

Lilly Planning Grant for Academic Library Collaboration

Meeting notes from October 22, 2001

Discussion of trends in teaching, learning, and research

More than 50 library directors responded to the survey. On the basis of the survey results, the identified trends were consolidated and a report provided that listed the trends in order of the level of consensus. The trends included:

1. Online Education (on and off campus)

This response includes the use by faculty of web based course software, the need for on-demand (asynchronous) learning, lifelong learning, and e-reserves. All but 5 to 8 institutions indicated that they have BlackBoard, WebCT or some comparable product. Many of these packages are used to support online education to on campus students in addition to distance education programs. Schools reported distance programs in many areas, including nursing and business. There are partnerships underway with other institutions such as the US Open University, and in targeted nations around the world. One school reported that they were offering programs to address the needs of the military education market. Libraries are seeing an increased number of interns (and other off-campus students) needing remote learning tools.

2. Reliance on web

Reliance on the web is demonstrated in many ways, some which were identified in the survey while others were defined in the discussion. Results of the reliance on the web, faculty are teaching web site assessment and are using the web more in courses. This brings the need to teach evaluative skills for web resources (a need for critical thinking instruction), and the need to do more BI, especially instruction that emphasizes search strategies. One library reported success with a library instruction strategy that is customized with faculty and is course specific.

There is an associated need to market the library and its role, explaining that the web is an access vehicle to library-licensed products as well web resources. In doing this, libraries need to distinguish between networked and web resources, since there are reports of faculty telling students NOT to use the web, which can lead to confusion. There is a need for library “branding” with licensed products to promote the library's role in providing those products. Marketing the library and its role is important in a web era. Although the web-based resource environment is complex, users need simplified web access. The importance of the library's web site is increasing, and is a location for electronic services such as E-Reference.

3. Demand for electronic resources as opposed to print resources.

Users are emailing articles from databases rather than printing them, which is one step further than printing rather than photocopying. Users want e-serials and demand full text so there is a need for digital archiving. Libraries can help bring

change in scholarly communication. One library recently surveyed students and learned that 70% come to the library electronically. Other attendees reported that gate counts are level or down, reference counts are in some cases dramatically down, but BI numbers are up. Today's students and their teachers express a need for digital images and digital media to use in learning. Libraries and faculty alike report less interest in books and other print resources. Fewer assignments require writing, and in response, some faculty are mandating book use. With every entering class, student technology skills are greater. Additionally there is almost exclusive reliance on web, with the Library becoming a last resort for their information needs.

4. Use of technology equipment in learning, with more sophisticated uses of technology

Faculty academic technology use is increasingly widespread, with sophisticated technology trends such as learning communities. Many are jumping on the technology bandwagon, and there are more tech-ready faculty, asking for videoconferencing, chat rooms or message boards to support online classroom discussion. While most faculty are merely migrating existing pedagogy to the course software (glossification), the early adopters are moving forward, and labs in academic units are now "learning centers" in some schools. The academic units and the library should be ready for collaboration, and the position of libraries may be threatened without such collaboration, since vendors are marketing to non-library organizations on campus.

Following the review of the top four trends, the group engaged in a process defining and briefly expanding upon the remaining trends, with the goal of identifying the top trends in Indiana higher education. During this discussion, many issues listed in the survey response report were merged with other topics. After discussion, the following list of all trends was added to the four top trends above. These trends included:

5. Interdisciplinary teaching and team teaching (about 30% of those present see this trend)
6. Collaboration with Teaching w/ technology units, with faculty on web site development, library does technology training, new skills for librarians and library staff
7. Collaboration with educational institutions in community, of community colleges, community outreach
8. Internationalization, multicultural exchanges, need for ESL programs, diversity, minority programs
9. More student group work, need group study areas, collaborative learning tools
10. Assessment, need assessment of new technology methods, OBE
11. Do more with same or fewer staff, need more staff
12. Importance of library web site, My Library portal, web "mining" tools, campus portals with library component, web-based scholarly resources created by library

13. Constructivist learning theory, active learning
14. Struggle for higher ed funding, and technology funding. Seeing more or new degree programs, all levels. More competition for students, focus on admissions, recruitment, retention
15. Co-ops, internships, Service learning
16. Demand for less complex, more consolidated info access.
17. Need more bandwidth
18. Increased need for primary & secondary resources
19. Too few dollars, more choices
20. Library facility renovation
21. Emphasis on undergrad research
22. Libraries in branch campuses
23. Theme-based reading rooms
24. While students are wired at home, they aren't high tech at home
25. Improved retention and graduate rates
26. More emphasis on library outreach, pr for increased library use
27. Struggle over changes in collection management resulting from digitization of scholarly communication and the changing publishing marketplace
28. Challenge to the very idea of a library
29. Increased need to teach older students new research methods
30. Leadership Training
31. Articulation agreements

The top trends as determined by the participants, were

- Online education
- Reliance on web resources
- Demand for electronic and full text resources
- Use of technology in the classroom
 - a. collaboration with IT units,
 - b. assessment,
 - c. need for more library resources (general collections),
 - d. the struggle for technology funding,
 - e. and higher education funding, including enrollment and retention.

Discussion of Collaborative initiatives that would respond to the learning environment

Following the discussion and prioritization of trends, the same process was used for discussion and prioritization of top priorities for collaborative action, moving from four to three top issues by including e-books in the database and electronic product licensing issue:

1. Database licensing, including online journals, full text products, e-books, with improved pricing realized by group negotiations and economy of scale.
We need licensing expertise. We need to look for ways to own the online resources instead of licensing back (as in the SPARC initiatives for reform of

scholarly communication), we need tailored resources that deal with the problems inherent in vendor bundling while we look for common ground rather than focusing only on tailored packages for types of libraries. Group licensing is already utilized, but there is a need to regularize and need more coordination to eliminate duplication of effort. E-book vendors used by libraries include: Logos, NetLibrary, and Questia. Approximately 9 attendees indicated that they are not offering e-books. Reasons include they are not ready yet, or they do not like current options. Issues especially related to e-book projects are the need for collaboration on selection and collection development, including selector options for format choices. There are problems with ebooks on reserves that have to be considered, as well as problems with perpetual access for ebooks (archiving). Printing concerns must be taken into account and compared to e-serials. Need to look at e-textbooks (coursepacks).

2. ILL and Enhanced document delivery

This collaborative initiative suggestion includes a systematic approach to fax, Ariel, and Wheels, with no charges for in-state borrowers, so that it would require net lender reimbursement and load balancing in order to protect the largest lenders. A statewide “last copy held” service would improve availability. Reciprocal lending agreements could also be an element so there is a need for improved lending and borrowing relationships and policies supporting ILL. Libraries need to provide faster service because people expect web speed. The frequency of courier pick-ups for books (Wheels) needs to be improved, therefore improved funding of Wheels might be required to cover more frequent stops for some libraries. Libraries need to provide both patron initiated loan requests and direct delivery to the patron. We have new technologies and ILL standards that do enable many of these needs. Indiana libraries need to reduce the overall cost of the statewide system, and might look for solutions that do not rely solely on payments to OCLC.

3. Well developed tools for accessing web resources

The suggestions included templates, subject guides, portals projects, and online user help systems for specific products. It may involve collaborative approaches to CORC cataloging of web sites for pathfinder production. Many libraries would like to find a way to identify full text products, along with providing information about where they are indexed and who has them. (DataMine, SFX, Knowledge sifter may all provide part or all of the system solutions for the need identified.) Libraries need support for copyright and intellectual property management systems as well as patron authentication service. One definition of a “Digital Library” project would be a single user gateway for Indiana digital resources (both digitized by libraries, and licensed), with a single interface as an option for users. Some libraries see the need for “My Library” or “Scholars' Portal” projects.

After reviewing, defining, and consolidating those top-listed priorities, the consultants quickly discussed the remaining priorities, inviting brief discussion of each. The resulting list was:

4. Shared ILS, union catalog with holdings, need to explore benefits including document delivery, coordinated selection, last copy service.
5. Extended hours reference service, 24 x 7, or extended reference but not necessarily all night, think about internationalization and time zones.
6. Staff development and training, online staff training, training on ils software upgrades or capabilities
7. Collective purchasing for non database items, equipment, book discounts, supplies, etc.
8. Archiving/preservation of media, digital resources, shared digital archive , shared infrastructure for DL development, metadata and scan standards
9. Products that help with organization of information resources (SFX), Need a better way to manage listing of full text journals
10. Centralized storage of lesser used items with document delivery, with document delivery service
11. Cooperative cataloging. Bibliographic integration (CORC)
12. Sharing expertise of staff (consulting), especially in IT
13. Non-mediated patron request capability for resource sharing
14. Conservation, preservation, last paper copy service
15. More bandwidth, network reliability
16. Shared infrastructure for digital library projects, Indiana DL project
17. Online education enhancement (Electronic reserves)
18. Inter-institutional collaboration
19. Collaboration in selection of resources/ collection development
20. Defining what resource sharing can mean on a statewide basis
21. General networking (people to people information sharing)
22. Acquiring, licensing and management expertise for databases
23. Patron authentication services
24. Additional videoconferencing units
25. Shared strategies for recruiting, esp. diversity recruiting
26. Common resources for disaster recovery
27. Distance Education support agreements (for physical sites)
28. A collaboratively funded R&D team to explore new technologies
29. Statewide borrowing privileges, reciprocal walk in
30. Electronic theses and dissertations

After the prioritizing process, the top priorities for collaborative activity were:

- Collaborative e-resource purchasing/licensing
- ILL and enhanced document delivery
- Tools for accessing web resources
- A union catalog with holdings (although the group realizes there are various ways to do this)
- Better bandwidth and network reliability
- Shared digital library and digitization infrastructure
- Central materials storage
- A digital resource archive

- Shared staff development, and
- Licensing support

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Charge to subgroups: For each of the high impact trends in teaching, learning, and research, identify the best mix of collaborative library priorities to address these trends.

Reporting of subgroups

Group one: Accessing e-resources of all types

End users want a tool for accessing resources of all types. The tool should be web-centric, customizable output, brandable, supports local to statewide searching, and general to more specific searching. The tool's environment involves collaboration:

- sufficient and reliable and standards based bandwidth,
- working through licensing with support,
- underlying sharing of digital resources and archives contributed uniquely.
- Provide a system of Continuing Education on the core competencies of library use and to support staff who support end users.

Group two: Technology infrastructure

This underlies and pervades everything we do. Collaborative pro-active advocacy position would produce more clout than individually. We do a needs assessment of technologies needed now and in the future. We need to collaborate with IT units, with state units such as IHETS, to get a dependable statewide backbone. We cannot individually do this sort of lobbying, but can produce results together, along with our IT units.

Group three: Online learning

All collaborators need a common vision. Lilly has a vision: that anyone can walk into any library and get anything they want. It will be important to develop strategies and means for this vision. We are operating in multiple environments, so there are various strategies (collaborative licensing, storage, patron initiated circulation) that will help us reach the vision. "Digital library services" also encompasses an underlying set of resources in paper, that is more comprehensive than licensed resources. Different libraries are at different places, so the priorities for action vary by type of or status of library. We can all come together on "digital library services."

Group 4: Higher education funding

Everything listed as a priority has something to do with funding if done collaboratively. We can spend less money and have more savings for libraries. Especially appropriate examples include: a centralized subscription and licensing office, the need for more emphasis on academics, regional digitization centers, digital resource archive, virtual linked catalog, ILL and enhanced doc delivery, shared storage, shared web tools with coordinated responsibilities for maintenance of those tools.

Group 5: Positioning the library

The number one priority was bandwidth, since a library can't be a leader without it. We all need it for web centric Digital Libraries (need better plumbing to get rid of clogging) and to avoid problems that are bad for the image of the library.

Collaborative purchasing and licensing would help marketing by identifying the library's niche, but we need to tailor that to specific student needs. With assessment, jointly purchasing of databases can enable better statistics and other use indicators. We will need to prove that money is used effectively and to identify outcomes in new ways. We need administrative tools to collect reporting and assessment information. We need good tools to help students keep from being overwhelmed and perplexed. That is another good niche. We need shared digital databases of graphics, pictures, audio and media.

Group 6: Changes in instruction on campus

Tools for accessing web resources showed up in all categories of change. Need to develop a toolkit that includes all sorts of specific products (a cafeteria plan of use) that would help lots of people. More the pick the more you pay: branding, e-resource licensing, subject guides and pathfinders, 24x7 reference service as an option.

“Ah-ha's”

What insights have come to participants during this day of planning?

- We have much in common
- We are working toward the same goal but we are going about it in different ways
- There are many wide-ranging issues so we need to collaborate
- A “lowest common denominator” approach is not good enough any more
- We are all very “Web-centric”
- Technology won't go away or slow down
- Libraries have to talk to other campus entities, and collaborate across the state
- New ways to relate must be developed
- We are in competition on campus for a budget priority position
- This planning is different from Inspire because the vision is coming from a private foundation rather than a public entity, which creates competition for priority at Lilly