
| Inter-building LOan | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 26.7% | 3.00 |
| Charge | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 20.0% | 3.33 |
| Check District | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 20.0% | 4.00 |
| Other1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13.3% | 1.00 |
| Flexible Report Writer | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6.7% | 1.00 |
| Tracking Boxes with Bar Codes | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.3% | 1.00 |
| Flexible Field Inputs | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 1.00 |
| Total | 40 | 14 | 18 | 17 | 10 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 106 | | |

<u>Note</u>: Respondents were asked to rank features from 1-7, and were given room to fill in other features.

Some respondents ranked items equally important by using 1 as their rank for all items.

Table 11 Ranking of importance of possible system enhancements

Availability of Funds

| Considering Change? | Fun | ds Avai | lable | Funds | s Forthc | oming | Funds Could Be Møde Availøble | | | |
|---------------------|----------|---------|-------|-------|----------|-------|----------------------------------|---------------------|-------|--|
| Total Count | Yes | No | Total | Yes | No | Total | Yes | No | Total | |
| Yes | 2 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 2 | . 4 | 6 | |
| No | 2 | 22 | 24 | 2 | 22 | 24 | 7 | <u> </u> | 24 | |
| Total | <u>i</u> | 26 | 30 | 5 | 25 | 30 | 9 | 21 | 30 | |
| Considering Change? | Fun | ds Avai | lable | Funds | s Forthc | oming | | ds Coul le Avail | | |
| Row Percentages | Yes | No | Total | Yes | No | Total | Yes | No | Total | |
| Yes | 33% | 67% | 100% | 50% | 50% | 100% | 33% | 67% | 100% | |
| No | 8% | 92% | 100% | 8% | 92% | 100% | 29% | 71% | 100% | |
| Total | 13% | 87% | 100% | 17% | 83% | 100% | 30% | 70% | 100% | |
| Considering Change? | Fun | ds Avai | lable | Funds | Forthc | oming | Contraction and the second | ds Coul le Avail | | |
| Col. Percentages | Yes | No | Total | Yes | No | Total | Yes | No | Total | |
| Yes | 50% | 15% | 20% | 60% | 12% | 20% | 22% | 19% | 20% | |
| No | 50% | 85% | 80% | 40% | 88% | 80% | 78% | 81% | 80% | |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | |

Table 12 Considering changing textbook system cross tabulated with funds availability

Only 20 percent -- 6 respondents -- of the districts with automated systems are considering changing their current system. Table 12 summarizes fund availability for those considering changing their systems. Only two districts considering a change have funds available. However, 3 others indicate funds are forthcoming, and 1 indicates funds are available if the system is cost justified. Of those not considering a change, only 8 percent indicate funds are available or forthcoming.

The Appeal of the System

Table 13 provides information for responses to the question regarding the appeal of a system with components similar to Gateway's. Favorable responses -- fairly appealing or better -- came from 70 percent of the respondents. Ten percent of the respondents were neutral, and 13 percent indicated a system such as Gateway's had little appeal.

| Overall Appeal | Total | % of Total |
|----------------------|-------|---------------|
| Very Appealing | 16 | 53% |
| Fairly Appealing | 5 | 17% |
| Neutral Appealing | 3 | 10% |
| Not so Appealing | 1 | 3% |
| Not At All Appealing | 3 | 10% |
| Non Response | 2 | 7% |
| Total | 30 | 100% |

Table 13 Summary of how appealing system is

Tables 27 through 32 in Appendix 3 provide information regarding the following cross

tabulations:

| | Cross Tabulated With Questions About |
|--|---|
| How Appealing (Question 10 Section II) | Enrollment (Question 7, Section 1) |
| How Appealing (Question 10 Section II) | Number of Schools in District (Question 6, Section I) |
| How Appealing (Question 10 Section II) | Considering Change (Question 11, Section II) |
| How Appealing (Question 10 Section II) | Are Funds Available (Question 12, Section II) |
| How Appealing (Question 10 Section II) | Are Funds Forthcoming (Question 13, Section II) |
| How Appealing (Question 10 Section II) | Can Funds be Made Available (Question 14, Section II) |

A summary of conclusions drawn from these cross tabulations is below.

- Larger schools tend to favor a system like Gateway's.
- Districts with less than ten *schools* found the system very appealing over 80 percent of the time. Districts with over 10 schools were more likely to find the system less appealing, yet over 50% of these district still ranked the system as fairly or very appealing.

- Eighty-three percent of the schools *considering a change* find the system very appealing. Only 46 percent of those *not considering a change* find the system very appealing, and 21 percent find it *fairly appealing*.
- Of those considering a change who *have funds available*, 100 percent rate the system as *fairly appealing* or higher. Likewise, of those who say funds are forthcoming, 100 percent rate the system as *fairly appealing* or better.

However, the reader should be cautioned that conclusions drawn from this data can not be

made with a high level of confidence due to the small sample size.

| | | | | | | | A | /er | age Los | s p | er distri | ict | | | |
|------------------|---------------------|----|------------------|------------------------------------|---------|----|--------|---------|---------|--------------------|-------------------------|-----|------------------------------|----|-------|
| Enrollment Group | Enroliment Group | | for proliment | Very Fairly Appealing Appealing | | | | Neutral | | Not So ppealing | Not At All Appealing | | Non- Response T Appeal | | |
| Below 2,000 | 6 | \$ | 7,500 | \$ | 11,125 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 500 | \$ | - |
| 2,000-3,999 | 4 | \$ | 6,875 | \$ | 7,500 | \$ | 5,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | • | \$ | 7,500 |
| 4,000-4,999 | 3 | \$ | 467 | \$ | 467 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 5,000-9,999 | 4 | \$ | 4,250 | \$ | - | \$ | 7,500 | \$ | 2,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 10,000-14,999 | 5 | \$ | 5, 9 00 | \$ | 7,500 | \$ | 10,000 | \$ | 12,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 15,000-19,999 | 0 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 20,000-24,999 | 1 | \$ | 15,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 15,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | _ |
| 25,000-49,999 | 4 | \$ | 20,938 | \$ | 11,250 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 50,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 50,000-99,999 | 2 | \$ | 50,000 | \$ | 100,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 100,000 and up | 1 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | | | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Nonresponse | 0 | \$ | • | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | • | \$ | • | \$ | • | \$ | - |
| Average | | \$ | 10,084 | \$ | 12,531 | \$ | 2,045 | \$ | 2,636 | \$ | 5,000 | \$ | 45 | \$ | 682 |

| | | | | | Count of F | Responses | | |
|------------------|----------------|--|-------------------|---------------------|------------|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Enrollment Group | Total Count | Average Cost for Enroliment Group | Very Appealing | Fairty Appealing | Neutral | Not So Appealing | Not At All Appealing | Non- Response To Appeal |
| Below 2,000 | 6 | \$ 7,500 | 4 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| 2,000-3,999 | 4 | \$ 6,875 | 2 | 1 | | | - | 1 |
| 4,000-4,999 | 3 | \$ 467 | 3 | | | | | |
| 5,000-9,999 | 4 | \$ 4,250 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | |
| 10,000-14,999 | 5 | \$ 5,900 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 2 | |
| 15,000-19,999 | 0 | | | | | | | |
| 20,000-24,999 | 1 | \$ 15,000 | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| 25,000-49,999 | 4 | \$ 20,938 | 3 | | | 1 | | |
| 50,000-99,999 | 2 | \$ 50,000 | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| 100,000 and up | 1 | \$- | 1 | | | | | |
| Nonresponse | 0 | \$- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 30 | | 16 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 |

Table 14 Appeal of system based on enrollment group an estimated losses

Table 14 summarizes the differences between the appeal of a system like Gateway's to by enrollment group and average estimated loss. The average loss per district of those who found the system very appealing is \$12,531. Districts who found the system less appealing had much lower average losses.

SECTION III RESULTS -- MANUAL GROUP

Make Up of Manual Respondents

As stated earlier, 165 -- 84 percent -- of those completing the survey are currently using manual textbook management systems. Districts in this group have an average of 9.8 schools, and the median is 7.0. Average enrollment is 5,004, and the median for enrollment is 3,200. Districts with manual systems average of 14.8 students per teacher. The average annual district cost for lost or damaged textbooks is \$4,364. The average annual cost per student for lost or damaged textbooks is \$1.68.

Student Management Software/Hardware

Table 27 in Appendix 4 provides a breakdown of the various student management software systems in use. The most popular system in use is CIMS III. SIMS is the second most popular system. Fifty-seven percent of the districts in this group use CIMS III, and 11 percent use SIMS. Seventy-three percent of those running CIMS III run it on an IBM AS/400. Overall, 65% of the student software systems are being run on IBM AS/400 systems. Sixteen percent are using the IBM System/36, and 11% use personal computers.

Importance of Interface

Table 15 provides a summary of the responses to Question 3 in Section III. This question dealt with the importance of having an interface between the textbook and student management systems. Those currently using manual systems indicated 68 percent of the time it was very important for the systems to be linked. Overall, 82 percent of the responses were above neutral. Only four percent responded that it was not so important or not at all important.

| Interface Importance | NO. | % of Total |
|----------------------|-----|------------|
| Very Important | 112 | 68% |
| Fairly Important | 23 | 14% |
| Neutral Important | 11 | 7% |
| Not So Important | 2 | 1% |
| Not At All Important | 5 | 3% |
| Nonresponse | 12 | 7% |
| Total | 165 | 100% |

Table 15 Importance of Interface with user of manual systems

Features Ranking

| | ĺ | | | | | Ra | nking | S | | | | |
|--|-----------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|-----|-----|------|----|
| Feature | Average F | lank | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | . 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Inventory of Textbooks | 1.86 | No. | 84 | 31 | 31 | 10 | 11 | 14 | 17 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| | • | % | 42% | 15% | 15% | 5% | 5% | 7% | 8% | 0% | - 0% | 0% |
| Tracking to Teachers | 3.07 | No. | 26 | 31 | 14 | 23 | 13 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | % | 21% | 25% | 11% | 19% | 10% | 7% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Tracking to Student | 3.12 | No. | 36 | 17 | 31 | 15 | 9 | 7 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u> </u> | | % | 27% | 13% | 23% | 11% | 7% | 5% | 11% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Input using Bar Coding | 3.21 | No. | 42 | 20 | 12 | 14 | 14 | 9 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| ······ | | % | 33% | 15% | 9% | 11% | 11% | 7% | 9% | 2% | 0% | 0% |
| Interface with Student Management System | 3.39 | No. | 28 | 17 | 12 | 16 | 11 | 15 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| | | % | 25% | 15% | 11% | 14% | 10% | 14% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Check District for Availability | 3.88 | No. | 27 | 14 | 10 | 10 | 13 | 20 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| •••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••• | | % | 23% | 12% | 9% | 9% | 11% | 17% | 15% | 1% | 0% | 0% |
| On-line Requisitioning Capability | 4.16 | No. | 18 | 8 | 17 | 5 | 13 | 14 | 19 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| | | % | 18% | 8% | 17% | 5% | 13% | 14% | 19% | 0% | 2% | 0% |
| Ability to track Student Fees | 4.17 | No. | 21 | 5 | 4 | 15 | 16 | 9 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| | | % | 23% | 6% | 4% | 17% | 18% | 10% | 12% | 2% | 1% | 2% |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Requisitioning Textbooks | 4.48 | No. | 6 | 6 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| | | % | 10% | 10% | 16% | 10% | 10% | 13% | 22% | 2% | 0% | 2% |
| Inter-building Loans | 4.86 | No. | 28 | 17 | 12 | 16 | 11 | 15 | 7 | O | 0 | 1 |
| | | % | 25% | 15% | 11% | 14% | 10% | 13% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 1% |

Note: This question asked respondents to rank features from 1-7. Some respondents ranked the features equally in some cases. For instance, all features were ranked with 1 meaning they are equally important.

Table 16 Results of ranking of features by those using manual textbook systems

Table 16 provides a summary of responses to Question 4 in Section III. This question asked respondents to rank the features of an automated textbook system in order of importance. Results are tightly bunched; the standard deviation of the rankings is only 0.87. The highest ranking features relate to tracking of inventory. *General inventorying*,

tracking inventory to teachers, and tracking inventory to students make up the top three categories. Input using bar code scanners ranks fourth. However, it received the second highest number of 1 rankings. Interfacing with the student management system ranks fifth.

Appeal of System

Table 17 provides a summary of results for Questions 5, in Section III. This question asked respondents to rank the appeal of a system with features similar to Gateway's. Favorable responses came from 71 percent of the respondents. Unfavorable responses totaled 7 percent. Neutral or nonresponse totaled 22 percent.

| Appeal of System | NO. | % of Total |
|----------------------|-----|------------|
| Very Appealing | 69 | 42% |
| Fairly Appealing | 48 | 29% |
| Neutral | 28 | 17% |
| Not So Appealing | 3 | 2% |
| Not at All Appealing | 8 | 5% |
| Nonresponse | 9 | 5% |
| Total | 165 | 100% |

Table 17 Appeal of System to those currently using manual systems

Tables 34-39 in Appendix 4 contain data showing results of the following cross tabulations:

| | Cross Tabulated With Questions About |
|--|--|
| How Appealing (Question 5 Section III) | Enrollment (Question 7, Section 1) |
| How Appealing (Question 5 Section III) | Number of Schools in District (Question 6, Section I) |
| How Appealing (Question 5 Section III) | Number of Teachers in District (Question 8, Section I) |
| How Appealing (Question 5 Section III) | Cost Per Student (Question 11, Section I) |
| How Appealing (Question 5 Section III) | Considering Change (Question 6. Section III) |
| How Appealing (Question 5 Section III) | When will Change Occur (Question 7. Section III) |

These cross tabulations were performed to help determine if there is a driving factor in

the level of appeal of the system. Conclusions drawn from these tables are given below:

- A higher percentage of favorable responses came from districts with 10 or more *schools*.
- Districts with over 10,000 students are more likely to rank the system very appealing than smaller districts. Schools with less than 3,000 students had a higher percentage of neutral responses.
- Districts with over 750 *teachers* favored the systems 86 percent of the time. The second highest category was districts with between 400-750 teachers.
- Those considering buying new systems responded favorably to a system with the features like Gateway's 100 percent of the time. Those not considering a purchase favored the system 64 percent of the time.
- Those who indicate they plan to purchase a new system within 12-24 months indicated 100% of the time that a system like Gateway's is very appealing. Those who intend to buy a new system within 12-24 months selected very appealing 94% of the time. Low responses came from those who did not know when they might consider buying a new system.

| | | | Average Loss per district | | | | | | |
|------------------|-------|--|---------------------------|---------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Enrollment Group | Count | Average Cost for Enroliment Group | Very Appealing | Fairly Appealing | Neutral | Not So Appealing | Not At Ail Appealing | Non- Response To Appeal | |
| Below 2,000 | 44 | \$ 931 | \$ 1,164 | \$ 1,106 | \$ 554 | \$ 300 | \$ 650 | \$ - | |
| 2,000-3,999 | 47 | \$ 3,009 | \$ 5,242 | \$ 1,589 | \$1,422 | \$ - | \$ 2,500 | \$ 2,917 | |
| 4,000-4,999 | 18 | \$ 4 ,539 | \$ 8,167 | \$ 1,250 | \$ 600 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 2,000 | |
| 5,000-9,999 | 31 | \$ 6,489 | \$ 9,771 | \$ 2,436 | \$3,750 | \$ - | \$ 1,000 | \$ - | |
| 10,000-14,999 | 9 | \$ 16,444 | \$19,714 | \$10,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| 15,000-19,999 | 6 | \$ 7,142 | \$ 3,250 | \$18,177 | \$ - | \$ - | \$- | \$ - | |
| 20,000-24,999 | 3 | \$ 3,833 | \$ 3,833 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| 25,000-49,999 | 2 | \$ 10,000 | \$20,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| 50,000-99,999 | 0 | \$- | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| 100,000 and up | 0 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Nonresponse | 5 | \$ 7,400 | \$ 6,333 | \$15,000 | \$3,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$- | |
| Average | 165 | \$ 5,435 | \$ 7,043 | \$ 4,505 | \$ 848 | \$ 27 | \$ 377 | \$ 447 | |

| | | | | Count of Responses | | | | | |
|------------------|----------------|---------|--|--------------------|---------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Enrollment Group | Total Count | C En | lverage lost for rollment Group | Very Appealing | Fairly Appealing | Neutral | Not So Appealing | Not At All Appealing | Non- Response To Appeal |
| Below 2,000 | 44 | \$ | 931 | 11 | 18 | 12 | 1 | 2 | |
| 2,000-3,999 | 47 | \$ | 3,009 | 16 | 14 | 9 | | 2 | 6 |
| 4,000-4,999 | 18 | \$ | 4,539 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 5,000-9,999 | 31 | \$ | 6,489 | 17 | 7 | 4 | | 3 | |
| 10,000-14,999 | 9 | \$ | 16,444 | 7 | 1 | | | | 1 |
| 15,000-19,999 | 6 | \$ | 7,142 | 2 | 2 | | 1 | | 1 |
| 20,000-24,999 | 3 | \$ | 3,833 | 3 | | | | | |
| 25,000-49,999 | 2 | \$ | 10,000 | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| 50,000-99,999 | 0 | \$ | - | | | | | | |
| 100,000 and up | 0 | \$ | | | | | | | |
| Nonresponse | 5 | \$ | 7,400 | 3 | . 1 | 1 | | | |
| Total | 165 | | | 69 | 48 | 28 | 3 | 8 | 9 |

 Table 18 Appeal with cost per district

Table 18 details the appeal of a system with features like Gateway's to those with losses associated with damaged or lost textbooks. The average of those who found the system *very appealing* is \$7,043 versus \$4,505 for those who found it *fairly appealing*. Furthermore, districts with lower average losses found the system less appealing than those with larger average losses.

Considering Purchase

Twenty percent of the respondents indicate they are considering purchasing an automated textbook management system. Table 19 provides the distribution of when schools might be considering buying an automated system. Of those who indicated they intend to buy a new system, 79 percent intend to buy one within 24 months. The remaining 21 percent expect to purchase one within 48 months. The majority of those who indicated their district was not considering purchasing a new system also had no idea when they might consider buying a system.

| When Might They Purchase | Considering Purchase | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|-----|-----|------------------|--|
| Total Count by Category | Total | Yes | | Non- response | |
| Within 12 Months | 10 | 9 | 1 | 0 | |
| Between 13-24 Months | 18 | 17 | 1 | 0 | |
| Between 25-48 Months | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | |
| Over 48 Months | 8 | 2 | 6 | 0 | |
| Unknown | 124 | 0 | 112 | 12 | |
| Total | 165 | 33 | 120 | 12 | |

| When Might They Purchase | | Considering Purchase | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|----------------------|-----|------------------|
| Expressed As % of Row Total | Total | Yes | | Non- response |
| Within 12 Months | 100% | 90% | 10% | 0% |
| Between 13-24 Months | 100% | 94% | 6% | 0% |
| Between 25-48 Months | 100% | 100% | 0% | 0% |
| Over 48 Months | 100% | 25% | 75% | 0% |
| Unknown | 100% | 0% | 90% | 10% |
| Total | 100% | 20% | 73% | 7% |

| When Might They Purchase | | Considering Purchase | | |
|------------------------------|-------|----------------------|------|------------------|
| Expressed As % of Col. Total | Total | Yes | | Non- response |
| Within 12 Months | 6% | 27% | 1% | 0% |
| Between 13-24 Months | 11% | 52% | 1% | 0% |
| Between 25-48 Months | 3% | 15% | 0% | 0% |
| Over 48 Months | 5% | 6% | 5% | 0% |
| Unknown | 75% | 0% | 93% | 100% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

Table 19 When Might District Consider Change

PROSPECT LISTS

One of the objectives of this survey was to build sales prospect lists. Building prospect lists serves a dual purpose. First, it meets a requirement of the sponsor of this project. Second, it provides another measure of the amount of interest in Gateway's Textbook Management Software. If there are a high number of serious prospects we can conclude there also is a high degree of interest in Gateway's software thereby helping prove the overall thesis statement.

To build the lists, prospects were separated into three categories: hot, warm, and cold. In addition, consistent with the results, there were two sets of reports created -- one for those currently using automated systems and one for those using manual systems. Once again, this division was necessary due to differences in the questions that each group faced. Prospects also were sorted by the estimated amount of losses per district. Prospects with higher estimated losses were moved forward in the group. This category was not used to qualify prospects because of the number of nonresponses received. However, we know from earlier discussions that districts with higher losses find a system with features like Gateway's more appealing. Therefore, when sales prospecting occurs these districts should be contacted first.

Prospects from Automated Group

Appendix 5 contains prospecting reports for those currently using automated systems. Table 20 provides the criteria used to separate the prospects. Each prospect must have some degree of fund availability. Without fund availability there is no chance of making a sale. To meet this requirement respondents had to answer *yes* to one of the three questions regarding the availability of funds. Prospects also were required to be *considering a change to their current system*. Hot prospects were required to be using the IBM AS/400. Hot prospects also had to answer the question regarding the appeal of a system with features like Gateway's with a high degree of favor. Warm prospects had to be using either the IBM AS/400 or the IBM System/36. System/36 users are longer term prospects; therefore, they were included in the warm category. If a district indicated it was considering a change but it was not using the IBM AS/400 or IBM System/36, it was rolled into the cold prospect group.

| | | Criteria | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Question | Hot Prospect | Warm Prospect | Cold Prospect |
| Hardware used for Student Management or Textbook Management System | IBM AS/400 | IBM AS/400 or IBM System/36 | Any Response |
| Appeal of System with Features Like Gateway's | Very Appealing Fairly Appealing | Very Appealing Fairly Appealing Neutral | Very Appealing Fairly Appealing Neutral |
| Considering a Change | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Funds Available? Funds Forthcoming? Funds Could Be Available? | Answered <u>YES</u> to 1 of the 3 Questions | Answered <u>YES</u> to 1 of the 3 Questions | Answered <u>YES</u> to 1 of the 3 Questions |
| Current System has Limitations? | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Table 20 Prospecting criteria for users of automated systems

Seven out of 30 -- or 23 percent -- of the automated respondents qualified as prospects. One respondent qualifies as a hot prospect. There are three warm prospects, and three cold prospects. If we apply what we learned from our sample to the overall

population we can determine an estimate for the total number of prospects in the customer base. Remember that 16 percent of the respondents have automated systems, therefore, we can assume with 95 percent confidence that on average 16 percent of NCS's customer base currently use an automated system to manage their textbooks. The total number of customers in the population is 931. Earlier we concluded that 806 to 757 NCS customers do not have automated systems, therefore 125 to 174 customers do use them. Further, if we apply the 23 percent prospect rate, we conclude that there are 28 to 40 prospects from the pool of customers currently using automated systems.

Prospects from Manual Group

Table 21 provides a breakdown of the criteria used to develop prospects from respondents using manual management systems. Appendix 6 contains a copy of the reports. Similar to the automated criteria, prospects in this group had to be *considering a change*. In addition, they had to acknowledge that a system with features similar to Gateway's was at least *fairly appealing*. Hot prospects were required to be using an IBM AS/400, and had to be considering a change within 24 months. Warm prospects were required to be using either the IBM AS/400 or the IBM System/36, and had to be considering a change within 25 to 48 months. Cold prospects were included because they were considering a change and found a system with features like Gateway's *very appealing*. However, none of the ten cold prospects are using an IBM AS/400 or IBM System/36 for their student management system. This does not preclude them from using the system for other projects.

| | | Criteria | |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Question | Hot Prospect | Warm Prospect | Cold Prospect |
| Hardware used for Student Management | IBM AS/400 | IBM AS/400 or IBM System/36 | Any Response |
| Appeal of System with Features Like Gateway's | Very Appealing | Very Appealing Fairly Appealing | Very Appealing |
| Considering Purchasing Automated System | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| When Might Purchase Occur | Within 12 Mths Between 13-24 Mths | Between 25-48 Mths Over 48 Mths | Any Response |

Table 21 Criteria for prospects from those using manual textbook management systems

The criteria in Table 21 produced 33 prospects -- 18 hot, 5 warm, and 10 cold. Twenty percent of the total respondents using manual systems made it into the prospect lists. This is consistent with the percentage of those making it onto the automated prospecting lists. Again if we apply this percentage to our assumption regarding the total population, we can conclude that there are between 161 and 151 prospects from this group of customers. Furthermore, we can now conclude with 95 percent confidence that there are between 201 and 179 prospects for Gateway within NCS's total customer base.

INTEREST IN THE SYSTEM

The general purpose of this project was to determine whether there is interest in the marketplace for an enhanced version of Gateway's textbook management system. Now that we understand the results and have built prospecting lists, we are ready to provide a more direct response to this question.

The analyses of question 10 in section II and question 5 in section III provide proof that there is interest. These two questions dealt with the appeal of system like Gateway's. Table 22 recaps the results for these questions for each group.

| Total Count | Automated Group | Manual Group | Total |
|----------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-------|
| Very Appealing | 16 | 69 | 85 |
| Fairly Appealing | 5 | 48 | 53 |
| Neutral Appealing | 3 | 28 | 31 |
| Not so Appealing | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Not At All Appealing | 3 | 8 | 11 |
| Nonresponse | 2 | 9 | 11 |
| Total | 30 | 165 | 195 |

| % by Rows | Automated Group | Manual Group | Total |
|----------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-------|
| Very Appealing | 19% | 81% | 100% |
| Fairly Appealing | 9% | 91% | 100% |
| Neutral Appealing | 10% | 90% | 100% |
| Not so Appealing | 25% | 75% | 100% |
| Not At All Appealing | 27% | 73% | 100% |
| Nonresponse | 18% | 82% | 100% |
| Total | 15% | 85% | 100% |

| % by Columns | Automated Group | Manual Group | Total |
|----------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-------|
| Very Appealing | 53% | 42% | 44% |
| Fairly Appealing | 17% | 29% | 27% |
| Neutral Appealing | 10% | 17% | 16% |
| Not so Appealing | 3% | 2% | 2% |
| Not At All Appealing | 10% | 5% | 6% |
| Nonresponse | 7% | 5% | 6% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% |

Table 22 Appeal of system with manual and automated group combined

The table shows that 71 percent of all respondents rated the system as *either fairly appealing* or *very appealing*. Fifty-three percent of the automated group and 42 percent of the manual group rated the system *very appealing*. Using a Chi-Squared test to

compare the results from the two groups, we can verify the amount of appeal the system is *not dependent* on whether a district's current system is automated. The details of this test

are given below:⁶

Hypothesis

Ho: Relative appeal of the system is independent of method of textbook control.

H_a: Relative appeal of the system is *dependent* of method of textbook control.

<u>Test</u>

Accept if $X^2 \le X^2_{.01}$ Reject if $X^2 > X^2_{.01}$

Using Microsoft's Excel spreadsheet tool for Chi-squared test yield a test statistic of 4.53. Using a significance level of .01 with 5 degrees of freedom we end up with the following result:

X2 = 4.53 $X^{2}_{.01} = 15.086$ 4.53 < 15.086

Conclusion

Accept H_o

The extremely strong responses to the questions regarding appeal indicate there is definitely interest in a system with the same functionality as Gateway's.

Furthermore, the amount of prospects generated from the sample also provides credence to the notion that there is interest in the system. Twenty-one percent of all respondents were identified as prospects. Table 23 provides data on the strength of this number by providing confindence levels for each prospect group. Within the table a success is defined as being part of the prospect lists. A recent sale of the **Textbook Management System** garnered Gateway \$40,000.⁷ If we assume Gateway generates

⁶ Statistics for Modern Business Decisions, Lawarence L. Lapin, California Statue University, San

Joes, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc. 1973, pages 339-347.

⁷ Gateway, pg. 6.

considering purchasing a new textbook system or whether they were considering changing their current system. In both cases 20 percent of the respondents were considering a new system. Eighty-three percent of those considering a change responded that a system with the same features as Gateway's was *very appealing*. Similarly, 93 percent of those considering purchasing a new system found the system *very appealing*.

In addition, we can conclude that there is significant interest in the system due to the

lack of features offered by most competitive systems. None of the systems mentioned had

all the primary features included in Gateway's. The average number of primary features

identified by respondents was only 3. Furthermore, 60 percent of the respondents in the

Table 23 Confidence levels for percentage of prospects at 95% confidence (Success = being included in prospect list)

One of the primary criteria used for identifying prospects was whether districts were

HotMan Warm Man Cold Man Total Manual GIOLON Hot Auto Werm Auto Cold Auto Total Auto 3 3 5 1 7 18 10 33 40 Number of Prospects 30 29 26 165 147 142 30 165 195 Sample Size 7% 3% 12% 11% 3% 10% 20% Proportion of Success 23% 21% 90% 97% 88% 77% 89% 97% 93% 80% 79% **Proportion of Failures** 30% 13% 22% 25% 10% 6% 8% 12% 11% Confidence Level +/-

sales from 10% of the total prospects then there is potential for an additional \$400,000 to \$1,280,000 in revenues. This will help Gateway continue to expand its growing revenues.

automated group indicated their current system had limitations.

fotel Al

LIMITATIONS

Sample Size

To provide guidelines regarding the strength of the conclusions drawn from our sample, it is necessary to perform statistical tests. Most tests of sample size are associated with finding out whether the sample mean or standard deviation is consistent with the total population mean or standard deviation. To perform these test, we can use numerical data gathered in the survey. Numerical data came from questions regarding the total number of schools, enrollment, teacher count, and cost of losses. However, there also are a number of tests of sample size and confidence levels that deal with *proportion of successes*. Since our overall goal was to find out if respondents were interested or not interested in the system, these tests also are applicable. Therefore, we will utilize both types of tests.

Sample size needs to be tested to determine the level of confidence we can have with our data. Using sample proportions, we can estimate sample size working with the following formula:⁸

Sample Size =
$$\underline{Z}_{\underline{2cl}}^2 \underline{p(1-p)}$$

W²

Where: <u>Z_{cl}</u> = Test Statistic based on desired Confidence *Interval* p = Proportion of successes W = Maximum allowance for error between population and sample

⁸ Business Research Methods, pg. 387.

Table 24 provides a summary of the various sample sizes needed to have a certain *level* of confidence at different confidence intervals. This table was constructed using p=50 percent. Using 50 percent as an estimate of the number of success yields a more conservative estimate of the quality of sample size. The sample size for this survey was 195. Using the table below we can conclude with 99% confidence that the margin of error for results expressed as a percentage is within + or - 5%. We can be 95% confident that the margin of error is approximately + or - 4 percent.

| | Con | fidence Inte | erval |
|---------------------|-------|--------------|-------|
| Level of Confidence | 90% | 95% | 99% |
| 1% | 2,435 | 3,457 | 4,869 |
| 2% | 609 | 864 | 1,217 |
| 3% | 271 | 384 | 541 |
| 4% | 152 | 216 | 304 |
| 5% | 97 | 138 | 195 |
| 6% | 68 | 96 | 135 |
| 7% | 50 | 71 | 99 |
| 8% | 38 | 54 | 76 |
| 9% | 30 | 43 | 60 |
| 10% | 24 | 35 | 49 |

Table 24 Sample size using proportions

Data regarding the number of schools at each district was utilized to test our sample

size using the following formula:⁹

Formula Sample Size = $(ZS/E)^2$

Where: Z = Test statistic based on confidence interval

S = Sample standard deviation

W= Size of confidence level

⁹ Ibid., pg. 386.

Table 25 provides the results of this calculation. The standard deviation for total schools is 14.24. From this table we can see that with our sample size, we can be 95 percent confident that our sample standard deviation is within at + or -2 of the total population's standard deviation. Since this number is relatively small, we can feel comfortable with the conclusions drawn from this survey.

| • · · · · · · • • • • • • • • • • • • • | fidence Inte | erval | |
|---|--------------|-------|-------|
| Level of Confidence | 90% | 95% | 99% |
| 1 | 549 | 779 | 1,097 |
| 2 | 137 | 195 | 274 |
| 3 | 61 | 87 | 122 |
| 4 | 34 | 49 | 69 |
| 5 | 22 | 31 | 44 |
| 6 | 15 | 22 | 30 |
| 7 | 11 | 16 | 22 |
| 8 | 9 | 12 | 17 |
| 9 | 7 | 10 | 14 |
| 10 | 5 | 8 | 11 |

Table 25 Sample size using standard deviation of totals schools

When statisticians deal with populations of a known size, they apply a finite population factor to reduce the sample size required. The finite population factor is calculated using the following formula:¹⁰

Formula Finite Factor = square root of (N-n)/(N-1).

Where: N = population sample size n = sample size

10 Ibid.

Table 26 shows the impact of the finite factor on the sample sizes from Table 25. The finite factor for our data equals 0.8977. The result is that we can be even more confident about the conclusion we draw from our data.

| Finite Factor | Cor | fidence Inte | erval |
|---------------------|------------|--------------|-------|
| Level of Confidence | 90% | 95% | 99% |
| 1 | 493 | 699 | 985 |
| 2 | 123 | 175 | 246 |
| 3 | 5 5 | 78 | 109 |
| 4 | 31 | 44 | 62 |
| 5 | 20 | 28 | 39 |

Table 26 Sample size using standard deviation adjusted for finite population factor

Pre-Testing

The survey was not pre-tested for two reasons. First, the core structure of the survey was taken from earlier survey's conducted by Gateway. Since these survey's were tested and verified, it was determined that this step could be foregone. Second, customer lists were not received until May. This did not allow for adequate time for pre-testing because the survey had to be mailed before the end of the school year.

Prospect Lists

Though 20 percent of the respondents ended up on the prospect lists, not all were considered hot prospects. In fact there are actually only 19 hot prospects. This represents 9.7 percent of the total respondents, and translates to between 50 and 140 hot prospects from NCS's customer base. The limitation caused by these figures is that there may not be immediate interest in the system for some of the prospects. Those on the warm and

cold lists may be interested, however, until they upgrade their systems to the IBM AS/400, they will not be able to run the program.

SUMMARY

There is no doubt that we can conclude that there is market level interest in an enhanced version of Gateway's Textbook Management System. In analyzing questions that dealt with the appeal of such a system, one would say that interest is very high. The system appears to have appeal to both customers currently using automated systems and those with manual systems. It appeals more to larger districts. Furthermore, larger districts tend to have higher estimated losses and the system appeals more to schools with larger estimated losses. Interest in the new system also is very high in districts currently considering buying a new system or upgrading their old automated system.

In addition, the level of prospects generated -- even though not all hot prospects -- also provides proof of interest in Gateway's system. Ten percent of the respondents are considered to be hot prospects. That means there is an estimated 100 hot prospects among NCS's customer base for Gateway. If they close sales with 10 percent of these customers it could potentially add \$400,000 in revenues to the company. Appendices



Master of Business Administration at Montana State University—Billings 303 Cisel Hall 1500 North 30th Street Billings, Montana 59101-0298 (406) 657-2290 (406) 657-2289 FAX

School District District Address City State Zip

I am a graduate student at the University of Montana currently working on a project for a software company that has clients nationwide. The company specializes in the development of software for K-12 school districts. The company is currently working on enhancing its textbook automation system. The system makes management of textbooks easier, and helps schools reduces expenses associated with textbooks.

To improve help improve the product, we are attempting to gain input from leading institutions like yours. We have developed the attached survey to help us collect this valuable information. The survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Completion of the survey will go faster if the person completing the survey is familiar with your current textbook circulation management and procedures.

Your responses will be kept confidential, and will not be used by anyone outside the scope of this project. We have enclosed a self addressed envelope for your convenience. Please use this envelope to return your completed survey.

The information you provide will be very helpful. We appreciate your time and effort.

Thank you

Neil A. Rixe Graduate Student University of Montana

| | | S | ection I | |
|----------|--|-------------------|-------------------|--|
| 1) 2) | Name of School Distric Address: | t: | | |
| 3) 4) | Contact Person: Position or Title: | | ······ | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| 5) | Is the Contact person the | person who con | npleted this ques | tionnaire? |
| | Yes | No (If NO ple: | ase complete the | e following) |
| | Name of person completin Title: | | | |
| 6) | How many schools are in | your district? | | |
| | High schools Junior high/middle Elementary schools | | | |
| 7) | What is your district's tota | al student enroll | ment? | |
| 8) | What is your district's tota | il teacher count | ? | |
| 9) | Does your state publish ar | n approved text | book list? | |
| | Yes | No | | |
| 10) | Which of the following be | est diagrams the | e current system | of textbook distribution in your district? |
| a) | Central Warehouse | School | Teacher | Student |
| b) | School | Teacher | Student | |
| c) | Central Warehouse | School | Student | |
| d) | Other, please specify | | | <u> </u> |
| 11) | Please estimate the <i>averag</i> district? | | of textbook dama | age and losses in your |
| | ····· | S | ection II | |
| 1) | What is the present metho | d of textbook c | ontrol in your di | istrict? |
| | Automated | Manual | None | |
| | If Ma | nuat or None g | to Section III | question #1 |

Textbook Survey

| what hardwar | e is used to run your textbook automation system? |
|---|--|
| IBM AS | 5/400 |
| IBM Sy | stem/36 |
| | or compatible |
| Macinto | |
| Other, p | lease specify |
| What student r | nanagement system is used for administration? |
| CIMS II | II |
| SASI | |
| SIMS | |
| Other pl | ease specify |
| What Hardwar | re system is used to manage your student management system? |
| IBM AS | 5/400 |
| IBM Sy | |
| IBM PC | or compatible |
| Macinto | |
| Other, p | lease specify |
| | t management software interfaced with the textbook automation system so you enter each students' name and identification? |
| | |
| not have to reYes | enter each students' name and identification? |
| not have to re- Yes What function | enter each students' name and identification?No s does your current textbook automation system have? (Check any that apply.) |
| not have to re- Yes What function Bar codi | enter each students' name and identification?No s does your current textbook automation system have? (Check any that apply.) ing capability |
| not have to re- Yes What function Bar codi Inventor | enter each students' name and identification?No s does your current textbook automation system have? (Check any that apply.) ing capability |
| not have to re- Yes What function Bar codi Inventor Tracking Tracking | enter each students' name and identification? No s does your current textbook automation system have? (Check any that apply.) ing capability g to teacher level g (check-out) to student level |
| not have to re- Yes What function Bar codi Inventor Tracking Interbui | enter each students' name and identification? No s does your current textbook automation system have? (Check any that apply.) ing capability g to teacher level g (check-out) to student level lding loans |
| not have to re- Yes What function Bar codi Inventor Tracking Interbui | enter each students' name and identification? No s does your current textbook automation system have? (Check any that apply.) ing capability g to teacher level g (check-out) to student level lding loans e to the student management system for enrollment check |
| not have to re- Yes What function Bar codi Inventor Tracking Interbui Interface On-Line | enter each students' name and identification? No s does your current textbook automation system have? (Check any that apply.) ing capability y g to teacher level g (check-out) to student level lding loans e to the student management system for enrollment check t textbook requisitioning capability |
| not have to re- Yes What function Bar codi Inventor Tracking Interbui Interface On-Line Ability t | enter each students' name and identification? No s does your current textbook automation system have? (Check any that apply.) ing capability Ty g to teacher level g (check-out) to student level lding loans e to the student management system for enrollment check textbook requisitioning capability to check district availability before ordering from an outside source |
| not have to re- Yes What function Bar codi Inventor Tracking Interbui Interface On-Line Ability t | enter each students' name and identification? No s does your current textbook automation system have? (Check any that apply.) ing capability Ty g to teacher level g (check-out) to student level lding loans e to the student management system for enrollment check textbook requisitioning capability to check district availability before ordering from an outside source to charge schools for requisitioning textbooks |
| not have to re- Yes What function Bar codi Inventor Trackin Interbui Interfact On-Line Ability (Student | enter each students' name and identification? No s does your current textbook automation system have? (Check any that apply.) ing capability Ty g to teacher level g (check-out) to student level Iding loans e to the student management system for enrollment check textbook requisitioning capability to check district availability before ordering from an outside source to charge schools for requisitioning textbooks fees/fines tracking |
| not have to re- Yes What function Bar codi Inventor Tracking Interbui Interface On-Line Ability t Student Other, p | enter each students' name and identification? No s does your current textbook automation system have? (Check any that apply.) ing capability ry g to teacher level g (check-out) to student level lding loans e to the student management system for enrollment check e textbook requisitioning capability to check district availability before ordering from an outside source to charge schools for requisitioning textbooks fees/fines tracking lease specify |
| not have to re- Yes What function Bar codi Inventor Tracking Interbui Interface On-Line Ability t Student Other, p | enter each students' name and identification? No s does your current textbook automation system have? (Check any that apply.) ing capability Ty g to teacher level g (check-out) to student level Iding loans e to the student management system for enrollment check textbook requisitioning capability to check district availability before ordering from an outside source to charge schools for requisitioning textbooks fees/fines tracking |
| not have to re- Yes What function Bar codi Inventor Tracking Interbui Interface On-Line Ability t Student Other, p | enter each students' name and identification? No s does your current textbook automation system have? (Check any that apply.) ing capability ry g to teacher level g (check-out) to student level lding loans e to the student management system for enrollment check e textbook requisitioning capability to check district availability before ordering from an outside source to charge schools for requisitioning textbooks fees/fines tracking lease specify |

······

Textbook Survey

- 9) What enhancements would you like in your textbook automation system. Please rank the top five enhancements in the order of importance to your district with number 1 being <u>most</u> <u>important</u>.
 - ____Bar coding capability
 - Inventory
 - _____Tracking to teacher level
 - _____Tracking (check-out) to student level
 - ____Interbuilding loans
 - Interface to the student management system for enrollment check
 - ____On-Line textbook requisitioning capability
 - _____Ability to check district availability before ordering from an outside source
 - Ability to charge schools for requisitioning textbooks
 - _____Student fees/fines tracking
 - ____Other, please specify_____
- 10) If a textbook automation package contained <u>all</u> the functions just mentioned, how appealing would it be to your district?
 - Very Appealing
 Fairly Appealing
 Neutral Appealing
 Not so Appealing
 Not at All Appealing
- 11) Is your district considering making a change to its current textbook automation system?

| Y | es | No |
|---|----|----|
| | | |

12) Are funds *currently* available for the purchasing a new automation system?

____Yes ____No

13) Are district funds *forthcoming* for the purchasing of new textbook software?

| Yes | No |
|-----|----|
| | |

14) If district funds are *not forthcoming*, could they be made available if the new textbook management software could be cost justified?

No

| Yes | ; | | |
|-----|---|--|--|
| | | | |

- Please Stop-When you reach this portion of the survey you are done, Please place the survey in the self addressed envelope and return it to us so it may be processed. Thank you for your input

Textbook Survey

| Section III | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| What student management system is used for administration? | | | | | |
| CIMS III | | | | | |
| SASI | | | | | |
| SIMS | | | | | |
| Other please specify | | | | | |
| What Hardware system is used for administration? | | | | | |
| IBM AS/400 | | | | | |
| IBM System 36 | | | | | |
| IBM PC or compatible | | | | | |
| Macintosh | | | | | |
| Other, please specify | | | | | |

3) If you were to purchase a textbook automation system, how important would it be that it interface with your student management system so that you did not have to re-enter student information?

Very Important
Fairly Important
Neutral Important
Not so Important
Not at All Important

Not at All Important

- 4) Below is a list of features that might be included in a automated textbook management program. Please rank the functions in order of importance to your district with number 1 being most important and number 7 being least important.
 - ____Bar coding capability
 - ____Inventory
 - Tracking to teacher level
 - _____Tracking (check-out) to student level
 - Interbuilding loans
 - Interface to the student management system for enrollment check
 - ____On-Line textbook requisitioning capability
 - Ability to check district availability before ordering from an outside source
 - _____Ability to charge schools for requisitioning textbooks
 - Student fees/fines tracking
 - ____Other, please specify_____
- 5) If a textbook automation package contained <u>all</u> the functions just mentioned, how appealing would it be to your district?
 - -
 - ____Very Appealing
 - Fairly Appealing
 - ____Neutral
 - ____Not so Appealing
 - ____Not at All Appealing

Textbook Survey

6) Are there any ongoing discussions regarding the purchase of a textbook automation system within the next three years?

_Yes ____No

- 7) If Yes when might your district purchase the new system?
 - Within 12 months Between 13-24 months Between 25-48 months
 - ____Over 48 months

- Please Stop-When you reach this portion of the survey you are done. Please place the survey in the self addressed envelope and return it to us so it may be processed. Thank you for your input.

Appendix 2 - Cost Regressions

Below is a summary of outputs obtained from Microsoft Excel's regression data tool. In each case the null hypothesis (H_o) is that a significant relationship does not exist between the independent variables (*enrollment, number of teachers*, and *number of schools*) and the dependent variable *estimated cost*. In each case we reject H_o if $|t| > t_{\sim/2,n-2}$. Each regression is run at 95% confidence interval. In every case the test statistic is greater than the table value and we reject the null. Therefore, we can say that there is a relationship between estimated losses and enrollment size, teacher count, and the number of schools. (Intro to Business Statistics)

| SUMMARY OUTPU | T COST WITH | | | | | | | 1 |
|-------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|----------|---------|---------|
| | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Regression S | statistics | | | | | | | |
| Multiple R | 0.6230 | | | | | | | |
| R Square | 0.3881 | | | | | | | |
| Adjusted R Square | 0.3834 | | | 1 | | | | |
| Standard Error | 10,784.7 | | | | | | | |
| Observations | 132.00 | | | | | | | |
| ANOVA | | El | | | | | | |
| | df | SS | MS | F F | Significance F | | | |
| Regression | 1 | 9,589,918,322 | 9,589,918,322 | 82.45166227 | 1.51018E-15 | | | |
| Residual | 130 | 15,120,245,577 | 116,309,581 | | | | | |
| Total | 131 | 24,710,163,899 | | | | | | |
| | - | | | | | Upper | Lower | Upper |
| | Coefficients | Standard Error | t Stat | P-value | Lower 95% | 95% | 95.000% | 95.000% |
| Intercept | 2401.930 | 1117.455 | 2.149 | 0.033 | 191.181 | 4612.680 | 191.181 | 4612.68 |
| X Variable 1 | 0.873 | 0.096 | 9.080 | 0.000 | 0.683 | 1.063 | 0.683 | 1.06 |

Appendix 2 - Cost Regressions

| | T COST WITH | TEACHERS | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|----------------|--|--------------------------------|-----------|------------------|-------------------------|----------|--|
| Regression S | Statistics | - | | _ | | | | | | | |
| Multiple R | 0.5830 | | | | | _ | | | | | |
| R Square | 0.3399 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Adjusted R Square | 0.3349 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Standard Error | 11,201,1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Observations | 132.00 | | | | | | | | | | |
| ANOVA | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | df | SS | MS | F | Significal | TO E | | | | | |
| Regression | | 1 83997135 | | | | | | | ···· | | |
| Residual | 130 | | | | 2.2103 | 42+13 | | | | | |
| Total | 13 | | 99 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | Uppe | | ower | Upper | |
| | Coefficients | | | P-value | Lower 9 | | 95% | | 000% | 95.000% | |
| Intercept | 2729.526 | | | | | 0.083 | | | 30.083 | 5028.968 | |
| | 13.702 1.675 | | | | 00 | 10.389 | | 04F | 40.000 | 17.015 | |
| X Variable 1 | 13.702 | 2/1.63 | 75 8.18 | 82 0.0 | 00; 1 | 0.389 | 17.0 | | 10.389 | 17.01 | |
| - | | _ | | <u>52 0.0</u> | | 0.389 | 17.0 | | 10.369 | | |
| - | | _ | | 52 <u>0.</u> C | | | | | 10.369 | | |
| SUMMARY OUTPUT Regression Si | | _ | | 52 O.C | | | | | | | |
| SUMMARY OUTPUT Regression Si Multiple R | | _ | | | | | | | 10.389 | | |
| SUMMARY OUTPUT Regression Si Multiple R R Square | COST WITH N at/stics 0.4875 | _ | | 52 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| SUMMARY OUTPUT | COST WITH N ratistics 0.4875 0 2377 | _ | | 52 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| SUMMARY OUTPUT Regression Si Multiple R R Square Adjusted R Square Standard Error | COST WITH N ratistics 0.4875 0 2377 0.2318 | _ | | 52 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| SUMMARY OUTPUT Regression Si Multiple R R Square Adjusted R Square Standard Error Observations | COST WITH N atistics 0.4875 0.2377 0.2318 12,037.5 | _ | | | | | | | | | |
| SUMMARY OUTPUT Regression Si Multiple R R Square Adjusted R Square Standard Error Observations | COST WITH N atistics 0.4875 0.2377 0.2318 12,037.5 | _ | | | Significance F | | | | | | |
| SUMMARY OUTPUT Regression Si Multiple R R Square Adjusted R Square Standard Error Observations ANOVA | COST WITH N atistics 0.4875 0.2377 0.2318 12,037.5 132.00 | IUMBER OF SCH | OOLS | | | | | | | | |
| SUMMARY OUTPUT Regression Si Multiple R R Square Adjusted R Square Standard Error Observations ANOVA Regression | COST WITH N atistics 0.4875 0.2377 0.2318 12,037.5 132.00 df | UMBER OF SCH SS 5,873,088,967 | OOLS MS | F | Significance F | | | | | | |
| SUMMARY OUTPUT Regression Si Multiple R R Square Adjusted R Square Standard Error Observations ANOVA Regression | COST WITH N atistics 0.4875 0.2377 0.2318 12,037.5 132.00 df 1 | UMBER OF SCH | 00LS | F | Significance F | | | | | | |
| SUMMARY OUTPUT Regression Si Multiple R R Square Adjusted R Square Standard Error Observations ANOVA Regression Residual | COST WITH N atistics 0.4875 0.2377 0.2318 12,037.5 132.00 df 1 130 | UMBER OF SCH SS 5.873,088.967 18,837,074,933 | 00LS | F | Significance F | ; 9 <i>Up</i> | per | Lower | | | |
| SUMMARY OUTPUT Regression Si Multiple R R Square Adjusted R Square Standard Error Observations ANOVA Regression Residual | COST WITH N atistics 0.4875 0.2377 0.2318 12,037.5 132.00 df 1 130 | UMBER OF SCH SS 5.873,088.967 18,837,074,933 | OOLS MS 5,873,088,967 144,900,576 t Stat | F | Significance F 3.0557E-0 Lower 95% | 9 9 <i>Up</i> 95 | per 5% | Lower 95 0009 | Up, 6 95 0 | | |
| SUMMARY OUTPUT Regression Si Multiple R R Square Adjusted R Square Standard Error Observations ANOVA Regression Residual | COST WITH N atistics 0.4875 0.2377 0.2318 12,037.5 132.00 df 1 130 131 | SS 5,873,088,967 18,837,074,933 24,710,163,899 | OOLS MS 5,873,088,967 144,900,576 | F 40 53 | Significance F 3.0557E-0 | 9 9 0 0 9 3 544 | per | Lower | Up, 6 95 0 3 5442 | | |

List of comments regarding limitations

- Tracking to teacher level.
- Individually based-not a centralized system
- There is always limitations, no system will do everything
- Fees and tracking levels
- We need to include inventory system
- Need to interface the textbook and student programs
- No interface with student database
- The limitation is that all reports generated are not acceptable to the Texas education Agency. The data is good
- System is automated at district level only and only just beginning automate at secondary level. We do not interface at all other than using district database to provide the most basic inventory information.
- It is not a true system
- Canned system -- I cannot access source code to make modifications. Not enough indexes. Field too narrow. Canned reports need a report writer.
- Cannot retain records of student owing books for year. Must manually change year. Previously the system would drop all cleared records for a year, and would retain only patrons owing fines.
- For some courses one student book consist of more than one title. We call these books student components. The program only lists one ISBN instead of all the titles.
- Bar coding, interface with student system.
- Each school has its own way.
- Too expensive.

| Appendix | 3 | - | Automated | Results |
|----------|---|---|-----------|---------|
|----------|---|---|-----------|---------|

| | 100000000000000000000000000000000000000 | | | | | | | | | r | |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Total Count By Category | Total | Below 2,000 | 2,000- 3,999 | 4,000- 4,999 | 5,000- 9,999 | 10,000- 14,999 | 15,000- 19,999 | 20,000- 24,999 | 25,000- 49,999 | 50,000- 99,999 | 100,000 and up |
| Very Appealing | 16 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Fairly Appealing | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Neutral Appealing | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not so Appealing | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Not At All Appealing | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nonresponse | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 30 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Appealing By Enrollment | | | | | Ë | nrollme | ent Gro | up | | | |
| Expressed as % of Row Total | Total | Below 2,000 | 2,000- 3,999 | 4,000- 4,999 | 5,000- 9,999 | 10,000- 14,999 | 15,000- 19,999 | 20,000- 24,999 | 25,000- 49,999 | 50,000- 99,999 | 100,000 and up |
| Very Appealing | 100% | 25% | 13% | 19% | 6% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 19% | 6% | 6% |
| Fairly Appealing | 100% | 0% | 20% | 0% | 40% | 20% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 20% | 0% |
| Neutral Appealing | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 33% | 33% | 0% | 33% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Not so Appealing | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% |
| Not At All Appealing | 100% | 33% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 67% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Nonresponse | 100% | 50% | 50% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Total | 100% | 20% | 13% | 10% | 13% | 17% | 0% | 3% | 13% | 7% | 3% |
| Appealing By Enrollment | | | | | Ei | nrollme | ent Gro | up | | | |
| Expressed As % of Column Total | Total | Below 2,000 | 2,000- 3,999 | 4,000- 4,999 | 5,000- 9,999 | 10,000- 14,999 | 15,000- 19,999 | 20,000- 24,999 | 25,000- 49,999 | 50,000- 99,999 | 100,000 and up |
| Very Appealing | 53% | 67% | 50% | 100% | 25% | 20% | 0% | 0% | 75% | 50% | 100% |
| Fairly Appealing | 17% | 0% | 25% | 0% | 50% | 20% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 50% | 0% |
| Neutral Appealing | 10% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 25% | 20% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Not so Appealing | 3% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 25% | 0% | 0% |
| Not At All Appealing | 10% | 17% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 40% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Nonresponse | 7% | 17% | 25% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 0% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

Table 27 Appeal cross tabulated with enrollment for automated group

,

| Appeal By No. Schools in Dist. | ŝ | Number of Schools in District | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------|-----|-----|-------|------|--|--|--|--|
| Total Count by Category | Total | < 3 | 3-5 | 6-9 | 10-19 | > 20 | | | | |
| Very Appealing | 16 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 4 | | | | |
| Fairly Appealing | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | | | | |
| Neutral Appealing | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Not so Appealing | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | | | |
| Not At All Appealing | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Nonresponse | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | | | |
| Total | 30 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 9 | | | | |

| Appeal By No. Schools in Dist. | | | Number o | f Schools in | District | |
|--------------------------------|-------|-----|----------|--------------|----------|------|
| Expressed As % of Row Total | Total | < 3 | 3-5 | 6-9 | 10-19 | > 20 |
| Very Appealing | 100% | 13% | 25% | 31% | 6% | 25% |
| Fairly Appealing | 100% | 0% | 0% | 20% | 60% | 20% |
| Neutral Appealing | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 67% | 33% |
| Not so Appealing | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Not At All Appealing | 100% | 0% | 33% | 0% | 33% | 33% |
| Nonresponse | 100% | 50% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 50% |
| Total | 100% | 10% | 17% | 20% | 23% | 30% |

| Appeal By No. Schools In Dist. | Number of Schools in District | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----|------|------|-------|------|--|
| Expressed As % of Column Total | Total | < 3 | 3-5 | 6-9 | 10-19 | > 20 | |
| Very Appealing | 53% | 67% | 80% | 83% | 14% | 44% | |
| Fairly Appealing | 17% | 0% | 0% | 17% | 43% | 11% | |
| Neutral Appealing | 10% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 29% | 11% | |
| Not so Appealing | 3% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 11% | |
| Not At All Appealing | 10% | 0% | 20% | 0% | 14% | 11% | |
| Nonresponse | 7% | 33% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 11% | |
| Total | 93% | 67% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 89% | |

Table 28 Appeal cross tabulated with number of schools for automated group

| Appealing By Consider Change in Current System | | Considering Chg? | |
|---|-------|---------------------|----|
| Total Count by Category | Total | YES | NO |
| Very Appealing | 16 | 5 | 11 |
| Fairly Appealing | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| Neutral Appealing | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Not so Appealing | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Not At All Appealing | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Nonresponse | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | 30 | 6 | 24 |

| Appealing By Consider Change in System | Current | Consid Ch | |
|---|---------|--------------|------|
| Expressed As % of Row Total | Total | YES | NO |
| Very Appealing | 100% | 31% | 69% |
| Fairly Appealing | 100% | 0% | 100% |
| Neutral Appealing | 100% | 0% | 100% |
| Not so Appealing | 100% | 100% | 0% |
| Not At All Appealing | 100% | 0% | 100% |
| Nonresponse | 100% | 0% | 100% |
| Total | 100% | 20% | 80% |

| Appealing By Consider Change in C System | Surrent | Consid Ch | |
|---|---------|--------------|------|
| Expressed As % of Column Total | Total | YES | NO |
| Very Appealing | 53% | 83% | 46% |
| Fairly Appealing | 17% | 0% | 21% |
| Neutral Appealing | 10% | 0% | 13% |
| Not so Appealing | 3% | 17% | 0% |
| Not At All Appealing | 10% | 0% | 13% |
| Nonresponse | 7% | 0% | 8% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% |

Table 29 Appeal cross tabulated with considering a change for automated group

| Appealing By Funds Currently Available | | Funds Available? | |
|--|-------|---------------------|----|
| Count by Category | Total | YES | NO |
| Very Appealing | 16 | 3 | 13 |
| Fairly Appealing | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| Neutral Appealing | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Not so Appealing | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Not At All Appealing | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Nonresponse | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | 30 | 4 | 26 |

| Appealing By Funds Currently Available | | Funds Available? | |
|--|-------|---------------------|------|
| Expressed As % of Row Total | Total | YES | NO |
| Very Appealing | 100% | 19% | 81% |
| Fairly Appealing | 100% | 20% | 80% |
| Neutral Appealing | 100% | 0% | 100% |
| Not so Appealing | 100% | 0% | 100% |
| Not At All Appealing | 100% | 0% | 100% |
| Nonresponse | 100% | 0% | 100% |
| Total | 100% | 13% | 87% |

| Appealing By Funds Currently Available | | Funds Available? | |
|--|-------|---------------------|------|
| Expressed As % of Column Total | Total | YES | NO |
| Very Appealing | 53% | 75% | 50% |
| Fairly Appealing | 17% | 25% | 15% |
| Neutral Appealing | 10% | 0% | 12% |
| Not so Appealing | 3% | 0% | 4% |
| Not At All Appealing | 10% | 0% | 12% |
| Nonresponse | 7% | 0% | 8% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% |

Table 30 Appeal cross tabulated with whether funds are available for automated group

| Appealing by Whether Funds are Forthcoming | | Funds Forthcoming? | |
|---|-------|-----------------------|----|
| Total Count by Category | Total | YES | NO |
| Very Appealing | 16 | 4 | 12 |
| Fairly Appealing | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| Neutral Appealing | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Not so Appealing | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Not At All Appealing | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Nonresponse | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | 30 | 5 | 25 |

| Appealing by Whether Funds are Forthcoming | | Funds Forthcoming? | | |
|---|-------|-----------------------|------|--|
| Expressed As % of Row Total | Total | YES | NO | |
| Very Appealing | 100% | 25% | 75% | |
| Fairly Appealing | 100% | 20% | 80% | |
| Neutral Appealing | 100% | 0% | 100% | |
| Not so Appealing | 100% | 0% | 100% | |
| Not At All Appealing | 100% | 0% | 100% | |
| Nonresponse | 100% | 0% | 100% | |
| Total | 100% | 17% | 83% | |

| Appealing by Whether Funds are Forthcoming | | Funds Forthcoming? | |
|---|-------|-----------------------|------|
| Expressed As % of Column Total | Total | YES | NO |
| Very Appealing | 53% | 80% | 48% |
| Fairly Appealing | 17% | 20% | 16% |
| Neutral Appealing | 10% | 0% | 12% |
| Not so Appealing | 3% | 0% | 4% |
| Not At All Appealing | 10% | 0% | 12% |
| Nonresponse | 7% | 0% | 8% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% |

Table 31 Appeal cross tabulated with whether funds are forthcoming for automated group

| Appealing by Whether Funds Could be Made Available | | Funds Could Be? | |
|---|-------|--------------------|----|
| Total Count by Category | Total | YES | NO |
| Very Appealing | 16 | 5 | 11 |
| Fairly Appealing | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| Neutral Appealing | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Not so Appealing | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Not At All Appealing | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Nonresponse | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | 30 | 9 | 21 |

| Appealing by Whether Funds Could be Made Available | | Funds Could Be? | |
|---|-------|--------------------|------|
| Expressed As % of Row Total | Total | YES | NO |
| Very Appealing | 100% | 31% | 69% |
| Fairly Appealing | 100% | 60% | 40% |
| Neutral Appealing | 100% | 33% | 67% |
| Not so Appealing | 100% | 0% | 100% |
| Not At All Appealing | 100% | 0% | 100% |
| Nonresponse | 100% | 0% | 100% |
| Total | 100% | 30% | 70% |

| Appealing by Whether Funds Coul Made Available | Funds Could Be? | | | |
|---|--------------------|------|------|--|
| Expressed As % of Column Total | Total | YES | NO | |
| Very Appealing | 53% | 56% | 52% | |
| Fairly Appealing | 17% | 33% | 10% | |
| Neutral Appealing | 10% | 11% | 10% | |
| Not so Appealing | 3% | 0% | 5% | |
| Not At All Appealing | 10% | 0% | 14% | |
| Nonresponse | 7% | 0% | 10% | |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | |

Table 32 Appeal with whether funds can be made available for automated group

| Student Management Systems | Hardware | | | | | | | | | | ł |
|---|----------|------------|-------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------|------------------------|---------|------|-----------------|-------------|
| Student Mgmt Software in Use | Dec VAX | IBM AS/400 | IBM PC or Compatible | IBM System 38 | IBM System/36 | Mac-intosh | Main-frame Offsight | VAX6610 | WANG | Nonrespons e | Grand Total |
| Admin & Classmaster | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| AES | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| CIMS III | 0 | 72 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 87 |
| Columbia School System | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | D | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Digitronics | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| EADS | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| IBM School System | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | D | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| In House System | 0 | 0 | ¢ | Û | 1 | D | Ó | 0 | ٥ | 0 | 1 |
| JTK Student Management System | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Mac School | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| MMS From Computer Resources Inc Barrington NH | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Multi Module System | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| NCS | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Non Technical | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| None | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0, | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| OSIRIS | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Q | 0 | 2 |
| Pentamation Leadership Series | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Region # Service Center | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| S3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| SASI | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | C | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Schoolnet | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | o | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| SDS | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Q | 0 | 1 |
| SIMS | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Specialized Data System | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Various | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Nonresposnse | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 23 |
| Grand Total | 1 | 99 | 16 | 1 | 25 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 165 |

| Student Management Systems Row Percentages | Hardware | | | | | | | | | - | |
|---|----------|-------------|-------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------|------------------------|---------|------|-----------------|-------------|
| Student Mgmt Software in Use | Dec VAX | IBM AS/400 | IBM PC or Compatible | IBM System 38 | IBM System/36 | Mac-intosh | Main-frame Offsight | VAX6610 | WANG | Nonrespons e | Grand Total |
| Admin & Classmaster | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| AES | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| | 0% | 83% | 1% | 1% | 14% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 100% |
| Columbia School System | 0% | 50% | _ 50% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Digitronics | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| EADS | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| IBM School System | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| In House System | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| JTK Student Management System | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Mac School | 0% | 17% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 83% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| MMS From Computer Resources Inc Barrington NH | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Multi Module System | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| NCS | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Non Technical | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| None | 0% | 0% | 50% | 0% | 50% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| OSIRIS | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Pentamation Leadership Series | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Region # Service Center | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| S3 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| SASI | 0% | 67% | 33% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Schoolnet | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| SDS | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| SIMS | 0% | 59% | 0% | 0% | 35% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Specialized Data System | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Various | 0% | 33% | 67% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Nonresposnse | 0% | 26% | 4% | 0% | 13% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 52% | 100% |
| Grand Total | 1% | 6 0% | 10% | 1% | 15% | 5% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 7% | 100% |

| Student Management Systems Column Percentages | Hardware | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
|---|----------|-----------|-------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------|------------------------|---------|------|-----------------|-------------|
| Student Mgml Software in Use | Dec VAX | BM AS/400 | IBM PC or Compatible | IBM System 38 | IBM System/36 | Mac⊣intosh | Main-frame Offsight | VAX6610 | WANG | Nonrespons e | Grand Total |
| Admin & Classmaster | 0% | 0% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| AES | 0% | 0% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| CIMS III | 0% | 73% | 6% | 100% | 48% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 53% |
| Columbia School System | 0% | 1% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Digitronics | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| EADS | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| IBM School System | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| In House System | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| JTK Student Management System | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Mac School | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 63% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% |
| MMS From Computer Resources Inc Barrington NH | 0% | 0% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Multi Module System | 0% | 0% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| NCS | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Non Technical | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| None | 0% | 0% | 6% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| OSIRIS | 0% | 0% | 13% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Pentamation Leadership Series | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Region # Service Center | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| S3 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| SASI | 0% | 4% | 13% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% |
| Schoolnet | 0% | 0% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| SDS | 0% | 0% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| SIMS | 0% | 10% | 0% | 0% | 24% | 13% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 10% |
| Specialized Data System | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 13% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Various | 0% | 1% | 13% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 2% |
| Nonresposnse | 0% | 6% | 6% | 0% | 12% | 13% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 14% |
| Grand Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

Table 33 Software/Hardware cross tabulation for manual group

| Appeal By Size of Enroliment | | | | | | Enro | liment (| iroup | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Total Count By Category | Total | Below 2.000 | 2.000- 3.999 | 4,000- 4,999 | 5,000- 9,999 | 10.000- 14.999 | 15.000- 19.999 | 20.000- 24.999 | 25.000- 49.999 | 50,000- 99 999 | 100.000 and up | Non Respons e |
| Very Appealing | 69 | 11 | 16 | 9 | 17 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ; |
| Fairly Appealing | 48 | 18 | 14 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| Neutral | 28 | 12 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| Not So Appealing | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (|
| Not at All Appealing | 8 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Nonresponse | 9 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| Total | 165 | 44 | 47 | 18 | 31 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Appeal By Size of Enrollment | 1 | | | | | Ento | liment (| irouo |) | | 1 | |
| Expressed As % of Row Total | Totel | Below 2,000 | 2,000- 3.999 | 4,000- | 5,000- 9,999 | 10,000- 14 999 | 15.000- 19.999 | 20.000- 24.999 | 25,000- 49,999 | 50,000- 99 999 | 100,000 and up | Non Respons |
| Very Appealing | 100% | 16% | 23% | 13% | 25% | 10% | 3% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% |
| Fairly Appealing | 100% | 38% | 29% | 8% | 15% | 2% | 4% | 0% | 2% | 0% | 0% | 2% |
| Neutral | 100% | 43% | 32% | 7% | 14% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% |
| Not So Appealing | 100% | 33% | 0% | 33% | 0% | 0% | 33% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Not at All Appealing | 100% | 25% | 25% | 13% | 38% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Nonresponse | 100% | 0% | 67% | 11% | 0% | 11% | 11% | 0% | 11% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Total | 100% | 27% | 28% | 11% | 19% | 5% | 4% | 2% | 1% | _ 0% | 0% | 3% |
| Appeal By Size of Entonment | | | | | | Enro | liment (| roun | | | | |
| Expressed as % of Column Total | Totel | 8 elow 2.000 | 2,000- 3.999 | 4,000- 4,999 | 5,000- 9,999 | 10,000- 14,999 | 15,000- 19,999 | 20,000- 24 999 | 25,000- 49.999 | 50,000- 99,999 | 100,000 and up | Non Respon: e |
| Very Appealing | 42% | 25% | 34% | 50% | 55% | 78% | 33% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 60% |
| Fairly Appealing | 29% | 41% | 30% | 22% | 23% | 11% | 33% | 0% | 50% | 0% | 0% | 20% |
| Neutral | 17% | 27% | 19% | 11% | 13% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 20% |
| Not So Appealing | 2% | 2% | 0% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 17% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Not at All Appealing | 5% | 5% | 4% | 6% | 10% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Nonresponse | 5% | 0% | 13% | 6% | 0% | 11% | 17% | 0% | 50% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% |

Table 34 Appeal with enrollment manual group

| Appeal By No. Schools in Dist. | | Number of Schools in District | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------|-----|-----|-------|------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Total Count by Category | Total | < 3 | 3-5 | 6-9 | 10-19 | > 20 | | | | | |
| Very Appealing | 69 | 7 | 10 | 20 | 22 | 10 | | | | | |
| Fairly Appealing | 48 | 3 | 20 | 13 | 7 | 5 | | | | | |
| Neutral Appealing | 28 | 3 | 12 | 7 | 6 | 0 | | | | | |
| Not so Appealing | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | | | | | |
| Not At All Appealing | 8 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | | | | | |
| Nonresponse | 9 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | | | | | |
| Total | 185 | 14 | 47 | 45 | 41 | 17 | | | | | |

| Appeal By No. Schools in Dist. | | Ň | in Distr | District | | |
|--------------------------------|-------|-----|----------|----------|-------|------|
| Expressed As % of Row Total | Total | < 3 | 3-5 | 6-9 | 10-19 | > 20 |
| Very Appealing | 100% | 10% | 14% | 29% | 32% | 14% |
| Fairly Appealing | 100% | 6% | 42% | 27% | 15% | 10% |
| Neutral Appealing | 100% | 11% | 43% | 25% | 21% | 0% |
| Not so Appealing | 100% | 0% | 33% | 33% | 0% | 33% |
| Not At All Appealing | 100% | 13% | 13% | 38% | 38% | 0% |
| Nonresponse | 100% | 0% | 33% | 11% | 33% | 11% |
| Total | 100% | 8% | 28% | 27% | 25% | 10% |

| Appeal By No. Schools in Dist. | | Number of Schools in District | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------|------|------|-------|------|--|--|--|--|
| Expressed As % of Col Total | Total | < 3 | 3-5 | 6-9 | 10-19 | > 20 | | | | |
| Very Appealing | 42% | 50% | 21% | 44% | 54% | 59% | | | | |
| Fairly Appealing | 29% | 21% | 43% | 29% | 17% | 29% | | | | |
| Neutral Appealing | 17% | 21% | 26% | 16% | 15% | 0% | | | | |
| Not so Appealing | 2% | 0% | 2% | 2% | 0% | 6% | | | | |
| Not At All Appealing | 5% | 7% | 2% | 7% | 7% | 0% | | | | |
| Nonresponse | 5% | 0% | 6% | 2% | 7% | 6% | | | | |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | | | | |

Table 35 Appeal with number of schools for manual group

| Appealing with Number of Teachers | | | Nur | nber of | Teache | :rs | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|-----------|------|---------|---------|---------|-----|
| Total Count by Category | Total | Non-resp. | < 50 | 50-149 | 150-399 | 400-749 | 750 |
| Very Appealing | 69 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 28 | 15 | 8 |
| Fairly Appealing | 48 | 5 | 3 | 16 | 16 | 4 | 4 |
| Neutral | 28 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 10 | 3 | 1 |
| Not So Appealing | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Not at All Appealing | 8 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Nonresponse | 9 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 165 | 12 | 9 | 41 | 64 | 24 | 15 |

| Appealing with Number of Teachers | | | Nur | nber of | Teache | :rs | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|-----------|------|---------|---------|---------|-----|
| Expressed As % of Row Total | Total | Non-resp. | < 50 | 50-149 | 150-399 | 400-749 | 750 |
| Very Appealing | 100% | 9% | 6% | 12% | 41% | 22% | 12% |
| Fairly Appealing | 100% | 10% | 6% | 33% | 33% | 8% | 8% |
| Neutral | 100% | 0% | 7% | 43% | 36% | 11% | 4% |
| Not So Appealing | 100% | 0% | 0% | 33% | 33% | 0% | 33% |
| Not at All Appealing | 100% | 13% | 0% | 25% | 50% | 13% | 0% |
| Nonresponse | 100% | 0% | 0% | 22% | 56% | 11% | 11% |
| Total | 100% | 7% | 5% | 25% | 39% | 15% | 9% |

| Appealing with Number of Teachers | | | Nur | nber of | Teache | :rs | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|-----------|------|---------|---------|---------|------|
| Expressed As % of Col Total | Total | Non-resp. | < 50 | 50-149 | 150-399 | 400-749 | 750 |
| Very Appealing | 42% | 50% | 44% | 20% | 44% | 63% | 53% |
| Fairly Appealing | 29% | 42% | 33% | 39% | 25% | 17% | 27% |
| Neutral | 17% | 0% | 22% | 29% | 16% | 13% | 7% |
| Not So Appealing | 2% | 0% | 0% | 2% | 2% | 0% | 7% |
| Not at All Appealing | 5% | 8% | 0% | 5% | 6% | 4% | 0% |
| Nonresponse | 5% | 0% | 0% | 5% | 8% | 4% | 7% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

Table 36 Appeal with number of teachers for manual group

Appendix 4 - Manual Results

| Appeal with Cost Per Student | Cost Per Student of Damaged or Lost Textbooks | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|----|----|-----------------|----|----|
| Total Count by Category | Total | 0 | | \$0.50 - \$0.99 | | |
| Very Appealing | 69 | 24 | 11 | 6 | 13 | 15 |
| Fairly Appealing | 48 | 19 | 4 | 12 | 10 | 3 |
| Neutral | 28 | 7 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 0 |
| Not So Appealing | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not at All Appealing | 8 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Nonresponse | 9 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Total | 165 | 58 | 31 | 25 | 32 | 19 |

| Appeal with Cost Per Student | Cost Per Student of Damaged or Lost Textbooks | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|-----|---------|-----------------|---------------|----------|
| Expressed As % of Row Total | Total | 0 | <\$0.50 | \$0.50 - \$0.99 | \$1.00-\$2.99 | > \$3.00 |
| Very Appealing | 100% | 35% | 16% | 9% | 19% | 22% |
| Fairly Appealing | 100% | 40% | 8% | 25% | 21% | 6% |
| Neutral | 100% | 25% | 36% | 21% | 18% | 0% |
| Not So Appealing | 100% | 67% | 33% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Not at All Appealing | 100% | 25% | 50% | 0% | 13% | 13% |
| Nonresponse | 100% | 44% | 11% | 11% | 33% | 0% |
| Total | 100% | 35% | 19% | 15% | 19% | 12% |

| Appeal with Cost Per Student | | Cost Per Student of Damaged or Lost Textbooks | | | | |
|------------------------------|-------|---|---------|-----------------|---------------|----------|
| Expressed As % of Col Total | Total | 0 | <\$0.50 | \$0.50 - \$0.99 | \$1.00-\$2.99 | > \$3.00 |
| Very Appealing | 42% | 41% | 35% | 24% | 4 1% | 79% |
| Fairly Appealing | 29% | 33% | 13% | 48% | 31% | 16% |
| Neutral | 17% | 12% | 32% | 24% | 16% | 0% |
| Not So Appealing | 2% | 3% | 3% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Not at All Appealing | 5% | 3% | 13% | 0% | 3% | 5% |
| Nonresponse | 5% | 7% | 3% | 4% | 9% | 0% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

Table 37 Appeal with cost per student for manual group

Appendix 4 - Manual Results

| Appealing with Considering Change | | Considering Change? | |
|--------------------------------------|-------|------------------------|-----|
| Total Count by Category | Total | Yes | NO |
| Very Appealing | 69 | 31 | 38 |
| Fairly Appealing | 48 | 2 | 46 |
| Neutral | 28 | 0 | 28 |
| Not So Appealing | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Not at All Appealing | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| Nonresponse | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| Total | 185 | 33 | 132 |

| Appealing with Considering Change | | Considering Change? | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------|------------------------|------|--|
| Expressed As % of Row Total | Total | Yes | NO | |
| Very Appealing | 100% | 45% | 55% | |
| Fairly Appealing | 100% | 4% | 96% | |
| Neutral | 100% | 0% | 100% | |
| Not So Appealing | 100% | 0% | 100% | |
| Not at All Appealing | 100% | 0% | 100% | |
| Nonresponse | 100% | 0% | 100% | |
| Total | 100% | 20% | 80% | |

| Appealing with Considering Change | | Considering Change? | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------|------------------------|------|--|
| Expressed As % of Col. Total | Total | Yes | NO | |
| Very Appealing | 42% | 94% | 29% | |
| Fairly Appealing | 29% | 6% | 35% | |
| Neutral | 17% | 0% | 21% | |
| Not So Appealing | 2% | 0% | 2% | |
| Not at All Appealing | 5% | 0% | 6% | |
| Nonresponse | 5% | 0% | 7% | |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | |

Table 38 Appeal with considering change for manual group

Appendix 4 - Manual Results

| Appealing by When Might Change Occur | | When mig | ht change o | occur | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|---------|
| Total Count by Category | Total | Within 12 Months | Between 13- 24 Months | Between 25- 48 Months | Over 48 Months | Unknown |
| Very Appealing | 69 | 10 | 17 | 5 | 4 | 33 |
| Fairly Appealing | 48 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 44 |
| Neutral | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 |
| Not So Appealing | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Not at All Appealing | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Nonresponse | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Total | 165 | 10 | 18 | 5 | 8 | 124 |
| Appealing by When Might Change Occur | | When mig | ht change d | accur | | |
| Expressed As % of Row Total | Total | Within 12 Months | Between 13- 24 Months | Between 25- 48 Months | Over 48 Months | Unknown |
| Very Appealing | 100% | 14% | 25% | 7% | 6% | 48% |
| Fairly Appealing | 100% | 0% | 2% | 0% | 6% | 92% |
| Neutral | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 96% |
| Not So Appealing | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Not at All Appealing | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Nonresponse | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Total | 100% | 6% | 11% | 3% | 5% | 75% |
| Appealing by When Might Change Occur | | When mig | ht change o | occur | | |
| Expressed As % of Col. Total | Total | Within 12 Months | Between 13- 24 Months | Between 25- 48 Months | Over 48 Months | Unknown |
| Very Appealing | 42% | 100% | 94% | 100% | 50% | 27% |
| Fairly Appealing | 29% | 0% | 6% | 0% | 38% | 35% |
| Neutral | 17% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 13% | 22% |
| Not So Appealing | 2% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 2% |
| Not at All Appealing | 5% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 6% |
| Nonresponse | 5% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 7% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

Table 39 Appeal with when considering a change for manual group

Prospects Report for Districts Currently Using Automated System

| Hot Pros | pects | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Contact Dat | a: | | District Data: | |
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | | | High Schools:1EnrollmeJunior/Middle:2TeachersElementary:6StudentsTotal Schools9Teacher | 333 S Per 14 |
| • | proved Textbook List?: Cost of Lost or Damaged Text | books: | Yes \$400 | |
| Current Sys | tems: | | | |
| Text Software: Text Hardware: Student Software: Student Hardware: | | | Current Textbook system has limitatio Comments: | ns: No |
| Textbook System I | nterfaced with Student Manag | ement System | ?: No | |
| Features of Curre. Using Bar Code So General Inventory: Tracking books to I Track books to stud Monintoring Interbu Interface with Stud Requistions: Ability to Check Dis Ability to Charge So Ability to Charge Fo | canning for Input: tearcher level: dent level: uilding Loans: ent: strict for Books: Schools for Books: ees to Students: | No Yes No No No No No | Rank of Importance Using Bar Code Scanning for Inp General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: Interface with Student: Requisitons: Ability to Check District for Books Ability to Charge Schools for Books Ability to Charge Fees to Student | 1 2 3 4 0 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 |
| How appealing is a | a systems with the features in | cluded Gatewa | y's? | Very Appealing |
| • | sidering a change to its currer | | | Yes |
| • | | | a textbook management system?: | Yes |
| | ning for the purchase of a new ade available if a new system | | | Yes Yes |
| Report Run Date: | 7/20/95 9:33:50 AM | | | |

Appendix 5 - Auto Prospects

Prospects Report for Districts Currently Using Automated System

| Warm Pr | ospects | | | |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| Contact Dat | a: | | District Data: | |
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | | | High Schools:1EnrollmenJunior/Middle:2Teachers:Elementary:8StudentsTotal Schools11Teacher: | 481 |
| State Publishes Ap | proved Textbook Li | st?: | Yes | |
| Estimated Annual (| Cost of Lost or Dam | aged Textbooks: | \$5,000 | |
| Current Sys | stems: | | | |
| Text Software: | Textbook Inventor | y - Hayes Associates | Current Textbook system has limitation | ns: Yes |
| Text Hardware: Student Software: Student Hardware: Textbook System I | IBM AS/400 | atible ent Management Syste | Comments: For some courses one stu- consists of more than one these books student comp program only lists one ISB titles. m?: Yes | title. We call onents. The |
| | | | | |
| Features of Curre | • | | Rank of Importance | |
| Using Bar Code So | anning for Input: | Yes | Using Bar Code Scanning for Inpu | t: 6 1 |
| General Inventory: Tracking books to 1 | toorobor lovot | Yes Yes | General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: | 7 |
| Tracking books to Track books to stu | | Yes | Track books to student level: | 8 |
| Monintoring Interbi | | No | Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 10 |
| Interface with Stud | - | Yes | Interface with Student: | 3 |
| Requistions: | | Yes | Requistions: | 4 |
| Ability to Check Di | strict for Books: | Yes | Ability to Check District for Books: | |
| Ability to Charge S | | Yes | Ability to Charge Schools for Boo | |
| Ability to Charge F | | No | Ability to Charge Fees to Students | i: 9 |
| Other Features of | System: | Membership Report | | |
| | | Purchasing Databa | | |
| How appealing is a | a systems with the fe | eatures included Gatew | vay's? | Fairly Appealing |
| Is your district con | sidering a change to | its current textbook m | anagement system?: | No |
| Does you district o | urrently have funds | available for purchasin | g a textbook management system?: | Yes |
| Are funds forthcon | ning for the purchase | e of a new textbook ma | anagement system? | Yes |
| Could funds be ma | ade available if a ne | w system could be cos | t justified? | No |
| Report Run Date. | 7/20/95 9:34:0 | 04 AM | | |

Prospects Report for Districts Currently Using Automated System

| Warm Pr | ospects | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|
| Contact Dat | ta: | | District Da | nta: | | |
| Name: | | | High Schools: | 2 | Enrollment: | 4004 |
| Contact: | | | Junior/Middle: | 2 | Teachers: | 242 |
| Title: | | | Elementary: | 5 | Students Per | 17 |
| Address; | | | Total Schools | 9 | Teacher: | |
|] | | | | | | |
| State Publishes Ap | proved Textbook Li | st?: | Ye | S | | |
| Estimated Annual (| Cost of Lost or Dam | aged Textbooks: | \$1,000 | | | |
| Current Sys | stems: | | | | | |
| Text Software: | Financial Manager | ment Systesm/NCR | Current Textboo | k system | has limitations: | Yes |
| Text Hardware: | IBM AS/400 | | Comments: We | need to ir | iclude inventory sy | stems |
| Student Software: | Student Managem | ent System/NCD | | | | |
| Student Hardware: | IBM AS/400 | | | | | |
| Textbook System I | nterfaced with Stude | ent Management Syste | m?: No | | | |
| Features of Curre | nt System | | Rank of Im | ortance | | |
| Using Bar Code So | • | No | Using Bar C | ode Scan | ning for Input: | 0 |
| General Inventory: | - | No | General Invo | entory: | | 1 |
| Tracking books to | tearcher level: | No | Tracking bo | oks to tea | rcher level: | 2 |
| Track books to stu | dent level: | No | Track books | to stude | nt level: | 3 |
| Monintoring Interbu | uilding Loans: | No | Monintoring | Interbuild | ling Loans: | 0 |
| Interface with Stud | lent: | No | Interface wit | h Studen | t: | 5 |
| Requistions: | | No | Requistions | | | 0 |
| Ability to Check Dis | strict for Books: | No | Ability to Ch | eck Distri | ct for Books: | 4 |
| Ability to Charge S | Schools for Books: | Yes | Ability to Ch | arge Sch | iools for Books: | 0 |
| Ability to Charge F | ees to Students: | No | Ability to Ch | arge Fee | s to Students: | 0 |
| Other Features of | System: | Purchase orders for | | | | |
| How appealing is a | a systems with the fo | eatures included Gatew | ay's? | | Veŋ | / Appealing |
| | | its current textbook m | | n? : | | No |
| - | | available for purchasin | | | system?: | No |

 Are funds forthcoming for the purchase of a new textbook management system?
 No

 Could funds be made available if a new system could be cost justified?
 Yes

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:34:06 AM

Prospects Report for Districts Currently Using Automated System

| Warm Pr | ospects | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Contact Dat | a: | | District Data: | | | |
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | | | High Schools:1Enrollment:Junior/Middle:1Teachers:Elementary:5Students PTotal Schools7Teacher: | 233 | | |
| | proved Textbook List?: Cost of Lost or Damaged Textboo | oks: | Yes n/r | | | |
| Current Sys | stems: | | | <u> </u> | | |
| Text Software: Text Hardware: Student Software: Student Hardware: | HS Circulation Plus IBM PC OR Compatible CIMS III | | Current Textbook system has limitations Comments: | :: Yes | | |
| Textbook System I | nterfaced with Student Managem | ent System | n?: No | | | |
| Features of Curre Using Bar Code So General Inventory: Tracking books to to Track books to stur Monintoring Interbu Interface with Stud Requisitions: Ability to Check Dis Ability to Charge S Ability to Charge F Other Features of S | canning for Input: tearcher level: dent level: uilding Loans: ent: strict for Books: Schools for Books: ees to Students: | Yes Yes No No No No Yes | Rank of Importance Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: Interface with Student: Requisitions: Ability to Check District for Books: Ability to Charge Schools for Books Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | |
| How appealing is a | a systems with the features includ | led Gatewa | ay's? | Very Appealing | | |
| 2 | sidering a change to its current te | | | Yes | | |
| 2 | | | a textbook management system?: | No | | |
| | ning for the purchase of a new te | | | Yes No | | |
| Report Run Date: | 7/20/95 9:34:07 AM | | | | | |

Appendix 5 - Auto Prospects

Prospects Report for Districts Currently Using Automated System

| Cold Pro | spects | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| Contact Dat | ta: | District Data: | | |
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | | High Schools:0Enrollment:Junior/Middle:0Teachers:Elementary:0Students PerTotal Schools0Teacher: | 1084 200 er 5 | |
| - | pproved Textbook List?: | No | | |
| | Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | \$2,000 | | |
| Current Sys | stems: | | | |
| Text Software: Text Hardware: Student Software: Student Hardware: | Tennessee Instructional Resource Cent IBM PC OR Compatible TIRCMS IBM PC or Compatible | Current Textbook system has limitations: Comments: Canned System- I cannot ac code to make modifications. indexes. Feilds to Narrow. O Reports need a report writer | cess source Not enough Canned | |
| Textbook System I | Interfaced with Student Management Syste | em?: Yes | | |
| Features of Curre Using Bar Code So General Inventory: Tracking books to Track books to stu Monintoring Interbu Interface with Stud Requisitions: Ability to Check Di Ability to Charge S Ability to Charge F Other Features of | canning for Input: No Yes tearcher level: Yes dent level: Yes uilding Loans: No lent: Yes No strict for Books: No Schools for Books: No ees to Students: No | Rank of Importance Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: Interface with Student: Requisitions: Ability to Check District for Books: Ability to Charge Schools for Books: Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 3 0 2 4 0 5 0 0 0 | |
| How appealing is a | a systems with the features included Gate | way's? Ve | ry Appealing | |
| - | sidering a change to its current textbook n | | Yes | |
| • | surrently have funds available for purchasir | | No | |
| | ning for the purchase of a new textbook m ade available if a new system could be cos | | No Yes | |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:34:19 AM

Prospects Report for Districts Currently Using Automated System

| Cold Pro | spects | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| Contact Da | ta: | District Data: | | | |
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | | High Schools:3Enrollment:3100Junior/Middle:1Teachers:163Elementary:0Students Per19Total Schools4Teacher:19 | | | |
| | pproved Textbook List?: | No \$15,000 | | | |
| | Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | \$15,000 | | | |
| Current Sy | | | | | |
| Text Software: Follet Textbook Plus 6.3 Text Hardware: IBM PC OR Compatible Student Software: SASI Student Hardware: Student Hardware: | | Current Textbook system has limitations: Yes Comments: Cannot retain records of students owing books for year. Must manually change year. Previously the system would drop all clear records for a year, and would retain patrons owing books. | | | |
| Textbook System | Interfaced with Student Management S | · • | | | |
| Features of Curr Using Bar Code S General Inventory Tracking books to Track books to str Monintoring Intert Interface with Stu Requistions: Ability to Check D Ability to Charge Ability to Charge S Other Features of | Scanning for Input: tearcher level: udent level: building Loans: dent: District for Books: Schools for Books: Fees to Students: | Rank of ImportanceYesUsing Bar Code Scanning for Input:0YesGeneral Inventory:0YesTracking books to tearcher level:0YesTrack books to student level:0NoMonintoring Interbuilding Loans:0YesInterface with Student:1NoRequisitions:2NoAbility to Check District for Books:0NoAbility to Charge Schools for Books:3YesAbility to Charge Fees to Students:0 | | | |
| How appealing is | a systems with the features included G | ateway's? Very Appealing | | | |
| • | nsidering a change to its current textboo | | | | |
| • | | asing a textbook management system? Yes | | | |
| | ming for the purchase of a new textboo nade available if a new system could be | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:34:21 AM

Prospects Report for Districts Currently Using Automated System

| Cold Prospects | | | | | | |
|---|--|------------------|------------|----------------------|-----------|--|
| Contact Data: | | District Data: | | | | |
| Name: | | High Schools: | 12 | Enroliment: | 72000 | |
| Contact: | | Junior/Middle: | 22 | Teachers: | 4000 | |
| Title: | | Elementary: | 67 | Students Per | 18 | |
| Address: | | Total Schools | 101 | Teacher: | | |
| | an a | | | | | |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: | | Ye | s | | | |
| Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textboo | ks: | \$100,000 | | | | |
| Current Systems: | | | | | | |
| Text Software: In House Software | (| Current Textbool | k system | has limitations: | Yes | |
| Text Hardware: IBM AS/400 | | Comments: Bar | Coding, I | nterface with studer | nt system | |
| Student Software: Columbia MacMillan McGraw Hi | fl | | | | | |
| Student Hardware: Network PC (Novell) | | | | | | |
| Textbook System Interfaced with Student Manageme | ent System | 1?: No | | | | |
| Features of Current System | | Rank of Imp | ortance | | | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | No | Using Bar C | ode Scan | ning for Input: | 2 | |
| General Inventory: | Yes | General Inve | entory: | | 3 | |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | Yes | Tracking boo | oks to tea | ircher level: | a | |
| Track books to student level: | No | Track books | to stude | nt level: | ٥ | |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | Yes | Monintoring | Interbuild | ling Loans: | C | |
| Interface with Student: | No | Interface wit | h Studen | t: | 1 | |
| Requistions: | Yes | Requistions: | | | 4 | |
| Ability to Check District for Books: | Yes | | | ict for Books: | ¢ | |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | Yes | Ability to Ch | arge Sch | nools for Books: | 5 | |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | Yes | Ability to Ch | arge Fee | s to Students: | C | |
| Other Features of System: | | | | | | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features includ | ed Gatewa | y's? | | Very A | Appealing | |
| Is your district considering a change to its current te | | | m2. | | Yes | |

Does you district currently have funds available for purchasing a textbook management system?NoAre funds forthcoming for the purchase of a new textbook management system?NoCould funds be made available if a new system could be cost justified?No

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:34:22 AM

| Contact Data: | District Data: | |
|--|----------------|---|
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | Junior/Middle: | 1Enrollment:44002Teachers:2555Students Per179Teacher:17 |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | No \$58,000 | |
| Current Systems: | | |
| Student Software: CIMS III Student Hardware: IBM AS/400 How important is it to have your textbook management system interfaced with your student management system? | Very Important | |
| Rank of Importance | | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 4 | |
| General Inventory: | 2 | |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 1 | |
| Track books to student level: | 7 | |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 5 | |
| Interface with Student: | 0 | |
| Requistions: Ability to Check District for Books: | 6 0 | |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 0 | |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 0 | |
| Other Features of Importance: | | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features included Gate | way's? L | /ery Appealing |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook managem | ent system? | ′es |
| When might your district purchase a new textbook manager | nent system? E | Between 13-24 Mo |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:34:34 AM

| Hot Prospects | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--------------------|--|--|
| Contact Data: | District Da | District Data: | | | |
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | High Schools: Junior/Middle: Elementary: Total Schools | 0 Enrollment: 4 Teachers: 15 Students Per 19 Teacher: | 11200 650 17 | | |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Text | Yes tbooks: \$48,000 | | | | |
| Current Systems: | | | | | |
| Student Hardware: IBM AS/400 How important is it to have your textbook manag system interfaced with your student management | | | | | |
| Rank of Importance | | | | | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 1 | | | | |
| General Inventory: | 1 | | | | |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 1 | | | | |
| Track books to student level: | 1 | | | | |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 1 | | | | |
| Interface with Student: | 1 | | | | |
| Requistions: | 1 | | | | |
| Ability to Check District for Books: | 1 | | | | |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 1 | | | | |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: Other Features of Importance: | 1 | | | | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features inc | | Very Appealing | | | |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbool | k management system? | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:34:37 AM

| Hot Prospects | | | |
|--|---|--|--------------------|
| Contact Data: | District Dat | a: | |
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | High Schools: Junior/Middle: Elementary: Total Schools | 2 Enrollment: 2 Teachers: 13 Students Per 17 Teacher: | 13500 750 18 |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: | Yes | | |
| Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbook | ks: \$50,000 | | |
| Current Systems: | | ŢŢ <u>ŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢŢ</u> | |
| Student Software: CIMS III Student Hardware: IBM AS/400 How important is it to have your textbook manageme system interfaced with your student management sys | | | |
| Rank of Importance | | | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 1 | | |
| General Inventory: | 3 | | |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 0 | | |
| Track books to student level: | 2 | | |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 4 | | |
| Interface with Student: | 0 | | |
| Requistions: | 7 | | |
| Ability to Check District for Books: | 6 | | |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 0 | | |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 5 | | |
| Other Features of Importance: | | | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features include | d Gateway's? | Very Appealing | |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook ma | nagement system? | Yes | |
| When might your district purchase a new textbook ma | anagement system? | Within 12 Months | |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:34:35 AM

76

| Hot Prospects | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------|--|-------------------|
| Contact Data: | District Da | nta: | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | High Schools: Junior/Middle: Elementary: Total Schools | 1 2 10 13 | Enrollment: Teachers: Students Per Teacher: | 6900 502 14 |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | Yes \$40,000 | | | |
| Current Systems: Student Software: CIMS III | | | | |
| Student Hardware: IBM AS/400 How important is it to have your textbook management system interfaced with your student management system | [?] Very Important | | | |
| Rank of Importance | | | | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 1 | | | |
| General Inventory: | 1 | | | |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 1 | | | |
| Track books to student level: | 1 | | | |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 4 | | | |
| Interface with Student: | 4 | | | |
| Requistions: Ability to Chock Dictrict for Books: | 1 | | | |
| Ability to Check District for Books: Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 1 | | | |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 7 | | | |
| Other Features of Importance: | | | | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features included G | ateway's? | Very | Appealing | |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook manage | ement system? | Yes | | |
| When might your district purchase a new textbook manage | ement system? | Withi | in 12 Months | |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:34:38 AM

.

| Hot Prospects | | - | | |
|--|---|--------------------|--|-------------------|
| Contact Data: | District Da | ata: | | |
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | High Schools: Junior/Middle: Elementary: Total Schools | 3 3 14 20 | Enrollment: Teachers: Students Per Teacher: | 5050 398 13 |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | Yes \$20,000 | | | |
| Current Systems: Student Software: CIMS III | | | | |
| Student Hardware: IBM AS/400 How important is it to have your textbook management system interfaced with your student management system? | Very Important | | | |
| Rank of Importance | | | | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 0 | | | |
| General Inventory: | 1 | | | |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 2 | | | |
| Track books to student level: | 0 | | | |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 0 | | | |
| Interface with Student: | 4 | | | |
| Requisitons: | 5 | | | |
| Ability to Check District for Books: | 7 3 | | | |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 3 6 | | | |
| Other Features of Importance: | · | | | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features included Gat | eway's? | Very | Appealing | |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook manager | nent system? | Yes | | |
| When might your district purchase a new textbook manage | ment system? | Betw | een 13-24 Mo | |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:34:39 AM

| Contact Data: | District Da | ata: | | |
|--|--|-------------|--|-------------------|
| Name: Contact: Title: | High Schools: Junior/Middle: Elementary: | 1 0 0 | Enrollment: Teachers: Students Per | 2000 130 15 |
| Address: | Total Schools | | Teacher: | |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: | No | | | |
| Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbo | oks: \$10,000 | | | |
| Current Systems: | | | | |
| Student Software: CIMS III Student Hardware: IBM AS/400 How important is it to have your textbook managen system interfaced with your student management s | | | | |
| Rank of Importance | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 2 | | | |
| General Inventory: | 1 | | | |
| General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: | 1 O | | | |
| General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: | 1 0 3 | | | |
| General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 1 0 3 0 | | | |
| General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: Interface with Student: | 1 0 3 0 0 | | | |
| General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: Interface with Student: Requistions: | 1 0 3 0 0 0 | | | |
| General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: Interface with Student: Requistions: Ability to Check District for Books: | 1 0 3 0 0 | | | |
| General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: Interface with Student: Requistions: Ability to Check District for Books: Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 1 0 3 0 0 0 5 | | | |
| General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: Interface with Student: Requistions: Ability to Check District for Books: | 1 0 3 0 0 0 5 0 | | | |
| General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: Interface with Student: Requisitions: Ability to Check District for Books: Ability to Charge Schools for Books: Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 1 0 3 0 0 0 5 0 4 | Very | Appealing | |
| General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: Interface with Student: Requisitions: Ability to Check District for Books: Ability to Charge Schools for Books: Ability to Charge Fees to Students: Other Features of Importance: | 1 0 3 0 0 0 5 0 4 4 | Very Yes | Appealing | |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:34:41 AM

| Contact Data: | District Data: | | | | |
|--|----------------|------|--------------|-------|--|
| Name: | High Schools: | 4 | Enroliment: | 22000 | |
| Contact: | Junior/Middle: | 6 | Teachers: | 1800 | |
| Title: | Elementary: | 21 | Students Per | 12 | |
| Address: | Total Schools | 31 | Teacher: | | |
| | | | L | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: | Yes | | | | |
| Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | \$9,500 | | | | |
| | +-, | | | | |
| Current Systems: | | | | | |
| Student Software: SIMS | | | | | |
| Student Hardware: IBM AS/400 | | | | | |
| How important is it to have your textbook management system interfaced with your student management system? | Very Important | | | | |
| Rank of Importance | | | | | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 6 | | | | |
| General Inventory: | 1 | | | | |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 4 | | | | |
| Track books to student level: | 3 | | | | |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 7 | | | | |
| Interface with Student: | 2 | | | | |
| Requistions: | 0 | | | | |
| Ability to Check District for Books: | 0 | | | | |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 5 | | | | |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 0 | | | | |
| Other Features of Importance: | | | | | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features included Ga | teway's? | Very | Appealing | | |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook manager | ment system? | Yes | | | |

When might your district purchase a new textbook management system? Between 13-24 Mo

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:34:42 AM

| Contact Data: | District Da | ata: | | |
|---|--|-------------|--|---|
| Name: Contact: Title: | High Schools: Junior/Middle: Elementary: | 1 2 7 | Enrollment: Teachers: Students Per | 0 |
| Address: | Total Schools | 10 | Teacher: | L |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: | Yes | | | |
| Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks | : \$5,000 | | | |
| Current Systems: | | | | |
| Student Software: Region # Service Center Student Hardware: IBM AS/400 How important is it to have your textbook management system interfaced with your student management syste | | | | |
| Rank of Importance | | | | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 3 | | | |
| General Inventory: | 1 | | | |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 2 | | | |
| Track books to student level: | 2 | | | |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 5 | | | |
| Interface with Student: | 2 | | | |
| Requisitons: | 1 | | | |
| Ability to Check District for Books: Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 1 | | | |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 1 | | | |
| Other Features of Importance: | | | | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features included | Gateway's? | Very | Appealing | |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook man | agement system? | Yes | | |
| When might your district purchase a new textbook management system? | | | n 12 Months | |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:34:43 AM

| Contact Data: | District Da | District Data: | | | |
|--|---|--------------------|--|------|--|
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | High Schools: Junior/Middle: Elementary: Total Schools | 1 3 12 16 | Enrollment: Teachers: Students Per Teacher: | 8193 | |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks | Yes s: \$4,000 | | | | |
| Current Systems: | | | | | |
| Student Hardware: IBM AS/400 How important is it to have your textbook managemen system interfaced with your student management syst | | | | | |
| Rank of Importance | | | | | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 1 | | | | |
| General Inventory: | 1 | | | | |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 1 | | | | |
| Track books to student level: | 1 | | | | |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 1 | | | | |
| Interface with Student: | 1 | | | | |
| Requisitons: | 1 | | | | |
| Ability to Check District for Books: Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 7 | | | | |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 1 | | | | |
| Other Features of Importance: | | | | | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features included | d Gateway's? | Very | Appealing | | |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook management system? | | | | | |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook mar | nagement system? | Yes | | | |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:34:45 AM

| Contact Data: | District Data: |
|--|--|
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | High Schools:1Enrollment:4300Junior/Middle:2Teachers:276Elementary:4Students Per16Total Schools7Teacher: |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | Yes \$2,000 |
| Current Systems: | |
| Student Software: CIMS III Student Hardware: IBM AS/400 How important is it to have your textbook management system interfaced with your student management system? | Very Important |
| Rank of Importance | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 2 |
| General Inventory: | 1 |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 2 |
| Track books to student level: | 1 |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 2 |
| Interface with Student: | 1 2 |
| Requisitons: Ability to Check District for Books: | 2 |
| Ability to Check District for Books: Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 2 |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 2 |
| Other Features of Importance: | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features included Gate | eway's? Very Appealing |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook managerr | ent system? Yes |
| When might your district purchase a new textbook manage | |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:34:46 AM

| Contact Data: | District Data: | |
|--|--|---|
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | High Schools:2Junior/Middle:3Elementary:9Total Schools10 | Teachers: 601 Students Per 15 |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | Yes \$1,200 | |
| Current Systems: | | |
| Student Software: CIMS III Student Hardware: IBM AS/400 How important is it to have your textbook management system interfaced with your student management system? | Fairly Important | |
| Rank of Importance | | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 5 | |
| General Inventory: | 1 | |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 6 | |
| Track books to student level: | 7 | |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 0 | |
| Interface with Student: | 4 | |
| Requisitons: | 3 2 | |
| Ability to Check District for Books: | 2 0 | |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 0 | |
| Other Features of Importance: | - | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features included Gate | way's? V | ery Appealing |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook managem | ent system? Y | es |
| When might your district purchase a new textbook manage | | etween 13-24 Mo |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:34:47 AM

| Contact Data: | District Data | a: | |
|--|---|---|-------------------|
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | High Schools: Junior/Middle: Elementary: Total Schools | 1 Enrollment: 2 Teachers: 7 Students Per 10 Teacher: | 4600 355 13 |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | Yes \$1,000 | | |
| Current Systems: | | | |
| Student Software: CIMS III Student Hardware: IBM AS/400 How important is it to have your textbook management system interfaced with your student management system? | Fairly Important | | |
| Rank of Importance | | | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 6 | | |
| General Inventory: | 2 | | |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 0 | | |
| Track books to student level: | 1 | | |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 0 | | |
| Interface with Student: | 3 | | |
| Requistions: | 5 | | |
| Ability to Check District for Books: | 4 | | |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 7 | | |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: Other Features of Importance: | 0 | | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features included Gate | way's? | Very Appealing | |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook management | ent system? | Yes | |
| When might your district purchase a new textbook manager | ment system? | Between 13-24 Mo | |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:34:48 AM

| i | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|---|--|
| District [| District Data: | | | |
| High Schools: | 3 | Enrollment: | 8900 | |
| | 2 | Teachers: | 500 | |
| Elementary: | 10 | Students Per | 18 | |
| Total School | 5 15 | Teacher: | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Yes | | | | |
| oks: | n/r | | | |
| | ····· | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| ent | | | | |
| | | | | |
| very important | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 8 | | | | |
| 2 | | | | |
| 3 | | | | |
| 7 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 10 | | | | |
| 10 6 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 6 | | | | |
| 6 9 | | | | |
| 6 9 1 | | | | |
| 6 9 1 5 | | | | |
| 6 9 1 5 | | | | |
| 6 9 1 5 | Very | r Appealing | | |
| 6 9 1 5 4 | Very Y e s | Appealing | | |
| | High Schools: Junior/Middle: Elementary: Total Schools Yes oks: Very Important | High Schools: 3 Junior/Middle: 2 Elementary: 10 Total Schools 15 Yes oks: n/r ent rstem? Very Important 8 2 3 | High Schools: 3 Enrollment: Junior/Middle: 2 Students Per Elementary: 10 15 Total Schools 15 Teachers: ves n/r ves n/r very Important 8 2 3 | |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:34:50 AM

| Contact Data: | District Data: |
|--|--|
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | High Schools:2Enrollment:7000Junior/Middle:2Teachers:10Elementary:6Students PerTotal Schools10Teacher: |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | Yes n/r |
| Current Systems: | |
| Student Software: CIMS III Student Hardware: IBM AS/400 How important is it to have your textbook management system interfaced with your student management system? | Very important |
| Rank of Importance | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 5 |
| General Inventory: | 4 |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 2 |
| Track books to student level: | 3 |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 4 |
| Interface with Student: | 1 |
| Requisitons: | 6 |
| Ability to Check District for Books: Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 7 |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 8 |
| Other Features of Importance: | - |
| How appealing is a systems with the features included Gate | way's? Very Appealing |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook managem | ent system? Yes |
| When might your district purchase a new textbook manager | nent system? Between 13-24 Mo |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:34:51 AM

| Contact Data: | District Data: |
|--|--|
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | High Schools:1Enrollment:2200Junior/Middle:1Teachers:225Elementary:3Students Per10Total Schools5Teacher: |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: | No |
| Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | n/r |
| Current Systems: | |
| Student Software: CIMS III Student Hardware: IBM AS/400 How important is it to have your textbook management system interfaced with your student management system? | Very Important |
| Rank of Importance | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 2 |
| General Inventory: | 1 |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 5 |
| Track books to student level: | 6 |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 0 |
| Interface with Student: | 3 |
| Requisitons: | 7 |
| Ability to Check District for Books: | 0 |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 0 4 |
| Other Features of Importance: | • |
| | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features included Gate | way's? Very Appealing |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook managem | ent system? Yes |
| When might your district purchase a new textbook manager | nent system? Between 13-24 Mo |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:34:52 AM

| Ca-4-4 D-4- | | |
|---|--------------------------------|-------------|
| Contact Data: | District Data: | |
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | Junior/Middle: 2 Teac | ents Per 13 |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbo | Yes poks: n/r | |
| Current Systems: | | |
| Student Software: CIMS III Student Hardware: IBM AS/400 How important is it to have your textbook manager system interfaced with your student management s | | |
| Rank of Importance | | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 1 | |
| General Inventory: | 0 | |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 0 | |
| Track books to student level: | 0 | |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 0 | |
| Interface with Student: | 0 | |
| Requistions: | 0 | |
| Ability to Check District for Books: | 0 | |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 0 | |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 0 | |
| Other Features of Importance: | | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features inclu | Ided Gateway's? Very Appeal | ing |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook i | management system? Yes | |
| When might your district purchase a new textbook | management system? Within 12 M | onths |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:34:54 AM

| Contact Data: | District Data: |
|--|--|
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | High Schools:5Enrollment:22500Junior/Middle:4Teachers:1400Elementary:18Students Per16Total Schools27Teacher: |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | No n/r |
| Current Systems: | |
| Student Software: CIMS III Student Hardware: IBM AS/400 How important is it to have your textbook management system interfaced with your student management system? | Very Important |
| Rank of Importance | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 1 |
| General Inventory: | 1 |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 3 |
| Track books to student level: | 2 |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 4 |
| Interface with Student: | 1 |
| Requisions: | 1 |
| Ability to Check District for Books: | 2 3 |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 5 |
| Other Features of Importance: | • |
| How appealing is a systems with the features included Gat | eway's? Very Appealing |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook managen | ent system? Yes |
| When might your district purchase a new textbook manage | |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:34:55 AM

| Contact Data: | District Data: |
|---|---|
| Name: | High Schools: 3 Enrollment: 850 |
| Contact: | Junior/Middle: 3 Teachers: 500 |
| Title: | Elementary: 10 Students Per 17 |
| Address: | Total Schools 16 Teacher: |
| | |
| | |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: | Yes |
| Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Text | tbooks: n/r |
| Current Systems: | |
| Student Software: CIMS III | |
| Student Hardware: IBM AS/400 | |
| system interfaced with your student managemen | nt system? Very Important |
| | |
| Rank of Importance | |
| Rank of Importance Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 7 |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 7 1 |
| - | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: General Inventory: | 1 |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: | 1 0 |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: | 1 0 3 |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 1 0 3 0 |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: Interface with Student: | 1 0 3 0 4 |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: Interface with Student: Requistions: | 1 0 3 0 4 5 |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: Interface with Student: Requistions: Ability to Check District for Books: | 1 0 3 0 4 5 6 |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: Interface with Student: Requisitions: Ability to Check District for Books: Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 1 0 3 0 4 5 6 0 |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: Interface with Student: Requistions: Ability to Check District for Books: Ability to Charge Schools for Books: Ability to Charge Fees to Students: Other Features of Importance: | 1 0 3 0 4 5 6 0 2 |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: Interface with Student: Requisitions: Ability to Check District for Books: Ability to Charge Schools for Books: Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 1 0 3 0 4 5 6 0 2 cluded Gateway's? Very Appealing |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:34:56 AM

| Contact Data: | District Dat | ta: | | |
|--|---|--------------------|--|-------------------|
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | High Schools: Junior/Middle: Elementary: Total Schools | 2 3 15 20 | Enroliment: Teachers: Students Per Teacher: | 8000 600 13 |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: | No | | | |
| Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | \$20,000 | | | |
| Current Systems: | | | | |
| Student Hardware: IBM AS/400 How important is it to have your textbook management system interfaced with your student management system? | ? Very Important | | | |
| Rank of Importance | | | | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 2 | | | |
| General Inventory: | 1 | | | |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 2 | | | |
| Track books to student level: | 2 | | | |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 6 | | | |
| Interface with Student: | 1 | | | |
| Requisitons: | 3 2 | | | |
| Ability to Check District for Books: Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 2 | | | |
| Ability to charge Schools for Books. | 1 | | | |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | | | | |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: Other Features of Importance: | | | | |
| | ateway's? | Very | Appealing | |
| Other Features of Importance: | | Very Yes | Appealing | |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:35:08 AM

92

Warm Prospects

| Contact Data: | District Data | 1: | |
|--|---|--|--------------------------|
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | High Schools: Junior/Middle: Elementary: Total Schools | 2 Enrollment: 3 Teachers: 11 Students Per 16 Teacher: | 7890 660 12 |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | No \$14,000 | | |
| Current Systems: | | | |
| Student Software: SIMS Student Hardware: IBM AS/400 How important is it to have your textbook management system interfaced with your student management system? | Very Important | | |
| Rank of Importance | | | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 3 | | |
| General Inventory: | 1 | | |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 4 | | |
| Track books to student level: | 2 | | |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 5 | | |
| Interface with Student: | 6 | | |
| Requistions: | 0 | | |
| Ability to Check District for Books: | 7 0 | | |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: Ability to Charge Fees to Students: Other Features of Importance: | 0 | | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features included Gate | eway's? | Very Appealing | |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook manager | nent system? | Yes | |
| When might your district purchase a new textbook manage | | Between 25-48 Mo | |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:35:09 AM

| | District Data: | |
|--|--|--------|
| Contact Data: | District Data: | |
| Name: | High Schools: 1 Enrollment: | 135 |
| Contact: | Junior/Middle: 0 Teachers: | 11 |
| Title: | Elementary: 0 Students P | Per 12 |
| Address: | Total Schools 1 Teacher: | |
| | | |
| | | |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: | No | |
| Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Te | extbooks: \$300 | |
| Current Systems: | | |
| Student Software: SIMS | | |
| Student Hardware: IBM System/36 | | |
| How important is it to have your textbook man | | |
| system interfaced with your student managem | ent system? Fairly Important | |
| | | |
| De als a filmana da man | | |
| Rank of Importance | | |
| Rank of Importance Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 8 | |
| • | 8 1 | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: General Inventory: | 1 | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: | 1 2 | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: | 1 2 3 9 5 | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 1 2 3 9 5 7 | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: Interface with Student: Requistions: Ability to Check District for Books: | 1 2 3 9 5 7 6 | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: Interface with Student: Requisitions: Ability to Check District for Books: Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 1 2 3 9 5 7 6 10 | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: Interface with Student: Requisitions: Ability to Check District for Books: Ability to Charge Schools for Books: Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 1 2 3 9 5 7 6 | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: Interface with Student: Requisitions: Ability to Check District for Books: Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 1 2 3 9 5 7 6 10 | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: Interface with Student: Requisitions: Ability to Check District for Books: Ability to Charge Schools for Books: Ability to Charge Fees to Students: Other Features of Importance: | 1 2 3 9 5 7 6 10 4 | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: General Inventory: Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: Interface with Student: Requisitions: Ability to Check District for Books: Ability to Charge Schools for Books: Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 1 2 3 9 5 7 6 10 4 included Gateway's? Very Appealing | |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:35:11 AM

94

| Warm Prospects | | | |
|--|---|--|---------------------------|
| Contact Data: | District Dat | a: | |
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | High Schools: Junior/Middle: Elementary: Total Schools | 4 Enrollment: 4 Teachers: 14 Students Per 22 Teacher: | 10738 608 18 |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | No n/r | | |
| Current Systems: | | | |
| Student Software: CIMS III Student Hardware: IBM AS/400 How important is it to have your textbook management system interfaced with your student management system? | Very Important | | |
| Rank of Importance | | | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 0 | | |
| General Inventory: | 6 | | |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 6 | | |
| Track books to student level: | 7 | | |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 4 | | |
| Interface with Student: | 0 | | |
| Requistions: | 3 | | |
| Ability to Check District for Books: | 1 2 | | |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 0 | | |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: Other Features of Importance: | | | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features included Gate | | Very Appealing | |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook manager | nent system? | Yes | |
| When might your district purchase a new textbook manage | ment system? | Between 25-48 Mo | |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:35:12 AM

| Warm Prospects | |
|---|---|
| Contact Data: | District Data: |
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | High Schools:2Enrollment:5300Junior/Middle:2Teachers:365Elementary:7Students Per15Total Schools11Teacher:15 |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: | No |
| Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | n/r |
| Current Systems: | |
| Student Software: CIMS III Student Hardware: IBM System/36 How important is it to have your textbook management system interfaced with your student management system? | Very Important |
| Rank of Importance | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 0 |
| General Inventory: | 0 |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 4 |
| Track books to student level: | 5 |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 7 6 |
| Interface with Student: | 1 |
| Requistions: Ability to Check District for Books: | 2 |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 3 |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 0 |
| Other Features of Importance: | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features included Ga | teway's? Very Appealing |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook manage | ment system? Yes |
| When might your district purchase a new textbook manage | |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:35:14 AM

| Contract Data: | District Data: | |
|---|---|------------------|
| Contact Data: | District Data: | |
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | High Schools:1Enrollment:Junior/Middle:1Teachers:Elementary:5Students PerTotal Schools7Teacher: | 2824 350 8 |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: | Yes | |
| Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Text | books: \$25,000 | |
| Current Systems: | | |
| Student Software: SIMS Student Hardware: IBM System/36 How important is it to have your textbook manage system interfaced with your student management | | |
| Rank of Importance | | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 1 | |
| General Inventory: | 1 | |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 6 | |
| Track books to student level: | 1 | |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 7 | |
| Interface with Student: | 1 | |
| Requistions: | 6 | |
| | | |
| Ability to Check District for Books: | 6 | |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 6 | |
| • | - | |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 6 6 | |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: Ability to Charge Fees to Students: Other Features of Importance: | 6 6 cluded Gateway's? Very Appealing | |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:35:25 AM

| Comtact Data | | 4 | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Contact Data: | District Dat | ita: | | | |
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | High Schools: Junior/Middle: Elementary: Total Schools | 2 Enrollment: 3 Teachers: 10 Students Per 15 Teacher: | 0 | | |
| | | | | | |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: | Yes | | | | |
| Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | \$10,000 | | | | |
| Current Systems: | | | | | |
| Student Software: Columbia School System | <u>.</u> | | | | |
| Student Hardware: IBM PC or Compatible | | | | | |
| How important is it to have your textbook management system interfaced with your student management system? | Very Important | | | | |
| Rank of Importance | | | | | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 1 | | | | |
| General Inventory: | 1 | | | | |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 1 | | | | |
| Track books to student level: | 0 | | | | |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 0 | | | | |
| Interface with Student: | 1 | | | | |
| Requistions: | 0 | | | | |
| Ability to Check District for Books: | 1 | | | | |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 1 | | | | |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 0 | | | | |
| Other Features of Importance: | | | | | |
| | | Very Appealing | | | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features included Gat | eway's? | | | | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features included Gat Is your district considering purchasing a textbook manager | | Yes | | | |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:35:27 AM

98

| Cold Prospects | |
|--|--|
| Contact Data: | District Data: |
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | High Schools:5Enrollment:18000Junior/Middle:8Teachers:1050Elementary:21Students Per17Total Schools34Teacher:17 |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: | Νο |
| Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | \$6,500 |
| Current Systems: | |
| Student Software: Pentamation Leadership Series Student Hardware: Dec VAX How important is it to have your textbook management system interfaced with your student management system? | Very Important |
| Rank of Importance | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 7 |
| General Inventory: | 3 |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 2 |
| Track books to student level: | 1 |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 0 |
| Interface with Student: | 6 |
| Requistions: | 4 |
| Ability to Check District for Books: | 5 |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 0 |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 0 |
| Other Features of Importance: | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features included Gate | eway's? Very Appealing |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook management | ent system? Yes |
| When might your district purchase a new textbook manage | ment system? Within 12 Months |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:35:28 AM

| Cold Prospects |] | | | | |
|--|----------------|------|---------------|------------|--|
| Contact Data: | District Data: | | | | |
| Name: | High Schools: | 1 | Enrollment: | 4200 | |
| Contact: | Junior/Middle: | 1 | Teachers: | 305 | |
| Title: | Elementary: | 6 | Students Per | 14 | |
| Address: | Total Schools | 8 | Teacher: | | |
| | | • | | . <u> </u> | |
| | | | | | |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: | No | | | | |
| Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | \$5,000 | | | | |
| Current Systems: | | | | | |
| Student Software: Multi Module System | | | | | |
| Student Hardware: IBM PC or Compatible | | | | | |
| How important is it to have your textbook management system interfaced with your student management system? | Very Important | | | | |
| Rank of Importance | | | | | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 1 | | | | |
| General Inventory: | 4 | | | | |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 3 | | | | |
| Track books to student level: | 6 | | | | |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 0 | | | | |
| Interface with Student: | 5 | | | | |
| Requistions: | 2 | | | | |
| Ability to Check District for Books: | 7 | | | | |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 0 | | | | |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 0 | | | | |
| Other Features of Importance: | | | | | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features included Ga | teway's? | Very | Appealing | | |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook manager | | Yes | | | |
| When might your district purchase a new textbook manage | | Betw | reen 13-24 Mo | | |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:35:29 AM

| Cold Prospects | |
|---|--|
| Contact Data: | District Data: |
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | High Schools:1Enrollment:2700Junior/Middle:1Teachers:190Elementary:4Students Per14Total Schools6Teacher:14 |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | No \$5,000 |
| Current Systems: | |
| Student Software: CIMS III Student Hardware: IBM System/36 How important is it to have your textbook management system interfaced with your student management system? | Very Important |
| Rank of Importance | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 2 |
| General Inventory: | 1 |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 0 |
| Track books to student level: | 3 |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 7 |
| Interface with Student: | 4 |
| Requisitons: | 0 6 |
| Ability to Check District for Books: Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 0 |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 5 |
| Other Features of Importance: | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features included Gat | eway's? Very Appealing |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook manager | nent system? Yes |
| When might your district purchase a new textbook manage | |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:35:31 AM

.

| Cold Prospects | |
|--|--|
| Contact Data: | District Data: |
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | High Schools:1Enrollment:7060Junior/Middle:0Teachers:1Elementary:6Students Per1Total Schools7Teacher:1 |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | Yes \$5,000 |
| Current Systems: | |
| Student Software: SASI Student Hardware: IBM PC or Compatible How important is it to have your textbook management system interfaced with your student management system? | Very Important |
| Rank of Importance | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 2 |
| General Inventory: | 1 |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: Track books to student level: | 5 |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 0 |
| Interface with Student: | 0 |
| Requistions: | 3 |
| Ability to Check District for Books: | 4 |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 0 |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: Other Features of Importance: | 0 |
| How appealing is a systems with the features included Gate | way's? Fairly Appealing |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook management | ent system? Yes |
| When might your district purchase a new textbook managen | nent system? Over 48 Months |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:35:33 AM

| Cold Prospects | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|--|-----------------|
| Contact Data: | District D | ata: | | |
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | High Schools: Junior/Middle: Elementary: Total Schools | 3 0 2 5 | Enrollment: Teachers: Students Per Teacher: | 367 34 11 |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | No \$3,000 | • | | |
| Current Systems: | | | | |
| Student Software: Admin & Classmaster Student Hardware: IBM PC or Compatible How important is it to have your textbook management system interfaced with your student management system? | Very Important | | | |
| Rank of Importance | | | | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 0 | | | |
| General Inventory: | 3 | | | |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 4 | | | |
| Track books to student level: | 0 | | | |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 0 | | | |
| Interface with Student: | 1 | | | |
| Requistions: | 0 | | | |
| Ability to Check District for Books: | 2 | | | |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 0 | | | |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: Other Features of Importance: | 0 | | | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features included Gate | | Very | Appealing | |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook managem | nent system? | Yes | | |
| When might your district purchase a new textbook manager | ment system? | Betw | een 13-24 Mo | |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:35:35 AM

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

.....

| Cold Prospects | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|--|----------------|
| Contact Data: | District Da | ta: | | |
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | High Schools: Junior/Middle: Elementary: Total Schools | 0 1 0 1 | Enrollment: Teachers: Students Per Teacher: | 710 85 8 |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | Yes \$500 | | | |
| Current Systems: | | | | |
| Student Software: Schoolnet Student Hardware: IBM PC or Compatible How important is it to have your textbook management system interfaced with your student management system? | | | | |
| Rank of Importance | 1 | | | |

| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 1 |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| General Inventory: | 0 |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 0 |
| Track books to student level: | 1 |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 0 |
| Interface with Student: | 0 |
| Requistions: | 1 |
| Ability to Check District for Books: | 0 |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 0 |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 1 |
| Other Features of Importance: | |

| How appealing is a systems with the features included Gateway's? | Very Appealing |
|---|------------------|
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook management system? | Yes |
| When might your district purchase a new textbook management system? | Between 25-48 Mo |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:35:36 AM

| Contact Data: | Distric | ct Data | a: | | |
|---|---------------------------|---------|--------|--------------------------|-----|
| | | | | | |
| Name: | High Scho | | 1 | Enrollment: | 135 |
| Contact: Title: | Junior/Mic | | 0 | Teachers: | 11 |
| Address: | Elementa | | | Students Per Teacher: | 12 |
| Aduless | Total Sch | nools | 1 | reacher. | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: | No | | | | |
| Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | | \$300 | | | |
| Current Systems: | | <u></u> | | | |
| Student Software: SIMS | | | | ······ | |
| Student Hardware: IBM System/36 | | | | | |
| How important is it to have your textbook management system interfaced with your student management system | ^{n?} Fairly Impo | rtant | | | |
| Rank of Importance | | | | | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 8 | | | | |
| General Inventory: | 1 | | | | |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 2 | | | | |
| Track books to student level: | 3 | | | | |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 9 | | | | |
| Interface with Student: | 5 | | | | |
| Requistions: | 7 | | | | |
| Ability to Check District for Books: | 6 | | | | |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 10 | | | | |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 4 | | | | |
| Other Features of Importance: | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features included G | ateway's? | | Very . | Appealing | |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook manag | ement system? | | Yes | | |

When might your district purchase a new textbook management system? Between 25-48 Mo

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:35:38 AM

.

| Cold Prospects | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------|--|-------------------|--|
| Contact Data: | District Data: | | | | |
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | High Schools: Junior/Middle: Elementary: Total Schools | 2 2 7 11 | Enrollment: Teachers: Students Per Teacher: | 5300 365 15 | |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | No | ı/r | | | |
| Current Systems: | | | | | |
| Student Hardware: IBM System/36 How important is it to have your textbook management system interfaced with your student management system? | Very Important | | | | |
| Rank of Importance | | | | | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 0 | | | | |
| General Inventory: | 0 | | | | |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 4 | | | | |
| Track books to student level: | 5 | | | | |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 7 | | | | |
| Interface with Student: | 6 | | | | |
| Requisitons: | 1 | | | | |
| Ability to Check District for Books: | 2 | | | | |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 3 | | | | |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: Other Features of Importance: | 0 | | | | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features included Gateway's? | | Very | Appealing | | |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook management system? | | | | | |
| When might your district purchase a new textbook management system? | | | 48 Months | | |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:35:39 AM

-

-

| Cold Prospects | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Contact Data: | District Data: | | | |
| Name: Contact: Title: Address: | High Schools:1Enrollment:2400Junior/Middle:1Teachers:200Elementary:1Students Per12Total Schools3Teacher: | | | |
| State Publishes Approved Textbook List?: | No | | | |
| Estimated Annual Cost of Lost or Damaged Textbooks: | n/r | | | |
| Current Systems: | | | | |
| Student Software: nr | | | | |
| Student Hardware: nr | | | | |
| How important is it to have your textbook management system interfaced with your student management system? | Very Important | | | |
| Rank of Importance | | | | |
| Using Bar Code Scanning for Input: | 7 | | | |
| General Inventory: | 1 | | | |
| Tracking books to tearcher level: | 2 | | | |
| Track books to student level: | 3 | | | |
| Monintoring Interbuilding Loans: | 0 | | | |
| Interface with Student: | 6 | | | |
| Requistions: | 4 | | | |
| Ability to Check District for Books: | 5 | | | |
| Ability to Charge Schools for Books: | 0 | | | |
| Ability to Charge Fees to Students: | 0 | | | |
| Other Features of Importance: | | | | |
| How appealing is a systems with the features included Gate | way's? Very Appealing | | | |
| Is your district considering purchasing a textbook management | ent system? Yes | | | |
| When might your district purchase a new textbook managen | nent system? Between 13-24 Mo | | | |
| | | | | |

Report Run Date: 7/20/95 9:35:40 AM

107

,