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Chapter 1
Introduction

This self-study describes the role of the library in learning and teaching at Carleton and provides a detailed view of our efforts and challenges in support of the College’s mission. This introductory chapter provides an overview of major themes in library development since the last departmental review, identifies major strategic directions for the library program, and outlines the key questions and challenges we face.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT
The last library departmental review was conducted in 1991. The reports from that review are on open reserve, and our progress in addressing the recommendations is included as Appendix A.

The library has a tradition of excellence in its collections, staff, and traditional library services. Beginning under the leadership of John Metz and continuing to the present, there has been a concerted effort since 1991 to strengthen our efforts in a number of key areas, while continuing to build on our core strengths of collections and staff. These new emphases have included:

• Updating the building in response to technology and changes in student research and study needs, and developing a vibrant, welcoming sense of place;
• Developing an outreach program to raise the profile of the library and its staff on campus, engaging the library more deeply with the curriculum and the community, and increasing awareness of the purposes, resources, and services of the library;
• Integrating information literacy into the curriculum of academic departments, strengthening the reference and instruction program, and developing a liaison program;
• Quickening the pace of innovation in adopting technology in support of library operations, resources, and services and forging a partnership with Information Technology Services (ITS);
• Developing the digital collection;
• Increasing the number of collaborations and partnerships on and off campus, including the establishment of the Bridge Consortium;
• Strengthening the capacity for innovation in developing information services in support of faculty and student scholarship;
• Increasing the number of staff to carry out new initiatives and intensifying staff development to meet these challenges.

Two major motivations for expanding our arenas of excellence are the need to keep up with innovations in the field of library and information science, and library programs of our peer institutions.

The explosion of innovation in library and information science requires us to be constantly aware of new developments in scholarly communication and to assess their relevance to Carleton. As Carleton has continued to raise its national profile and national rankings, its library has increasingly looked outward and gauged its aspirations and innovations against those of peer institutions. In adopting this more outward-looking perspective, we are mindful that what makes Carleton good is precisely what is unique about the College — its quiet, confident sense of itself, its skepticism of fads, and its thoughtful and relentless dedication to excellence in learning and teaching. We know that what is right for Carleton is not to be found in simply mimicking other schools or chasing current fads. However, we are committed to developing a dynamic library program, customized to the needs of Carleton, and commensurate in quality with the teaching programs the library supports.
The key to ensuring that library development is consistent with academic needs and values is tying the library closely into the College’s academic program planning. With administrative changes in the College it is appropriate that the library returned to reporting to the Dean of the College beginning with this academic year. This change in reporting relationship offers great promise for further integrating the library into academic planning and ensuring that the College has a library that meets the changing needs of faculty and students.

Intelligent development of the library program will involve learning from and working with others, on and off campus. Thus this self-study outlines our increasing collaborations on campus, regionally, and nationally. It also includes many points of comparison with the libraries of peer institutions and a summary of our nascent internal assessment activities.

Over the past six years we have worked hard to step up the pace of innovation in introducing new resources and services, and in adopting new technologies. We believe that, since the last review, we have moved from a position of being a “trailing institution” to a position solidly in the “middle of the pack” among our peer institutions. Chapter 7 will discuss our present position and our recommendations for picking up the pace of innovation.

We are very proud of our accomplishments in updating and expanding our resources and services and picking up the pace of innovation. Relative to our comparison group, this has been done with less staff and a smaller budget. This is in the Carleton tradition of “doing more with less.” However, it must be emphasized that whatever improvements we have been able to make are due largely to the keen expertise, hard work, and fierce determination of the library staff members, who have performed a tremendous service to the College since the last review. It has not been easy to affect the kind of change required to move us forward in our relative position. Indeed the accomplishment has been accompanied by understandable stress and anxiety as we have undergone so much change so quickly. However, in terms of staff skills, organizational agility, and programmatic accomplishment, we believe this big push has put us in a good position to meet the challenges of the decade ahead.

KEY AREAS FOR LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT

After the conclusion of the departmental review the library will undertake planning to implement the recommendations. This will likely entail a series of retreats and discussions to develop a strategic plan and our next set of three-year goals, conduct a review of staffing and program needs to determine priorities for new staff positions, and establish budgetary priorities. However, it seems clear to us that key areas for future library development should certainly include the following top priorities identified in our self-study:

- Building addition – Planning and completing a library expansion by 2009.
- Information literacy – Working with faculty on departmental information literacy goals, and strengthening partnerships with the faculty and other academic support units to ensure that faculty have appropriate support in achieving information literacy goals.
- Collection support – Finding the right balance between print and electronic resources, and text and other genres; and securing the funding, staff expertise, and faculty involvement needed to gracefully effect the continuing transition from a library collection

---

1 This typology is borrowed from “Getting beyond budget dust to sustainable models for funding information technology” by David L. Smallen and Jack McCredie in EDUCAUSE Review March/April 2003, p. 44.
composed of text resources to one that includes visual, data, and multimedia resources in a variety of formats.

- Staff – Continuing to build and support our most important library resource, the staff, by strengthening efforts in staff development, recruitment and retention, diversity, and competitive compensation; and by increasing staff numbers as required by workload and challenges in scholarly communication.

- Technology – Strengthening our partnership with ITS; placing ourselves strategically in terms of technology innovation; and focusing on systems integration and simplified access to e-resources.

KEY CHALLENGES AND QUESTIONS
What role should the library play in supporting Carleton’s purpose of “liberating individuals from the constraints imposed by ignorance or complacency and prepare them broadly to lead rewarding, creative and useful lives?”

The library supports this purpose by:
1. Providing a collection representing the public record appropriate for a liberal arts college.
2. Developing and preserving the collection – print and digital.
3. Organizing the collection for ease of access and use.
4. Providing expertise, technology, and services in support of access and use of the record.
5. Partnering with the faculty to ensure that students become information literate and develop appropriate research skills.
6. Providing space that makes the library a center of our learning community.
7. Providing programming as a cultural center for the campus.

Following are the key challenges we face today and in the future, along with some of the key questions we hope to address in the departmental review.

1. Is the library providing an appropriately effective representation of the public record, onsite and online, in support of scholarship at Carleton?

   A. Key challenges:
   1. Electronic resources – sustaining and expanding access to bibliographic and full text resources in the face of cost increases.
   2. Journal costs and formats – determining the mix of print and e-journals in support of each discipline and supporting national/international efforts to make journal literature affordable to the academy.
   3. Faculty participation – involving faculty in review of e-resources and ensuring continued appropriate faculty involvement in building the collection.

   B. Key questions:
   1. How well does the library collection meet the needs of the College community?
   2. Is our allocation of resources by type (journals, books, e-resources) appropriate?
   3. Does our selection process work effectively? Is the faculty involved appropriately?

2. Is the library developing and preserving the collection in response to changes in scholarly communication and Carleton’s needs?

   A. Key challenges:
   1. Beyond text – incorporating new genres of information (visual resources, data, and multimedia) into our concept of collections and workflows.
   2. Global resources – expanding collection scope to prepare students to be members of a world community and to meet the needs of a diverse faculty and student body.

---

3. Budgetary support for a balanced collection—providing sufficient funding to maintain our traditional strength in print monographs while also strengthening e-journal access, purchasing new digital collections in the humanities and other areas, and expanding the collection in response to faculty and student needs.

4. Preservation/digitization—developing the capacity to retrospectively digitize Carleton scholarship and publications for access and preservation.

5. Staff implications—providing sufficient staff with the appropriate skills to manage these changes.

B. Key questions:
   1. How does the College address the challenge of library costs that consistently rise at a rate greater than inflation?
   2. Should Carleton selectively join national efforts to influence the terms and conditions of access, as it has done with the Science Direct e-journals package?
   3. How can we tie collection funding to new program development and new curricular directions in the College?

3. Is the library effectively organizing and providing easy access to the collections, both print and digital?
   A. Key challenges:
      1. Developing skills and changing workflows—as tools and methods for the organization of information change we must provide professional development to support staff in managing this change.
      2. Striving for seamless access—integrating multiple information systems to provide easier, more seamless access to the information resources available on a topic, which requires more intensive technology development and an even closer partnership with ITS.
      3. Digital assets management and institutional repository—providing campus leadership in ensuring responsible stewardship of the College’s digital output.
      4. Outreach in information management—sharing our skills and perspectives with individuals and departments as they develop and manage their own information collections.

B. Key questions:
   1. How can we improve our support of professional development for library staff?
   2. Having decided not to use the Chief Information Officer model, how will the College proactively coordinate information and technology activities campus-wide to ensure cost-effective and responsible stewardship of the College’s information resources?
      Having decided not to merge ITS and the library, what will the College do to help foster a partnership between library and ITS?
   3. How can the College more effectively engage the growing expertise of library staff in campus-wide information creation, organization, access, and management?
   4. How can Carleton work collaboratively with other institutions in managing digital assets and developing an institutional repository?

4. Does the library provide appropriate services, expertise, and technology tools to support faculty and student scholarship?
   A. Key challenges:
      1. Adapting services in response to changes in scholarly communication and the needs of students and faculty. Developing services to support the use of visual information, data and GIS, and multimedia.
      2. Keeping up with ever-changing technologies; making timely, cost-effective decisions about tools and resources that will significantly benefit student and faculty work.
3. Providing staff development opportunities to ensure the expertise needed to support library services.
4. Coordinating service initiatives with ITS and other academic support services, including ongoing development of the Research/IT service (joint service desk).

B. Key questions:
1. How can the library most effectively partner with faculty and other academic support services in identifying needs for new information services and in implementing those services? Is the liaison program effective?
2. Is the library sufficiently active in its application of technology to its delivery of resources and services? Is the strategic plan for library technology development adequate? Are there technologies we have not identified that we should be investigating?
3. Does the College believe it is appropriate for the library to become a “close follower” in service and technology innovations?

5. Is the library appropriate and effective in partnering with the faculty to help ensure that students become information literate and are prepared to undertake the research required for the integrative exercise (comps) in the senior year?
   A. Key challenges:
   1. Learning what faculty expect students to know by way of research skills in preparation for comps, and how the library can help to prepare students.
   2. Gaining the confidence of faculty in librarians as partners in the educational process.
   3. Expanding information literacy efforts beyond the five Mellon initiative departments.
   4. Integrating information literacy into the curriculum of the College and making it one of the College’s identified and regularly assessed learning areas.
   
   B. Key questions:
   1. Are students learning the information skills they need to be effective in coursework and in their majors at the proper times, in an intentional, sequential way? How can the library best contribute to developing information literacy in students?
   2. How can we change the perception in academic culture at Carleton that research skills are something students should already know, and that seeking a reference librarian’s help is an admission of failure?
   3. How can we further integrate information literacy into the curriculum of the College? How can we engender faculty leadership in information literacy? How can we factor information literacy into discussions of curricular reform/review in the coming years? How can we best build on the momentum gained in the Mellon information literacy initiative?
   4. In our information literacy efforts, should we continue to focus primarily on work in the major, or should there be other areas of logical curricular focus?
   5. How would faculty like us to communicate with them when we know a student is having problems with an assignment, or when we can see that an assignment is not working well?

6. Does the library provide adequate and appropriate space for both individual and collaborative research and study across the disciplines?
   A. Key challenges:
   1. Initiate planning process for library expansion in 2005.
   2. Effectively engage the community in what the expanded library should be.
   3. Complete addition to the building by 2008–09
B. Key questions:
1. What kinds of learning and teaching spaces do we want to include in the expanded library? What kinds of spaces or services might be particularly useful to faculty? In light of the loss of the Science Library in 1996, what more can be done to make the Gould Library better serve the needs of scientists?
2. What academic support services might we locate in the library and what kinds of programmatic synergies might result?
3. What does the College community want in its library? What vision do we want to guide the library expansion?

7. Is the library providing programming important to the learning community?
   A. Key challenges:
   1. Cultural events – continuing the Athenaeum program of partnership with the faculty, students, and others in sponsoring an ongoing series of cultural events in the library.
   2. Curriculum-based exhibitions program – further developing and sustaining a program of exhibitions related to the curriculum and campus conversations.
   3. Art in the library – further developing and sustaining the current program to educate the eye and stimulate aesthetic judgment of students through familiarity over four years with artistic works of high quality in a space they frequent.

B. Key questions:
   1. Should we continue the Athenaeum program co-sponsoring cultural events in the library?
   2. Should we continue the exhibitions program? If so, what can we do to make library exhibition space and services more useful to faculty and students in both course work and supporting campus conversations?
   3. Should we continue the program of art in the library? How should this relate to or complement the program of the planned museum?
   4. Are there other ways in which the library can provide appropriate programming important to the learning community?

8. Is the library effective and appropriate in its program of resources and services and in its planning and direction?
   1. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the library program?
   2. Is the library program appropriately forward looking? Are there things we are doing that we should de-emphasize or discontinue? Are there important trends or issues we are ignoring?
   3. What College curricular and programmatic changes or pedagogical trends will affect use of the library and its resources in the coming years?
   4. Is the library effective in meeting faculty needs?
   5. Are the directions, aims, and program for library development as represented in the self-study appropriate for Carleton? Is the current mission and vision statement appropriate and up-to-date? Is it reflective of the College’s aspirations for its library program?
   6. What role should library staff have in campus planning for information policy, services, and infrastructure development?
   7. How can we tie library development more closely to the College planning processes?
   8. How can we ensure effective recruiting, retention, and support in maintaining the best possible library staff in service to the College?
Chapter 2
The Library’s Role in Learning and Teaching

INTRODUCTION
Everything we do in Gould Library supports learning and teaching at Carleton College. Our mission statement asserts that “we help faculty, students, and staff meet academic and personal goals that extend knowledge and promote achievement in the individual and in the community” (See Appendix C). Although the library provides support for faculty and staff as well as students, the focus in this chapter is on student learning.

We begin this self-study with an exercise in isolating and foregrounding the skills, concepts, and understandings we expect students to gain, in part through intelligent use of Gould Library over four years at Carleton. We then assess, in successive chapters, information services and resources; the organization of information, technology, and computing; library as place; the library expansion; staff and organization; and budgetary support. An extensive appendix contains detailed documentation of these narrative chapters.

It is important to emphasize that most of what is learned in using the library is inextricably related to student academic work in individual courses and in fulfilling the requirements of majors, i.e., in the formal curriculum of the College. Thus the library has no separable, unique curriculum of its own, and the nature and quality of the partnership between faculty and librarians is key to the efficacy of the library’s efforts in supporting learning and teaching.

What students learn through intelligent use of the library is a set of skills fundamental to conducting independent research. Although research means different things in different disciplines, the core components are:

• Finding out what is already written about a topic;
• Evaluating the existing evidence;
• Framing a significant question or set of questions;
• Conducting the investigation and exploration necessary to find answers;
• Effectively communicating the results.

The library prepares students for a lifetime of learning, as future leaders and liberally educated individuals. We do this in part by helping students undertake independent research in their major and support them in conducting comps, (capstone project) research. What research skills do the faculty want students to have when they enter the major? What research skills should a student have before undertaking comps, and what should students learn about research through comps? And how, in each discipline, can the library prepare students to conduct independent research? These are key questions we hope the departmental review process will help us address.

As a contribution to this discussion, we submit the following as the learning outcomes we currently strive to teach in partnership with the faculty and our colleagues in other academic support units. It is on the basis of our success in helping to foster these learning outcomes that we wish to be evaluated.

CORE LEARNING OUTCOMES
We hope that for all Carleton students these learning outcomes result from coursework, fulfillment of requirements for major, use of the library, and interaction with library staff.
1. **Familiarity with the literature and awareness of trends in scholarly communication in a field of study (i.e., in one's major and/or in a topic selected for an integrative exercise).**
   • What are the key sources of information? What genres of information exist and how important is each in the field? Are there highly specialized types of information resources unique to this field?
   • How is information in the field structured or organized? What languages are important in the discipline and why? What scholarly/scientific societies are relevant to the discipline, and what journals and other publications do they produce?
   • Who produces, owns, controls, and profits from the information flow in this discipline? What are the major scholarly communication themes in the discipline, i.e., open access journals, intellectual property rights, and Web/e-publishing? What social and ethical issues arise from the economic structure of the information flow?

2. **Successful experience of conducting research and making intellectual connections.**
   • Understand that to conduct research means different things in different fields, and involves various methods and materials; know what it means in the student’s discipline; and have at least a rudimentary comparative view across divisions.
   • Refine their research skills, building on what they have learned during their first three years, and produce a scholarly project.
   • Frame questions and develop testable/answerable hypotheses. Be able to determine if the data/evidence exist to judge how effective it will be to pursue a given question.
   • Experience research as an iterative process. Develop sufficient mastery so that one can extrapolate what is learned about research in one discipline to master the knowledge base and conduct inquiry in other disciplines.
   • Develop the capacity for interdisciplinary thinking.

3. **Skills in finding, evaluating, and using information.**
   The information literate student:
   • Determines the nature and extent of the information needed.
   • Accesses needed information effectively and efficiently.
   • Evaluates information and its sources critically and incorporates selected information into his or her knowledge base.
   • Uses information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.
   • Understands the role of browsing and serendipitous discovery in the research process.
   These skills are extracted from the *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education* of the Association of College and Research Libraries, a division of the American Library Association. (For complete lists of standards, see [http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlstandards/objectivesinformation.htm](http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlstandards/objectivesinformation.htm)).

**DESIRABLE LEARNING OUTCOMES**

1. **A basic understanding of the role of libraries in society, and of the librarian profession.**
   • Understand the role and purpose of libraries in a democratic society.
   • Appreciate libraries as a community resource, an intellectual commons.
   • Realize that each library user has a stewardship responsibility in managing the commons.

2. **An experience of aesthetic appreciation and pleasure in the use of books and records of human knowledge.**
   • Develop an appreciation for the book as an object, understanding how books are made, and the changes and trends in bookmaking today.
• Give thought to building one’s personal library – print and digital – over a lifetime, and to developing personal information systems.
• Gain exposure to the book arts: e.g., fine bindings and fine printing, artists’ books, calligraphy, and rare and beautiful books through exhibits and use of rare books and manuscripts.

3. **For the 80+ students who work in the library, experience a stimulating and informative employment opportunity.**
   • Develop teamwork skills.
   • Develop understanding of service.
   • Expose students to future employment opportunities in the library profession.

The balance of our self study is in large part a discussion of the library’s methods, programs, resources, and needs for contributing to the College’s achievement of these educational aims.
Chapter 3
Information Services

INTRODUCTION
Our commitment to quality service is listed first in our Values Statement (see Appendix C):
As a teaching library, we believe information fluency is fundamental to the liberal arts,
and we exist to provide information services of the highest quality in advancement of the
College’s purpose.

This value informs all of our work in providing services to the Carleton community, and engages
every staff member in the educational mission of the College.

How are we doing in providing information services to the community? We have commenced
programs of outreach and assessment designed to ensure that our services are responsive to
college needs. These are discussed in this chapter. The LibQUAL+ survey of service quality,
administered in Spring 2004, provides us with the broadest assessment of overall library services.
We were pleased with the very positive results overall and grateful for the indications of areas
where services can be improved. Attached as Appendix D is a summary of the results of the
LibQUAL+ survey. The entire Survey Report is on open reserve.

We view every service we offer as a potential opportunity to foster in our patrons a high level of
independence and sophistication in their ability to find, evaluate, and use information for a
lifetime of learning. What follows is a summary of our strategies and methods along with some
discussion of the challenges ahead.

BUILDING CARLETON’S UNDERSTANDING OF THE LIBRARY
When hired in 1998, the College librarian was charged by the president and the search committee
with raising the profile of the library, i.e., making the library and its staff more active players in
the life of the College and integrating the library more broadly and substantively into the fabric of
learning and teaching at Carleton.

Over the past six years we have implemented a wide variety of outreach activities, including:

• Developing an information literacy initiative and liaison program.
• Having regularly scheduled Library Committee meetings, expanding the Library
  Committee to include students, and using it more actively as a sounding board and
  communications conduit;
• Meeting with constituents to provide and gather information about the library, e.g.,
  holding receptions, meeting with departments and department chairs, talking with
  students and student groups, establishing a liaison program, conducting tours and
  orientation activities, conducting focus groups, hosting topical discussions and guest
  lectures on library issues, participating in teaching of classes, and co-hosting numerous
  programs with other departments across campus;
• Establishing a public relations program and a newsletter focusing on library services and
  changes occurring in the library;
• Working with student groups, including the Friends of the Library, to develop a more
  nuanced understanding of the role of libraries in society and the academy, and drawing
  student attention to librarianship and other information professions as possible career
  paths;
• Developing a set of interrelated programs featuring cultural events in the Athenaeum, art
  in the library, and exhibitions supporting specific courses and campus conversations;
• Expanding and continually developing the library’s Web site;
• Partnering with ITS in developing services.

REFERENCE AND INSTRUCTION SERVICES
The use of libraries is perhaps more complex and potentially more rewarding now than at any time in history. The Web has brought new tools and resources to the user, but not necessarily the expertise required to use them effectively. The impact is more evident with ubiquitous computer access and high-bandwidth connectivity. Because the role of the reference librarian is as important as ever in supporting student research, we have taken steps in recent years to strengthen our reference and instruction services at Gould Library.

In the four years that students spend at Carleton, we must move them, as researchers, from the world of information space they occupied in high school into the knowledge world of the academy. This situation requires an intentional pedagogical sequence of assignments and interventions designed to ensure that students develop careful research methods to accompany and extend critical thinking. Our information support services must meet students where they are and aid them at the point of information need. Our aspiration is to work with faculty towards eventual integration of information literacy into the curriculum of each department, carefully preparing students to undertake a culminating research project in departments that require it.

As we consider the future of the reference and instruction department, we have identified some opportunities for improvement. Training and professional development, particularly in our subject liaisons, are imperative if we are to continue providing the level of service expected of us. To this end, we would like to attend more discipline-specific conferences. The department has hired three librarians relatively new to the field. We will continue to expand opportunities for the new librarians to network and thus form relationships with librarians at other institutions, particularly other new librarians. Increasing our expertise in assessment is another goal for the department.

Reference services
In recent years we have devoted increasing resources and attention to providing reference services to the community. As a result of needs assessments and experimentation, we have updated the design and functionality of the reference room. To strengthen our capacity to meet the information needs of the community, we increased the number of reference librarians from 2.9 FTE in 1998 to the present 5.4 FTE, and added a .4 FTE permanent support position for the reference and instruction department. It has taken six years to lay the foundation for a truly responsive information services program, but we believe the gains will be realized in the next three to five years as the reference team continues to expand partnerships with the faculty, and as physical improvements in the reference area shape the way students use our services and experiment with new services.

While the number of questions has been declining at most academic libraries nationally, we have seen an increase in the number of questions asked at our reference desk and in the number of individual appointments that we provide. We believe the increase is due to the effectiveness of our efforts in outreach, information literacy, and liaison work. Far more important than the numbers, though, is the nature of the interaction between librarians and patrons, and the nature of the services provided. We are seeing an increase in in-depth, complex questions, and a decrease in basic or ready reference questions. People are “Googling” to find factual information and introductory sources, so that those who visit the reference desk are looking for help in digging more deeply into a question. This trend is driving our focus on informal instruction, individual appointments, and strengthening of the liaison program, which leads to more follow-up work by the librarians.
Liaison program
The reference and instruction department has adopted a liaison model in which librarians provide services to faculty and students in the various academic departments. Librarians are assigned groups of departments based loosely on the categories for the College's distribution requirements: Arts & Literature, Humanities, Social Sciences, and Math & Natural Sciences. Our liaison model is based on precedents within the Gould Library, the library profession, and in the ITS/academic computing coordinators. Faculty members appreciate having an identified subject librarian, and encourage students to work with liaison librarians, which helps to overcome student reluctance to ask for help. This has dramatically increased the use of individual consultations. Students trust and value the service of someone with whom they are familiar. With more extended consultations, the role of the librarian is shifting from anonymous service provider to collaborator and knowledge counselor. This initiative addresses the lowest LibQUAL+ student scores in the general survey questions: “Giving users individual attention” (see Appendix D). Our score of 6.50 on this topic was slightly lower than those of other liberal arts students, underscoring our belief that we must continue to strengthen the liaison program.

We are very pleased with the early results of our liaison program, yet we have additional ideas to explore and concerns to address:

- With a staff of 5.4 liaisons, we cannot supply deep subject expertise in every field. The liaison model is accepted most readily by faculty when the librarian has an advanced degree in their subject area. However, we are first and foremost generalists, though we each also have deeper knowledge in specific fields.
- Librarians work closely with students on certain assignments and are in a position to provide faculty with useful feedback on assignments. There is no formal mechanism in place for this.
- There is potential value in incorporating peer-to-peer reference and instruction in our liaison model. This may take the form of working with existing student departmental assistants or developing a parallel program in partnership with the departments.
- We are experimenting with finding the right balance of classes, small group tutorials, and individual appointments in working with specific departments.
- We are experimenting with qualitative assessment measures to complement and extend the quantitative measures commonly used to assess reference and instruction services.

Re-designed reference room
In September 2004 we reopened our reference room, which had been redesigned using the model of an information commons. The key feature, besides increased technology, is a service point (formerly known as the reference desk) called “Research/IT.” It is jointly staffed and managed by librarians and ITS student workers. This program has brought together technology and information support for the first time at Carleton. The initial service program for the redesigned reference room was developed through close collaboration with ITS. This collaboration ensured that the services offered at Research/IT fit in the context of services offered at SCIC (Student Computing Information Center) and elsewhere on campus. (See Appendix E). We will continue a process of evaluating services, furnishings, and the configuration of software and technology around this program.

In addition to developing the joint service point, the reference room was redesigned to provide zones for different kinds of research and multimedia production, to provide furnishings and equipment for group work, to increase network access, and to create a seamless information environment that reflects user needs rather than institutional organization. The redesign was approached as an exercise in prototyping. Ongoing evaluation will inform future design and service choices in the upcoming library addition.
Information literacy
The American Library Association (ALA) defines information literacy as "the set of skills needed to find, retrieve, analyze, and use information." We see information literacy as integral to a liberal arts education and contributing to fostering it one of the highest programmatic priorities of the library. Prior to 1999, development of a formal information literacy program related to the curriculum was not a high priority, though reference librarians worked with interested faculty in providing course-related instruction. As a result of our work with departments on the Mellon Information Literacy Grant, a number of faculty and College administrators have recently encouraged librarians to think of information literacy within the context of research skills, a term more resonant with faculty. These conversations relate to a closer focus on providing students with opportunities for substantive undergraduate research experience. This focus has stimulated interest in other aspects of student research. Curricular conversations are now addressing a bundle of literacies seen as fundamental to the liberal arts: writing, information literacy, quantitative reasoning, visual literacy, and presentation skills. The College recognizes the library has a role to play in supporting these initiatives.

Carleton students are very curious and can almost always find enough information to support an acceptable paper. In our conversations with students at the Research/IT desk, we learn that they consistently turn to the Web for answers. We hypothesize that this is because they value immediacy of results and interactivity. While we cannot afford to underestimate their resourcefulness in using the Web, it is clear from our work with them and from formal assessments that many students are unaware of the richness of the print and electronic resources in the areas they are researching, inexperienced in how to use the tools of the discipline, and insufficiently skeptical about the authority of many of the online sources they encounter. Serious student research requires a level of experience that is not necessarily gained in producing short papers. In our experience, students often enter the comps process unprepared to undertake the level of research that the faculty expect of them, a source of considerable frustration for many students. A key role of the library is collaborating with the faculty to teach students to find and evaluate information.

Several factors have created a climate conducive to pedagogical focus on information literacy. A 1999 Education and Curriculum Committee (ECC) Report on the Senior Year Experience recommended that departments make sure their curriculum offers sufficient coaching in research and writing skills to prepare students for comps. A successful writing program served as a model for a major curricular initiative. The success of the ACNS computing coordinators model suggested a parallel liaison model for librarians, forming a third leg for library/ITS/faculty collaboration. With these influences in mind, we launched a College initiative to integrate information literacy into the curriculum by applying to the Mellon Foundation for a three-year grant. Consultations with faculty indicated that a successful approach to curricular integration at Carleton should be faculty-driven, focus on discipline-specific approaches, and concentrate on the requirements for majors rather than on lower level courses. We solicited proposals for participation from whole departments (not individual faculty) to work towards making information literacy an integral and intentional part of their curriculum. Five departments – classics, English, economics, geology, and history – volunteered to participate, and Mellon approved our proposal in 2000.

The project, which began in 2000, included departmental retreats focusing on information literacy in the curriculum, curricular grants to redesign courses or assignments, assessment of activities,
and evaluation of the overall project. Over four years (the grant period was extended by a year) these five departments made considerable progress in integrating information literacy into the departmental culture and, in some cases, into the curriculum. Victoria Morse’s (history) conclusion serves us all well: “The outcomes include a much greater level of self-consciousness about these issues and their teaching and a greater involvement in communicating their importance to our students, which will be of lasting benefit to all parties.” Encouraged by this success, we have begun expanding information literacy efforts to other departments. Attached as Appendix F is an eight-page overview from the project report which includes key learnings and outcomes. Not included in the appendix but available for review are the core of the report, the extensive reflective pieces from each department and the librarians on grant activities, and the outcomes and assessment.

From faculty members' reflective evaluation reports, we find that changes due to the Mellon information literacy initiative may be subtle, but each department has developed a broader and deeper understanding of information literacy. Most have developed specific information literacy goals for their discipline. Clara Hardy in classical languages wrote, “Over the past three years, the Mellon grant has allowed our department to spend a significant amount of time articulating the goals we have for our majors, and implementing a series of curricular changes that will better accomplish these goals.” Although the involvement of the librarians in the departmental retreats and decisions varied, Charles Priore’s comment that “there is definitely a heightened awareness and understanding of information literacy” rings true. One of the major factors for this acceptance and integration resided in the departmental retreats.

An increasing number of faculty members now recognize that many students are reluctant to ask a librarian for help with their research. Students often believe that finding and evaluating information is something they should already know how to do and that asking for help is an admission of failure. One of the most powerful antidotes to this unrealistic attitude of self-reliance is the faculty’s active sanctioning of the librarian’s role in providing research assistance. It appears that students will not take a library research assignment seriously unless it is clearly part of the intellectual architecture of the course and the curriculum.

Another institutional initiative towards information literacy started this year when the ECC conducted a review of information literacy at Carleton. Following an ECC report on information literacy, half of Carleton departments reviewed their curricula to determine if students receive an integrated sequence of information literacy sessions in a range of courses from introductory to advanced. (Appendix G).

There are still many challenges that remain in our effort to integrate information literacy into the Carleton curriculum. Chief among them is ensuring the continuation of the work that was begun with the Mellon initiative. The departments already engaged in information literacy activities need to be supported, and their innovations need to be disseminated to other departments. The College as a whole needs to decide where information literacy fits within the overall structure of its learning goals, and whether it should be adopted as a College-wide learning outcome. Carleton faculty, students, and academic support staff should begin a conversation about improving student research experiences across the four years, focusing on both the research process and methods and experiential research. We would also like to develop an information literacy curricular grant to continue to support faculty leadership in curricular innovation and strengthen the partnership between librarians and faculty.

Consequently, we must consider the sustainability of our current model. While the reference and instruction staff is sufficient to cover the demand for courses at the moment, if we succeed in increasing the call for information literacy instruction from all departments, we will not have the staff to adequately respond to requests.
Outreach
In the late 1990s, we aimed to make the library warmer and more user-friendly. Student focus group interviews during the spring of 2001 revealed a need to publicize reference and instruction services. A publicity initiative was funded under the Mellon Foundation Information Literacy Grant.

As part of this initiative, one librarian received ALA’s @your library marketing training. This was the basis of a marketing workshop for the MnObe (consortium of the Minnesota Oberlin Group colleges – Carleton, Gustavus, Macalester, St. Olaf, and St. John’s) reference group where strategies were developed for members of the libraries to use. The outreach efforts also included librarian trading cards, posters distributed around campus, a Web page for the liaison librarians, a reference desk kiosk, public service announcements for the campus radio programs, a murder mystery event in the library for new students, and a USA PATRIOT Act exhibit.

Assessment and Evaluation of Reference Services
Reference services have been assessed in a variety of ways, including transaction statistics, focus group interviews, surveys, and anecdotal evidence.

Reference Desk, Instruction and Appointment Statistics
Nationally, the number of questions asked at reference desks is rising at public libraries and declining at academic libraries. At Carleton we have seen a steady increase in the number of reference questions received at the desk, from 2,505 in 1998–99 (data before this date are sporadic and unreliable) to 4,493 in 2003–04. We have moved up significantly in comparison with peer institutions (see Appendix H), from 13th to 9th in number of reference desk transactions. Although a renewed emphasis on instruction resulted in an increase in classes taught from 58 in 1998–99 to 110 in 2003–04, we slipped from 8th to 9th in number of group transactions. These comparative figures do not measure the area of greatest growth at Carleton: individual appointments. In 2000–01, as part of the expansion of our liaison program, we began to emphasize individual consultations with reference librarians. The numbers of consultations, including email consultations, rose from 230 in 2000–01 to 551 in 2003–04. Numbers for the current year suggest that the popularity of this service is steadily growing.

Focus Groups
Reference and instruction conducted focus group interviews in the springs of 2001 and 2003. In 2001 the interviews found that services were effective overall, but not sufficiently publicized. Students also complained of feeling stigmatized when approaching the reference desk for help. Students liked the liaison program and felt it was more permissible to work with a liaison. General instruction sessions were considered to be dull and difficult to apply later, but students appreciated specialized instruction sessions. Both students and staff found the Web site useful. However, they also deemed it difficult to navigate and were unaware of some of our online services.

The focus group interviews in 2003 looked at the experiences Carleton students have during their first four terms and how those experiences complement each other. Students reported that they had used course research guides and learned from instruction sessions, though they wanted more reinforcement throughout their college career. The students found consultations with librarians at the desk and by appointments helpful.

Surveys
The economics department has surveyed juniors as they begin the major and seniors after finishing comps for the past three years. The survey looks at students’ library experiences and asks students to rate their research skills, and then asks questions to test those skills. Students who had rated their skills as at least very good often commented later in the testing section that
they had overrated their skills. The survey also found that students who made use of a liaison librarian were positive about the interaction.

The library's First Year Student Survey was designed specifically to determine the level of experience incoming students had with libraries, their confidence in their information literacy skills, and their ability to actually perform certain tasks related to information literacy. This survey was conducted in 2002 with 209 respondents, and again in 2003 with 274 respondents. Both years found that, for a majority of our incoming students, scholarly journals/e-journals and searching databases are new ideas. While incoming freshmen do have previous experience with libraries and librarians, many have never used an academic library. Students reported using textbooks and Web sites most often for research during their senior year of high school. Despite their lack of familiarity with academic library resources, most students are confident of their ability to conduct college-level research.

We also have survey data from the ACE/CIRP Freshman Survey and the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ). Quality of effort (QE) scales from the 2001 CSEQ are composite scores comprised of student responses to questions within a given area (in this case, library experience). The more frequently students state they have engaged in a behavior, the higher the QE score. The mean QE score for library experiences in 2001 was 2.5 out of 4, the fifth highest mean for the College overall. The library QE score does demonstrate that students are highly engaged in using the library for a variety of academic and non-academic purposes. The CSEQ also asked students to rate the emphasis that Carleton puts on “developing information literacy skills (using computers, other information resources)” from 1 (weak emphasis) to 7 (strong emphasis). In all, 49.7 percent of students put Carleton’s emphasis in the highest range (6 or 7). This held true across class years, with 50 percent of freshmen and 48.6 percent of seniors giving information literacy the highest rankings.

In early 2004, Carleton was awarded a grant from MITC (Midwest Information and Technology Centers) to lead an effort to develop a common tool for assessing first-year students' information literacy. Known as FYILLAA (First-Year Information Literacy in the Liberal Arts Assessment), the grant funds the development of a pilot survey in winter/spring 2005, with the full survey to be completed in fall 2005. The survey will assess skills involved in information literacy, the students' assumptions and intentions, and their understanding of the purpose of research. The pilot survey will include Carleton College, Grinnell College, Macalester College, and St. Olaf College. Use of the survey will help us assess and track information literacy in our own students and will also provide us with a way to compare our first-year students with those at similar institutions.

LOAN SERVICES
Loan services staff members are innovative in employing technology to improve services, with the introduction of ILLIAD (a program for requesting and tracking interlibrary loan requests), e-reserves, and ARIEL (electronic document delivery). This, in combination with implementation of the Bridge catalog, has increased the complexity of workflows, the need for staff training (including students), and dependence on IT (Information Technology) support from within the library and from ITS (Information Technology Services).

The book stacks are extremely well maintained, the collection is inventoried regularly, and items in need of repair are identified at the circulation desk, ensuring that damaged materials are repaired before they are returned to the stacks.

Circulation
While measures of materials use have not been fully reengineered to factor in use of e-resources, it is clear that there has been a steady decline in book borrowing. Since 1995–96 there has been a 35% decrease overall. Student loans have decreased by 35% and faculty loan by 15%. The
largest decreases have been in areas where e-access has increased the most: government
documents, periodicals, and reserves. The largest increase in print collection usage is in special
collections materials.

This decline in book circulation is generally consistent with national trends. However, Carleton
ranks surprisingly 16th out of our group of 17 comparison schools (see Appendix H), reflecting,
we believe, the dampening effect of the ten-week term on the assignment of long papers requiring
in-depth research, student preference for using online sources, and the related desire for
instantaneous results.

Reserves
Carleton’s approach to pedagogy makes heavy use of reserve readings, and the faculty rely
heavily on the work ethic of students. We rank third out of the 17 comparison schools in use of
reserves, with 44,000 uses per year in 2003/04 (See Appendix H). The brevity of the ten-week
term and heavy reading loads are often cited as the reason for this reliance on reserves. While the
number of items placed on reserve has increased somewhat over the past decade, student
borrowing of print reserve readings has decreased by about 30 percent in the past six years.

We delayed implementation of e-reserves for several years while the campus considered its
approach to course management systems, hoping for an integrated approach. We plan to
participate in broader campus conversations about course management systems. E-reserves
(Docutek system) was introduced on a pilot basis last year and has been enthusiastically received
by faculty and students. During the two terms of the pilot period (Winter and Spring terms 2004)
there were 34 courses using reserves, with a total of 10,000 e-reserve uses. In Fall Term 2004
there were 117 courses and a total of just under 20,000 e-reserve uses. It seems likely that
electronic reserve use alone in 2004/05 will exceed 2004/05 combined reserve use (print and
electronic). As use has expanded to all interested departments this year, we have discontinued
paper photocopy reserves. As a result, printing is increasing dramatically and the resulting cost
increases need to be addressed.

Inter-library loan (ILL)
Borrowing materials from other libraries had increased dramatically (311 percent) in the past
decade, with approximately equal increases in borrowing of both books and articles. (See
Appendix I). With the implementation of ARIEL and ILLIAD, and through ongoing workflow
redesign, we have managed to dramatically increase the speed of delivery. On average, it takes
7.9 days to receive books we borrow and 2.78 days to process items we lend. We don’t have
statistics on how quickly we receive articles (electronic files are delivered directly to the patron),
but from experience we know that it is frequently same-day or next-day delivery. Carleton has
long been a net borrower but has increased lending significantly by 82 percent in the past five
years. With 10,987 items borrowed and 2,560 items loaned (not including St. Olaf loans), our
ratio of borrowing to lending is about four to one. Joining the consortium LVIS (Libraries Very
Interested in Sharing) last year has not only increased borrowing opportunities for Carleton but
has also enabled us to increase the numbers of items we lend to other institutions. MnLINK
(Minnesota Library Information Network) Gateway presents another potential opportunity to
further increase access to our collections.

Increases in ILL activity cause concern about the sustainability of the service with existing staff
and resources. We have been able to keep up with the workflow by reorganizing ILL in 2000–01,
the addition of a fulltime position to ILL in 2001–02, and the use of new software and workflows,
but we will need to once again review operations and make some changes to keep up with
demand.
Expanded access to bibliographic databases has increased the complexity of journal finding, which, combined with the ease of filling out and submitting online ILL forms, has resulted in 15 percent of ILL requests being cancelled because we own the item. This process is very labor intensive and points to the need for both user education and for improved systems for journal finding.

Interlibrary loan costs are rising alarmingly. Royalty payments to the Copyright Clearing Center (CCC) for articles borrowed from the same journal more than five times in a year have increased from $1,640 in 2000–01 to $9,437 in 2003–04. We expect these costs to rise even more dramatically beginning this fiscal year as the CCC has raised its rates significantly. After discontinuing charges for out-of-network borrowing in 2002–03, we experienced a surge in out-of-network borrowing, and incurred over $8,700 in unbudgeted borrowing fees in 2003–04, an increase of $7,000 over the previous year. We have not received budget increases to cover these cost increases and will take them out of the collections budget until some budgetary relief is provided. We have no real limitations on use of ILL and may need to consider limitations in the future.

Most interlibrary loan is through MINITEX (64 percent), but we also use Oberlin Group (8 percent), LVIS (6 percent), other networks, and individual libraries (6 percent). In comparison with our peer group (See Appendix H), we rank 7th in items borrowed via interlibrary loan, and 15th in items loaned.

Carleton/St.Olaf Exchange
The number of items loaned between the two colleges has increased steadily in recent years and has increased significantly with the advent of the Bridge shared catalog. (See Appendix J). For September-November 2004, Carleton checked out 2,744 items to St. Olaf patrons (112 percent increase over 2003–04) and St. Olaf checked out 1,881 (132 percent increase over 2003–04) items to Carleton patrons.

NEW AND EMERGING SERVICES
Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and Data services
The reference librarians, in cooperation with colleagues in ITS, are implementing a program of support for GIS. The goal is to collaborate with faculty and staff at Carleton to provide access, resources, and training for geospatial information. As part of the effort, three librarians have begun training in GIS, and there are two GIS workstations with ArcView software in the reference room. We now offer a program of support for individual and group projects.

Students are increasingly using data sets in comps projects and other research activities. This is especially true in the economics department, where the faculty have worked closely with the social sciences librarian and the academic computing coordinator for social sciences.

We anticipate a significant increase in demand for support of student work incorporating the analysis and display of data. The library is involved in the College initiative in quantitative reasoning, which has been boosted by receipt of a FIPSE (Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education) grant. Also in the context of the quantitative reasoning initiative, there has been discussion of expanding our existing data services program to the social sciences division as a whole, and possibly securing outside funding to use this expansion initiative as an opportunity to develop a model data services program for a liberal arts college.

Other than maintaining an ICPSR (Inter University Consortium for Political and Social Research) membership through ITS, there is no systematic program in place to identify, acquire, catalog, archive, and make accessible such data sets. In addressing this challenge over the next decade, we will build on the work of university data centers and endeavor to keep the costs as low as possible.
**Information discovery/management/presentation tools**

In 1999 we purchased a site license for EndNote, and its use has become routine for many faculty and increasing numbers of students. While it is not possible to calculate use statistics, we do know that it is used by many courses and seniors for their comps. Carleton is one of a dozen colleges in the country providing this software without charge and offering it in a networked environment. The EndNote learning curve is rather steep for the casual user, and we are considering offering an entry-level citation management tool.

With the implementation of the Research/IT service desk, we are significantly strengthening our capability to provide support for presentation software (e.g., PowerPoint), Web development tools (Dreamweaver), and tools for editing/excerpting sound, video (e.g., iMovie), images (e.g., Photoshop), and text. We have added color printing and need to figure out how to contain costs. Scanning and printing of microforms is sufficiently heavy that we are considering adding a second station.

We have expanded the number of alert services and tables of contents available to faculty and students but have not yet succeeded in making their availability known and optimizing their use. Comps preparation might be the logical teachable moment for this type of tool.

The use of student portfolios as a way of evaluating student work is becoming widespread, and we will need to assess what we can do to support this aspect of information creation/management.

The library is considering how it can help equip students in developing a personal system of information management organizing, purging, and repurposing daily notes/jottings/lists.

Finally, to help seniors transition to the world after college, the library can help prepare them for access to scholarly information after graduation. The library might collaborate with the Career Center on teaching students methods and strategies for accessing information beyond the campus.

**Visual information**

Visual images are becoming a more dominant means of cultural communication and education. This has become evident at Carleton with increasing use of visual resources in the curriculum. As students use images in their work more frequently, we will need to expand what we know about image-seeking and image-use needs and behaviors, develop methods of instruction and intermediation, and help develop a high level of student fluency in visual means of expression. This will include spatial analysis, 3-D visualization, rapid prototyping, GIS, and video editing. We will work with others on campus to determine the library’s proper role in these areas.

When the DVD and videos currently housed in Media Services are moved to the library in summer 2005, we will implement plans for maintaining and providing access to them. Loan policies were developed in consultation with the faculty and reflect a concern that the curricular support nature of the collection be maintained and that it not take on an entertainment/video store quality. The physical media will reside behind the circulation/reserve desk and be available for short-term loans. After two years, policies will be reviewed. This review will include acquiring, loaning, screening spaces, and network delivery, in part to determine adequate staffing. In the long term we will explore integrating this collection with the monograph collection and liberalizing loan policies. With impending responsibility for DVDs and videos and providing access to ArtSTOR (digital library of art images), we are at the very beginning of a long learning curve in the arena of visual resources.

A higher level of support for scanning and image enhancement software may be necessary as creating and managing of extensive personal image collections becomes commonplace in the coming years. Meeting these challenges will require expertise not currently available in the library to identify, acquire, catalog, manage, and consult on visual and multimedia resources.
Chapter 4
Information Resources

COLLECTION OVERVIEW
Historically, Carleton has strongly supported library acquisitions, ensuring that adequate funds are allocated to build and maintain an excellent liberal arts college print collection, and cultivating a tradition of strong faculty involvement in collection building. As with the reputation of its academic departments, Carleton’s library collection is strong and does not emphasize any discipline as outstanding or superior to others in depth or funding emphasis. Traditionally, our print monograph collection is excellent and we maintain a good print journal collection. However, our strength in scholarly monographs has been significantly eroded as the collection budget, designed to support a high quality print collection, has been stretched to cover both unsustainable increases in print journal costs and expansion of access to e-resources. Faculty responses to the LibQUAL+ survey (see Appendix D) make it clear that there is widespread faculty concern about the adequacy of both the print collections generally and the journal collection (print and electronic) in particular.

A key challenge in maintaining collection strength is to budget at a level that allows us to build both the print and digital components of the collection. We are in the midst of trying to secure the same level of excellence in digital access that we have provided in our print collections. Making this transition to rich hybrid collections of print and electronic resources, comprising text and non-textual genres is a key challenge for the library. See Chapter 11 for further discussion of this financial needs and issues in building this hybrid collection.

The current overall collection size is roughly 913,330 items or pieces, representing approximately 645,230 titles. The title count also includes many but not all of the electronic resources accessible to our patrons. Because we have not yet completed cataloging all of the government documents online, the title and piece counts are still a little low. When that work is completed (hopefully in 2005), we will be able to rely on the counts provided by our online catalog records and ongoing collection inventories for a much more accurate enumeration of the physical collection size. At that point, the only materials that will not have been cataloged are certain government documents maps.

While we are confident that we have a collection befitting one of the top-ranked liberal arts colleges in the nation, it is clear that in terms of library collection resources, we are going to have to work harder in the future to live up to our reputation. Appendix H provides comparative data for a group of 17 highly selective liberal arts colleges. In collection measures, we tend to rank about 11th out of 17, or in the 35th percentile. So far, this has proven good enough to compete nationally, but with the challenges that lie ahead, it will be a stretch to maintain our collection strength without budgetary increases that go beyond keeping up with inflation.

The physical library collection has nearly outgrown the space available in the existing building. Installation of compact shelving in areas with sufficient floor load capacity, weeding, and transfer of 15,000 volumes to offsite storage at University of Minnesota (MLAC) storage facility have bought us a few years (until 2007–08) to build a library addition.

PRINT COLLECTIONS
Monograph Collection
Our monograph collection, selected largely by the faculty, is particularly rich, and provides undergraduates with sufficient depth and scope to support student research approaching
master’s level work in the humanities, languages, and literature. The erosion of this collection mentioned above is evident in Appendix P, which shows a 30% reduction in receipt of book volumes since 1993–94. While part of this reduction is due to some reduction in the numbers of scholarly monographs published, most is a function of insufficient funds to build both print and electronic parts of the collection.

**Journals**

The collection of 1,551 print journal subscriptions is strong, but is increasingly dwarfed in scope and use by the 12,884 e-journals to which we provide access. After increasing the number of print journals in 1999–2000 in response to faculty needs, subsequent biennial journal reviews have resulted in significant cancellations and substitutions, adjusting the title mix to reflect current needs. While we have managed to keep the number of print subscriptions roughly level for the past five years, our print journal costs have increased by 21 percent. Science and social science disciplines are particularly reliant on journal literature and are feeling the pinch of a number of consecutive journal cancellation reviews and budgetary constraints. While our journal holdings, in combination with interlibrary loan services, are more than adequate for most purposes, there is a strong perception among faculty and students in science disciplines that journal holdings are inadequate. This is due to the combination of a loss of access to Science Direct journals, print journal cancellations in recent years, and higher expectations due to expanded access to bibliographic databases. Our LibQUAL+ survey results strongly reinforced our recognition that faculty are not satisfied with journal holdings. In fact, the only score on the LibQUAL+ survey in which the perceived quality was less than the minimum expected was in faculty response to the question 8 in the Information Control category: “Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work” (See Appendix D). From the LibQUAL+ respondent comments it was clear that some of the negative comments about journal holdings are due to specific misunderstandings about hour holdings in specific fields, but clearly the depth of concern indicated in the survey demands some redress. We clearly must do better in both providing what faculty and students need and in communicating the situation with regard to journals, print and electronic.

Even though we offer access to over 12,000 e-journals, we have not been able to substitute e-access for print subscriptions as a cost-savings measure in many cases. In fact we are faced with paying for both print and e-versions of many journals, a financial strain discussed in Chapter 11, Budgetary Support.

**Government Documents**

We are one of two U.S. government document depository libraries in Northfield (St. Olaf being the other), selecting 22 percent of item numbers and providing access to the full range of network accessible documents. We long ago coordinated our selection of item numbers with St. Olaf, but this needs to be reviewed in the new context of a shared system.

**Special Collections**

Our 9,337 volume special collection is a gem of a highlights collection. It is particularly well suited for undergraduate use in the context of course-related assignments in many fields and for use in a serious program of library exhibitions designed to expose students to the wonders of books and bookmaking.

Until 1999–2000 special collections was underutilized. At that time, the newly established collection development department was put in charge of special collections and the bibliographer’s responsibilities were expanded to include responsibility for special collections. Since that time, a mission statement has been written (see Appendix K), and a plan for care and expanded use was outlined (See Appendix L). We have allocated funds annually (except in the 2002–03 budget retrenchment) for new acquisitions and for outsourced conservation treatments, and a wide range of collection maintenance procedures has been implemented. A space has been
designated and remodeled for classes and collection use, and the use of special collections materials for course assignments has increased dramatically (See Appendix M). Faculty using special collections in their courses usually return in future terms, often citing the positive ratings for this activity on student evaluations. For students, using primary source materials combines a visceral thrill of connection to the past and a memorable experience of conducting serious research. We are committed to continuing the program of integrating the use of special collections materials into the work of appropriate courses.

The most important preservation need is to move special collections from the ground level, where it is vulnerable to dampness and flooding, into quarters with adequate environmental controls (the current “temporary” dehumidifier is noisy and inadequate). The most widespread conservation treatment needs are for repair of detached boards and for custom-made boxes. We should consider the possibility of hiring an educational associate in special collections to conduct a collection condition survey and begin to address these needs. In planning the addition to the current building, we hope to physically showcase special collections, increasing its visibility as a campus resource. We would also like to locate special collections closer to curatorial staff and develop a dedicated special collections use area where patrons can be easily assisted and monitored. We believe that if we continue to focus on taking better care of the collection and promoting its use, we will receive more gifts from bibliophile alums. To continue the momentum for encouraging use and taking better care of our special collections in the years ahead we will need to:

• Double the allocations for conservation and acquisitions (both would be attractive for fund-raising/endowments);
• Provide improved facilities;
• Develop an organized program of high-end donations targeted at tying together/supplementing a group of special collections materials used with a specific course or major.

World Resources
Generally speaking, there has not been an adequate emphasis on providing vernacular language information resources to support student and faculty needs resulting from the internationalization of Carleton. Today we have a far more diverse faculty and student body than we did in 1991, including many more international students, increased opportunities for international engagement of faculty and students, and strengthened teaching and learning in foreign languages and international studies. However, there has been no commensurate increase in library funding to support the reading and research needs of this globalization initiative. If we are preparing students to be members of a world community we need to strengthen their access to international resources (film, newspapers and periodicals, popular literature and scholarly sources).

One example of this oversight is that library support was not originally included in the $10 million Starr grant to enhance internationalization. After several years of advocacy we were able to obtain one-time funds to enhance the collection, but not the sort of ongoing support that allows for the purchase of newspaper and journal subscriptions, and for ongoing building of the collection. Similarly, Carleton is not a full participant in the Cooperative East Asian Collections Project with Macalester and St. Olaf. While we have allocated some funds through 2004–05 for purchase of materials and partial support of the curator, we are relying on Macalester for some of the funding of the curator’s time at Carleton, and have no assurance of ongoing funding in support of this position and project. These are examples of the need to tie library development more closely to the planning and development of academic programs, both fiscally and programmatically.
Other Print Collections
While the primary purpose of the collection is curricular support, general reading and special interests are represented in the following collections: current reading room collection, Hubbs paperback collection of mysteries and science fiction, children’s literature reflecting the favorites of Carleton students, and a selection of popular/general interest periodicals.

E-RESOURCES
We now provide access to approximately 12,884 e-journals, 200 bibliographic databases, and 21,624 e-books. We are now spending 19% of our collections budget on e-resources (see Appendix Z. In 1998, we began to develop a library-wide understanding of how we were building and managing the electronic component of our collection, but had no plan to handle the inevitable tremendous growth in e-resources. Today, we have policies and procedures in place to handle an enormous increase in e-resources. In making this transition, we have avoided the model of designating an e-resources librarian in favor of mainstreaming the handling of e-resources into the work of every department. This mainstreaming has required a re-engineering of library operations, which took place through a series of committees (Electronic Resources Committee 1999–2001, Committee on Organization and Delivery of Information 2002–03). These committees coordinated the work of each department to improve communications and mutual understanding and to continually adjust workflows as we learned how to handle emerging digital resources. The investment has paid off in a staff that is agile, knowledgeable, and experienced in adapting procedures to new developments in scholarly communication.

We have strengthened the infrastructure for acquiring and delivery of bibliographic and full-text information through the implementation of more robust networking capacity, increased public computers and peripherals, authentication, and development of principles and guidelines for the negotiation of license agreements. Following the lead of the industry standard counter guidelines, we are beginning to measure the use of e-resources. While the data are still incomplete, we now have at least one solid indicator of the extent of e-resource use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-text articles downloaded:</td>
<td>12,703</td>
<td>49,542</td>
<td>87,582</td>
<td>168,697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As this growth in the use of full-text articles shows, our patrons increasingly rely on our licensed e-content services. The difficulty is that prices for some of these subscription e-journal packages are increasing at an unsustainable rate.

A prime example is the 92 Elsevier print journals to which we subscribed and the access we had to the over 700 titles in Science Direct through the MINITEX contract. The average price of our 92 Elsevier print titles is $2,333 per year, totaling $214,638 per year, or 25 percent of our periodical budget for 6 percent of the titles to which we subscribe. Once the Science Direct contract was no longer subsidized by MINITEX, the deal Elsevier offered contained a provision designed to ensure that we would commit to this level of annual spending for Elsevier print journals (i.e. non-cancellation clause) per year, plus pay an additional fee for access to a sizable Science Direct package. If we had agreed to there terms and accepted the Elsevier promise of holding annual prices increases to “only 7.5 percent”, over a 10 year period our financial commitment to Elsevier would have risen from 25 percent of our periodical budget to 39 percent, and after 20 years we would be paying Elsevier 50 percent of our periodical budget and 27 percent of our total acquisitions budget (assuming acquisitions increases of 3 percent annually).

Pricing policies like Elsevier’s force us to make some difficult and painful decisions, such as opting out of the MINITEX/Elsevier Science Direct contract (See Appendix N). Deliberations about this issue with the Library Committee and science faculty were very stimulating and supportive. There are of course some faculty members who are very much inconvenience by this decision, and many disciplines are feeling the pain of this stand even though it is in our long-term...
interest. We are committed to continuing a systematic program of outreach on campus on behalf of the open access journal movement, providing opportunities for discussion of the issues. We hope the faculty will agree to participate selectively in other national efforts to influence the development of license terms and pricing schemes for scholarly publications that are favorable to the academy.

Until recently we have purposely limited our e-book offerings to a relatively small number of collections, including participation in the MINITEX net library and a subscription to LION (Literature Online). This year, with donor funding, we licensed access to Early English Books Online (EEBO), and, in response to faculty teaching needs, we secured access to the Evans Early American Imprints set. This is the beginning of a new wave of digital collections of books, government publications, newspapers, and pamphlets that will become available over the next decade. We need to be ready to purchase those important to the faculty.

Finally, we will continue to struggle, along with the rest of the library profession, to figure out how best to make known to students the many high quality free Web sites that are useful in academic work.

**New Genres of Information Resources**

Beyond sustaining and expanding access to full text, our key challenges will be in incorporating new genres, such as visual information, data (including spatially referenced data), and multimedia into our concept of collections and policies and workflows. The College’s DVD and VHS collection will be transferred to the library in summer 2005. We began to work with still images by acquiring AMICO and by serving as a beta site for ArtSTOR. We are currently building our capacity to work with the art and art history department and ITS on plans for digitizing more slides and moving their catalog of images to ContentDM for their catalog of images, and figuring out how these resources relate to access via the library catalog. The GIS and data services programs will receive a boost from the new College initiative in quantitative reasoning, which we will support, in part, through providing access to data sources. It is not clear if the College will want its library to participate in selecting and organizing sound, which is currently handled in a departmental library managed by the music department.

**PRESERVATION OF RESOURCES**

We have an exceptionally strong traditional preservation program, reflecting a long-standing institutional ethos of care and regard for the library collection. We treat about 2,500 volumes per year, not including commercial binding. Most of this work is done by well-trained students in our cramped but well-run preservation area. The program for maintaining the circulating collection is excellent, ensuring that damaged materials are repaired before they are returned to the stacks. We have an *Emergency Recovery Response Plan* that is updated regularly. Six years ago we stabilized the temperature in the library by convincing the College to leave the HVAC system on constantly, rather than shutting it off on summer nights. The preservation staff advises on book care for exhibits and contributes to ongoing education about the food and beverage policy. We seem to have found a good balance in our mandate to preserve the collection and to create an atmosphere conducive to academic work by students of the current generation. Ongoing education and enforcement will be the key to keeping the building free of damaging insect populations.

Commercial library binding is an area that needs more attention. We now bind 77 percent of our current paper periodical titles. We rebind a small number of books already in the collection, when they cannot be repaired in-house. Prior to 1999, we routinely bound all new paperbacks added to the collection. In 1999, we began binding new paperbacks and government documents very selectively, when we judge that they will receive high use or cannot circulate unbound. One book vendor supplies some paperback university press titles prebound, according to our specifications.
In 2003-04, the budget for binding was reduced by 29 percent to conserve funds for new monographic purchases. This situation required some quick decisions about how to reduce binding for certain categories of materials to stay within the budget. These decisions were based on common sense and we don’t believe that they will result in any great harm to the collections. However, in the next few years, we should analyze the impact of these changes on our collection and do a comprehensive analysis of the role of commercial library binding in our preservation program – especially regarding journals that are now available electronically and paperbacks that circulate rarely or never – and make changes to binding policies accordingly.

Prior to 2000, we removed paper dust jackets from all books before adding them to the general collections. In 2000, we began to retain dust jackets (covered with polyester sleeves) on most new books, as a way to preserve the useful information they provide and to protect the book covers from light and abrasion.

We have begun to allocate funds ($2,000 per year) for contract conservation of special collections materials. To responsibly care for the special collections we will need to increase the level of conservation treatment and investigate in-house procedures to add to our treatment repertoire.

We have not yet begun to digitize materials from the collection, but plan to begin with the _Carletonian_ and with a pilot project to secure prospectively _de novo_ digital copies of all comps projects.

As our contribution to national preservation efforts, over the next few years we plan to take the lead in working cooperatively with other Northfield libraries and the Northfield Historical Society to develop and implement a cooperative preservation plan for materials documenting Northfield/Rice County and its institutions. We will define the subject scope, identify material we have that is uniquely held in Northfield, inventory our holdings, assess the physical condition of materials, set priorities for preservation, and seek grant funding to preserve these works cooperatively.

**SELECTION**

There is a strong tradition of direct faculty involvement in collection building. About 60 percent of the monograph budget is sub-allocated to departments for faculty selection. Faculty participate in the biennial review of periodicals, review standing orders for monographic series, and give input on occasional weeding/transfer projects. Because of the many new faculty hires in recent years, we developed a brochure outlining faculty involvement in selection (See Appendix O), and we implemented a one-time allocation of $750 to each new tenure track faculty member to build the collection in their area of teaching interest. While we do not foresee any fundamental rethinking of this model for selection, there are some indications that a review and updating of the methods of faculty involvement in collection building may be useful in the next few years. There is a perception among some senior faculty that younger faculty are not taking sufficient responsibility for selection and that the collection is not being developed as intensively in some areas as before. Some departments are disorganized in their approach to routing selection sources and handling orders, apparently sending a signal to younger faculty that this is not an important matter for the department and for individual faculty. There are persistent problems in some departments with faculty not spending the funds allocated for monographs, though this is not nearly the problem it was six years ago when we implemented a “use it or lose” rule. We believe faculty involvement in selection should be strengthened by some open discussion with the faculty on these topics, and by finding ways to involve faculty in decisions about e-resources.
RESOURCE-SHARING
In recent years, we have increased our involvement with our regional consortium, MINITEX, and have become involved locally with the establishment of the MnObe consortium (Carleton, Gustavus Adolphus, Macalester, St. Johns/St. Bens, and St. Olaf) and the Bridge Consortium (Carleton and St. Olaf). We continue to participate in interlibrary loan, and license most of our databases through consortial deals with various Oberlin Group libraries and with MINITEX. In the next few years, our primary focus will be realizing the full potential of recent consortial development within the state. The Cooperative East Asian Collection Project with Macalester and St. Olaf is another cooperative collections venture initiated in recent years.

Within the Bridge Consortium we will jointly review all e-resource licenses for both schools, seek opportunities to save money through joint licensing, eliminate unnecessary duplication, find ways to extend our buying power, and develop a joint collection strategy for expanding access to e-resources. Over time we will also be reviewing our agreements regarding government document selections and evaluating whether two depository libraries are still needed in Northfield. The level of duplication in our monographic collections is currently 17 percent. We will be looking for ways to avoid unnecessary duplication, and are investigating collection analysis tools that will facilitate identification of collection strengths and overlaps and inform ongoing collection development. Finally, coordination of print journal subscriptions presents a major opportunity for optimizing use of acquisitions funds on both campuses. The librarians will develop mechanisms for securing faculty input and buy-in as we increasingly coordinate our collections policies and practices.
INTRODUCTION
The past decade has seen great change in the organization and delivery of information, and the next decade promises to be even more eventful. Our work has gradually shifted from an emphasis on printed books and journals to CDROM formats to increasing numbers of network-accessible resources. While the number of printed books and journals ordered and cataloged is gradually declining, the number of e-journals, e-books, and databases we license and provide access to is rising dramatically.

With the workload shifting to encompass new formats, the staff has redesigned workflows and mastered new and techniques to keep up with an increasingly complex environment. We have developed our Web site into an important tool for accessing networked information and information about using the library. In addition, while maintaining our services in organizing the print collection, we have undertaken a number of major projects, including the following:

- Loading bibliographic records for about 70 percent of e-journals into the catalog;
- Classifying the print journal collection;
- Transferring many reference materials to the stacks;
- Transferring 15,000 volumes to offsite storage at Minnesota Library Access Center (MLAC);
- Planning to assume responsibility for acquisitions, cataloging, and circulation of the media collection;
- Upgrading to Millennium software for our integrated library system (ILS);
- Creating online records for government documents;
- Barcoding of entire collection;
- Completing conversion of collection from Dewey to LC;
- Migrating from Carlyle to a full ILS in 1994;
- Cataloging print periodicals;
- Eliminating paper shelf-list.
- Developing a joint library system with St. Olaf.

In the next few years we will begin to implement tools that will enable more seamless linking from one digital object to another, permit searching across multiple databases, and provide easier, clearer access to print, digital, and e-collections. As we develop skills in integrating information systems and describing/encoding materials to ensure interoperability, we believe the library staff will increasingly be called upon to conduct outreach activities.

Acquisitions
Orders for print materials are processed quickly, and rush orders are handled via Internet vendors when possible and generally received within a week. Since 1991, the number of firm orders placed for books has fallen by nearly one third, and the number of book volumes received has decreased by a similar margin. See Appendix P for a summary of technical services statistics for 1994–95 through 2003–04.

While orders for print materials are down, we are spending more of our time providing network access to materials we do not own. The Internet has enabled us to find and purchase books and other items we were previously unable to obtain, such as rare materials for special collections and out-of-print titles. However, searching, ordering, and processing these items is also a labor-
intensive process. We are receiving more requests from faculty and staff for these types of materials.

We are investigating the use of our library system vendor, Innovative Interfaces, Inc.’s, Electronic Resources Management tool to help manage and keep track of our license agreements, payments schedules, and changes in search interfaces and content for our more than 12,000 e-journals and several hundred bibliographic databases.

Government Documents
Receipt of government documents in print form has dropped from more than 17,000 in 1993 to 5,492 in 2003–04. During this same time period there has been a rise in Internet access to government documents in fulfillment of our collection responsibilities as a depository library. While in 1995–96 Carleton received (i.e., cataloged and provide access to) two Internet government documents as part of our depository library receipts, last year we received 8,926 Internet accessible government documents in our depository library profile. Informed by a consultant’s review of our government documents operation in 2002, we reorganized our handling of government documents, reducing staff FTE and focusing our efforts on managing e-documents.

Cataloging and Classification
Traditional cataloging of materials is accomplished efficiently. There are no cataloging backlogs, and rush materials are cataloged the same day they are received. Titles cataloged have fallen from 11,674 in 1994–95 to 7,337 in 2003–04. The number of book volumes added to the collection has fallen from a high of 14,501 in 1995–96 to 8,393 in 2003–04.

Nearly everything in our physical collections is now in the online catalog and classified in a consistent manner. We load bibliographic records for electronic resources when they are available from vendors or catalog via OCLC those deemed especially important. Approximately 70 percent of our e-journals are cataloged. We load records for e-books and other electronic databases and sets – e.g., netLibrary, LION texts, Early English Books Online (EEBO). We have cataloged a few Web sites, at the request of reference staff. However, as yet we have no ongoing program of cataloging Web sites for the OPAC. We do not classify electronic resources.

Online cataloging of government documents collection received a big boost in 1994, when we purchased the post-1976 catalog records from Marcive and began to load Marcive records for current receipts weekly. Since then we have systematically cataloged the vast majority of the older pre-1976 records using OCLC. By 2005 we hope to have almost all documents listed in the online catalog, except for certain sets of maps. Federal documents are classified and shelved using SuDocs classification.

MARC cataloging of 2,680 video resources (DVD & VHS) was contracted out to marc4media in 2004. Approximately 5,000 other titles have been cataloged in-house. The staff is preparing to assume responsibility for acquiring, cataloging, and processing over 500 titles that are acquired annually, after the collection is transferred to the library in 2005.

In 1999, we completed a long-term project to catalog and reclassify the book collection from Dewey to LC classification. In 2002 we classified all periodical titles held in paper into LC classification, before moving them into compact shelving. Current issues are still shelved alphabetically. Periodicals in other formats (e.g. microform) were not classified.

In 2003 we implemented CJK software to enable searching and cataloging of materials using Chinese, Japanese, and Korean vernacular characters.
We have not yet implemented the enhancement of our bibliographic records with information about publications (e.g., tables of contents, book jackets, reviews), something we will investigate with our Bridge colleagues.

We familiarized ourselves with the metadata standards and the use of metadata, though the cataloger with the most training in this area left Carleton several months ago. In recruiting for a replacement, we are seeking leadership in adapting our cataloging methods as libraries move beyond MARC to the use of metadata, XML, and other protocols for managing digital objects with a variety of information systems.

SEAMLESS ACCESS TO E-RESOURCES AND INTEGRATION OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS

In conducting bibliographic research for a paper students will typically use multiple information systems: e.g., several different abstract and indexing tools, multiple e-journal services, the online catalog, e-reserves, and ILLIAD for interlibrary loan. Someday we will be able to provide a single integrated library system that seamlessly pulls together all our search results and quickly connects us to all relevant text and services. Unfortunately, our integrated library system (ILS) software, Innovative Interface’s (III) Millennium, is a good traditional ILS, but is still very much an “information silo,” i.e., not easily integrated with other information systems. While III is one of the best ILS systems available, like the others it is still evolving towards a higher degree of interoperability that will allow us to affect seamless integration of disparate information systems. While the development of truly seamless network access to scholarly resources will most likely evolve over the next decade with industry developments and innovations in information science, we are poised to take advantage of some available tools in the near term. This requires us to be astute consumers of the products available in the marketplace and sophisticated in knitting systems together.

We are improving the interface design in the III system. Our Bridge Consortium team has produced an initial interface design, and continues to work on refinements. We are committed to building a team of staff in both libraries with deep knowledge of III’s functionality and interface options so we can optimize the capabilities of the system. However it may be difficult to produce what users seem to want: the Google-like simplicity of a single search box that enables powerful searching across a wide range of information systems. This kind of functionality is not yet available for purchase, but we may be able to approach it in areas like journal finding.

Within the context of the Bridge Consortium, we plan to select open URL resolver software and federated search software within the next six months. We are not limiting our search to III products, but the tools we choose must be compatible with our current system. We are particularly interested in using these tools to experiment with providing access to materials not included in Bridge, such as the records of art history slide images. A more pressing need is to develop a better method of finding journal holdings and linking to articles. Rather than simply implementing open URL and federated search software as independent systems, we are investigating the feasibility of developing an interface, like that used at the University of Rochester, that harnesses the power of both these software products in an easy-to-use journal finder interface. We will assess the feasibility of this development project with the ITS staff of Carleton and St. Olaf. If we should decide to go forward with it, the two schools could use this foray into systems integration to plan and implement more sophisticated interface designs and customization. Also within the Bridge Consortium context, we will move towards enrichment of bibliographic records with access to table of contents, book reviews, and book covers.

We still need a tool for organizing access to image collections. The art and art history department is experimenting with the use of ArtSTOR’s hosting service as a database management tool for records of its digitized art history slides. The presentation functions are adequate but don’t have all the functionality we need. Purchase of a site license to OCLC’s Content DM has promise as a
way of beginning to provide centralized access through the Bridge to distributed digital collections. Progress in making decisions on organization and access to visual image collections is hampered by the lack of a mechanism for coordinating and implementing information and technology decision-making across departmental lines.

Finally, we will participate in the implementation of the next generation of the campus-wide portal. We hope that the library expertise in the organization of information will be involved at an early stage of development. Meanwhile, we will continue to develop our own Web site as a portal to information resources and services.

**THE LIBRARY WEB SITE**

Our Web site is a critical component for providing access to library resources and services. We developed Web design skills within the staff, but need to develop more Web skills and knowledge to improve what has become one of the largest and most complex Web sites in the College.

A core group is responsible for the overall look and feel of our Web site, working with a larger group of 12 content managers responsible for posting and maintaining Web content. This decentralized model works well, but optimal performance requires a higher level of staff development and coaching than we have provided.

We are using Reason, a locally developed content management software, for database pages. We are considering using it for subject guides and course research guides, in order to simultaneously manage all instances of links to our 200 databases.

The last comprehensive design overhaul of our Web site was in summer 2002. Beginning in December 2004, the Web team will orchestrate a redesign of the Web site. Our work will include a systematic review of other relevant sites, usability studies, and building and testing prototypes. We will review the technology we are using for Web development since our current site management software, Dreamweaver, may not be the optimal tool. We will also consider how we are organized for Web development, identify staff development needs, and look at how our Web development efforts relate to those of the College as a whole. Finally, Web development will be coordinated with ITS and will proceed towards eventually folding our work into the campus portal.

We hope to improve coordination of our course support resources with campus-wide strategies for management of learning objects. Some faculty and departments provide links from their pages to e-reserves and to our Web subject guides and course research guides. Others do not. There could be more consistency across courses for students in locating course materials. Developing a coherent campus approach to course management software has the potential for unifying and simplifying student access to course-related resources.

**INSTITUTIONAL REPOSITORY**

Carleton must pay more attention to capturing today the full range of documentation of College activity that will be useful in understanding ourselves tomorrow. Currently, this lack of attention to institutional history is most clearly manifest in insufficient funding for staff and automation in the College archives program (not a part of the library organizationally).

Important historical documentation from campus departments and programs need to be captured for the archives and made more accessible with online records and finding guides. This serious deficiency in the College’s overall information resources and services program must be rectified so that the increasing digital output of the College is available and accessible, now and in the future.
Carleton faculty, staff, and students create a wide range of digital documents and publications that deserve careful consideration in terms of long-term retention and appropriate dissemination. As with all other colleges and universities, Carleton faces the challenge over the next decade of developing thoughtful and cost-efficient strategies for digital assets management, and, in so doing, intentionally creating an institutional repository that will preserve the College’s intellectual heritage for future use. This is an important and expensive long-term effort, and it behooves us to move into it early and intentionally, rather than back into it after the fact.

While we are likely to develop a full-fledged institutional repository within the framework of a consortium of liberal arts colleges over the coming years, initial steps need to be taken including:

- An institutional commitment to gradual development of a robust and cost-effective institutional repository program;
- An organizational framework for the archives, library, ITS, and dean’s office to work with departments and programs in developing and implementing policies and infrastructure for responsible digital assets management. Development of an institutional repository is a key goal established jointly by the library and ITS.
- The implementation of some pilot projects designed to establish policies and practices and to begin to put in place the framework of an institutional repository.

Over the next few years, digitizing the Carletonian (student newspaper) and archiving digital copies of student comps projects are obvious pilot projects. Others might include archiving of student writing portfolios, College publications, College oral history materials, and faculty publications. The library is developing expertise in this area and is positioned to play a leading role in the campus-wide cooperative effort.

CAMPUS-WIDE ORGANIZATION OF INFORMATION

The library staff is has developed useful skills in organizing information and is poised to play a larger role, along with ITS, in campus-wide organization of information. We have much to offer as the campus develops its infrastructure and policies and practices of information management and access. We are committed to playing more of an outreach role in sharing our skills and perspective with individuals and departments as they develop and manage collections of information.
Chapter 6
Collaboration

A key to our success in meeting Carleton’s information needs is collaboration within the College and regionally and nationally. Over the past few years we have begun to look and reach outward, engaging more actively with departments and academic support units on campus, and initiating regional consortia.

COLLABORATIONS ON CAMPUS
Through outreach and new programs we are creating partnerships with faculty, students, and colleagues on campus. We are exploring new models of academic support, including co-sponsoring events in the Athenaeum, collaborating on exhibitions, developing class assignments with faculty, and participating in workshops through the Learning and Teaching Center and the Writing Across the Curriculum programs. We will be co-sponsoring a conference on Writing Across the Curriculum and Information Literacy this summer. Our most important academic support collaboration with ITS is described Chapter 7.

We have provided service space in the library for the Career Center and the Write Place. The next stage in this collaboration is to build on the potential for programmatic synergies, and to explore locating these and other academic support services in an expanded library.

We work closely with the TRIO/Student Support Services and CLAE (Carleton Liberal Arts Experience) programs in the summer. We are developing more program support for international students, a growing and possibly underserved population in terms of library services at Carleton. There is potential for more engagement with service learning at Carleton, through programs such as GIS and Friends of the Library.

COLLABORATION WITH ST. OLAF – THE BRIDGE CONSORTIUM
The Carleton and St. Olaf libraries formed the Bridge Consortium in the summer of 2004 when the libraries merged their bibliographic and patron databases and developed a shared integrated library system. This effort was funded by generous planning and implementation grants from the Andrew Mellon Foundation, along with allocations from the two colleges. While it is too early to judge the long-term impact of this consortium, it has had a significant impact this past year. Some staff members have characterized it as “as significant a change as when we first went up with an online catalog.” Public response to the joint catalog has been very positive. More people from both institutions are using both libraries. One of the great benefits has been the expansion of colleagues we have to work with and expertise to draw on as the staffs of the two libraries work together daily. Working groups comprised of library staff from both colleges are extremely active on a wide range of projects. As part of creating the Bridge, for example, staff have developed shared circulation policies, implemented common cataloging procedures, designed a new interface for the online public access catalog, and examined acquisitions practices. Finally, a new administrative structure was created to involve staff from both schools in systems administration.

We see tremendous benefits and significant challenges ahead. This cooperation is working well for faculty and students, and as this trust builds the Bridge Consortium will explore opportunities for future cooperation in the areas such as:

- Cooperative collection development, including joint licensing of e-journals and e-resources;
- Joint selection, purchase, and implementation of additional components of our integrated library system (e.g., open URL resolver and federated search software);
• Staff development;
• Software selection and technology development;
• Services and operations such as cataloging, preservation, and reference.

While cost savings are an important consideration in establishing the Consortium, our primary aim is to increase the scope of information resources and services available to our patrons. The establishment of this formal consortium has stimulated interest in broader inter-institutional cooperation between the two colleges.

Establishing the consortium and developing a shared integrated system has been an enormous undertaking. It has laid the groundwork for a partnership that will bear fruit for years to come. We will be studying the experience of other consortia and gradually developing a range of cooperative programs. We are open to the idea of eventually expanding consortium membership to include other institutions.

COLLABORATION WITH OTHER GROUPS/ORGANIZATIONS
The library maintains memberships in the Minnesota Library Association and the Council on Library and Information Resources, and participates selectively in the activities of both. We are members of SPARC and are now joining the Center for Research Libraries, which will open up access for our patrons to a number of research collections. Carleton’s ICPSR membership is through ITS, but the library is an active user of those resources and is beginning to send staff to training programs.

Our off-campus library cooperation ties have long included MINITEX and its Council of Academic Library Directors, and the Oberlin Group. Since their inception, we have been active participants in the Mellon-funded National Institute for Technology and Liberal Education (NITLE) and its regional branch the Midwest Information Technology Center (MITC). The Associated Colleges of the Midwest (ACM) has begun to engage in more information and technology activities, and we have been active with them.

The Minnesota IUG (Innovative User Group) is a collaboration of over 30 public and academic libraries using the same integrated library system. This organization presents workshops and training opportunities for staff two times a year, and have a collective voice that might be more readily heard on our needs for system improvements.

In 2003, the directors of the five Oberlin group libraries in Minnesota (Carleton, Gustavus Adolphus, Macalester, St. John’s and St. Ben’s, and St. Olaf) began meeting regularly, and have developed a consortium called MnObe, the Minnesota Oberlin Group. This collaboration has engendered several large symposia (one for all staff from the five libraries, and another for all technical services staff) and a variety of smaller cooperative projects. The MnOBE reference group has been meeting on a regular basis for several years, and a technical services group is forming. This consortium has a great deal of potential, particularly for staff development. There has also been discussion of sharing an integrated library system at some time in future.
Chapter 7
Technology and Public Computing

Note: When referring to the Carleton department that provides technology services, Information Technology Services, the abbreviation ITS is used. When referring to information technology generically, the abbreviation IT is used.

PICKING UP THE PACE OF INNOVATION
As with our overall emphasis in the development of library services, we have worked hard to step up the pace of innovation in adopting new technologies. Figure 1 below provides a simple summary view of the situation and outlook for the place of Carleton’s library program within the world of highly selective liberal arts colleges. This bell curve depicts how we see the trajectory of the library in terms of innovation in developing information services and in adopting technology in support of library operations and services.

![Figure 1 Innovation in information services and technology](image)

In terms of innovation in both services and technology, we believe that since the last review we have moved from a position of being close to a “trailing institution” to a position solidly in the “middle of the pack” among our peer institutions. Our assessment of relative position among peers is based largely on knowledge of what other institutions are doing to modernize and improve their libraries. However, in the area of technology innovation we have tested our judgment by administering a survey among the 30 top-ranked liberal arts colleges in the *U.S. News and World Report* survey.

---

4 This typology is borrowed from “Getting beyond budget dust to sustainable models for funding information technology” by David L. Smallen and Jack McCredie in EDUCAUSE Review March/April 2003, p. 44.
While this survey (See Appendix B) is admittedly a simplistic instrument, the results are helpful in gauging where we stand in relation to other liberal arts colleges of similar endowment size, caliber, and mission. By adding up the raw scores on the 0-2 scale we find that Carleton is tied in the middle with Grinnell and Lafayette. There are six schools with higher scores (Vassar, Wellesley and Colorado College have the highest scores) and seven schools with lower scores. Thus we are right in the “middle of the pack” among our peers. We are among the 7 percent of our peers in this survey who have not yet implemented an open URL resolver and 21 percent who are not yet digitizing materials from our collections. Otherwise are not far out of the mainstream.

We believe the 5th ranked liberal arts college deserves a library that is more innovative than average. We believe that, with continued drive and additional IT staff dedicated to library operations, we can move within the next three to five years into the most cost-effective strategic position: that of a “close follower,” in both services and technology. This will allow us to selectively adopt innovations soon after they have been proven to be of high quality, cost-effective, and suitable for our campus needs. Moving to a place “just in front of the wave,” rather than behind it, will provide faculty and students with the benefits of improvements in information services earlier in the ongoing cycles of change. It will also ensure that our investments in new services and technologies will have a longer life cycle and therefore greater cost-benefit. Does the College believe that moving to the position of close follower is an appropriate goal? If so, is the College prepared to support more aggressive funding to make that possible?

STRATEGIC PLANNING FOR LIBRARY TECHNOLOGY

The Information Technology Strategic Plan (See Appendix Q) was written to guide library technology development for 2001–02 through 2004–05. We have completed or made good progress on recommendations, and implemented a number of additional technology projects not envisioned at the time. A new three-year IT Strategic Plan (still in draft form until completion of the Departmental Review) summarizes the progress made on the previous plan’s recommendations and presents a new set of goals (See Appendix R).

IT STAFFING AND EXPERTISE

We are developing information technology expertise among staff throughout the library and supplementing it with a small IT department. The library IT staff has handled desktop support, hardware and software management, and systems administration for the integrated library system is shared with head of technical services. Currently we have 1.0 FTE library technology coordinator and 15 hours of student assistants in our library IT department. With the hiring of our library technology coordinator in late 2003, the library and ITS (Information Technology Services (the department responsible for the College’s information technology infrastructure and support) took a big step toward further cooperation of library/ITS personnel in support of computing in the library, giving us greater access to ITS resources and significantly opening up the channels of communication between the two organizations. As library IT initiatives increase we will need to increase library IT staffing or find a new form of partnership with ITS that allocates more ITS time to library IT operations and development.

LIBRARY/ITS PARTNERSHIP

While the library and ITS have enjoyed a cordial relationship for many years, since Joel Cooper began as director of ITS in 2001 we have moved steadily from collaboration toward partnership. How we continue to develop this partnership is a key question for the College in relation to its information and technology services.

How Carleton chooses to actively coordinate information and technology activities campus-wide will become an increasingly pressing question as the College faces up to challenges such as
digital assets management, creating an institutional repository, and making College-wide operational and policymaking decisions regarding management of information technology.

We are fortunate to work with a superb group of ITS colleagues. They are incredibly knowledgeable, deeply committed to Carleton, and fun to work with. In recent years the library and ITS have strengthened communications, explored a number of new ways to work together, and identified both flagship and small-scale projects to pursue in partnership. Some key examples are:

- Regular meetings to discuss policy, program and operations issues of mutual concern;
- Reconfiguration of the library IT position to library technology coordinator, giving unprecedented access to ITS staff and resources, and inclusion in staff meetings;
- Joint planning of the information commons space in the library and joint operation of the Research/IT desk;
- Collaboration in the development of data and GIS services;
- MITC grant to support a student exchange program with DePauw University;
- Holding biennial library/ITS Retreats to develop a common agenda for the next two years (See Appendix S);
- Planning for phasing out of media services operation and for upgrading the slide collection database for art and art history department;
- Selection process for course management software;
- Planning, along with St. Olaf’s library and information technology staff members, for implementation of the Bridge;
- Implementation of LDAP with III, ILLIAD, and e-reserves.

In addition, we have made two major changes in dividing of responsibilities between the two organizations. First, in 2003 we began to phase in a plan whereby ITS would be responsible for support of all public-access computers in the library. Second, in an effort to support campus-wide strategic planning for Web support, the library decided as part of its 2003 staffing review not to hire a second library IT staff person and instead invest in a campus-wide Web team. We do our own library Web development, but rely on the College Web team for a range of higher-level programming and integration services (such as implementation of LDAP with our integrated library system). This trial arrangement will be reviewed this year for possible continuation.

PUBLIC ACCESS COMPUTING IN THE LIBRARY

We currently have 60 public access computers in the library. In recent years we moved away from a single computer lab model to more distributed, ubiquitous access to computing. We have expanded the number of data ports to 100, wiring all the group study rooms and many other locations in the library, creating two smaller labs and redesigning the reference room as an information commons, providing access to scanners and color printers, and providing wireless access to the network in about 70 percent of the building. In 2003 we adopted the standard student computing software build for all public access computers so the student computing environment is more consistent campus-wide. We are now better able to accommodate group work. The recently installed SMART Boards and GIS stations represent a move towards providing students with the tools for more powerful and innovative use of information in completing class assignments. There are two featured technology stations in the reference room that will be used to introduce new applications over time.

Rooms 170 and 305 will be upgraded in summer 2005 to serve as class video screening rooms, and we plan to wire them for course-related use of cable and satellite TV programming, and possibly for video-conferencing.
THE CHALLENGES AHEAD

We seem to be on the verge of taking a more holistic approach to information services at Carleton. The library is poised to play a greater role in this process. With innovations such as the Research/IT desk, the provision of carefully planned central services for media production and presentation, and making the language lab a “branch” of the library for purposes of placing videos on reserve, Carleton is beginning to move towards such a coordinated service model. The work the library and ITS did in planning Research/IT service point was something of a breakthrough in this regard. The grid (see Appendix E) mapping what information and technology services are provided where on campus was a good beginning for the task still ahead: developing a campus-wide strategy for providing of information and technology services.

A key challenge for the library profession and for Carleton’s library will be to update our technology architecture to provide more seamless navigation of information resources and access to tools to create and use information. We anticipate offering more library resources from a common starting point with a common search interface, as well as participating in the development of a campus-wide portal to make more campus resources available from a central location.

Over the next few years the library needs to be part of the conversation as the campus works towards a coordinated approach to Web development, digital assets management, and development of an institutional repository. There is a tendency at Carleton to think of the each unit, including the library, as separate users of information and technology services rather than as an active partners in shaping the College’s approach to information management. We recommend involving the library, ITS, and other unites in more coordinated institutional planning with respect to information policy, strategy, and operations.

Our new IT Strategic Plan (while still in draft form) lays out in more detail the challenges for the next three years (see Appendix R).
A SENSE OF PLACE
A successful library building, with its programs and staff, creates a sense of connection to the values, traditions, and intellectual life of the community it serves. The sense of place we are striving to create is a reflection of Carleton as a place of serious academic purpose that prizes intellectual curiosity and adventure, and has a strong sense of community. The Gould Library, a physical manifestation of these values, is the largest (at 111,000 sq ft) and one of the most heavily used (with a gate count of over 300,000 per year) buildings on campus. The building is well designed to support and celebrate a wide range of academic activity by providing study spaces, information resources and services, and facilities to support the faculty and student research of a highly academic community.

The sense of place provided by the library building and its services and functions are very important to members of the Carleton community generally, but to students in particular. Student responses to the LibQUAL+ survey indicate that Carleton students place a high value on library as place and their perceptions of service quality in this category of the survey were significantly higher than those of students at other liberal arts colleges (See Appendix D).

ELEMENTS OF PLACE
Even with many resources available via the Web, students come to the library and we have worked to support their activities. Following is a list of the elements of place we have observed to be particularly important to students and a brief summary of how we have worked to improve our support of each. While the library as a place is important to faculty and staff, the focus here is largely on student use of the library.

Reading and study
- Reading and relaxing in safety and quiet – About five years ago we extended the hours of the library until 1 a.m. and improved safety and security by creating evening supervisor positions to ensure an adult presence in the building at all times. This past year we upgraded the library security system to increase the number of motion detectors and added video surveillance and a public address system. We have tried to maintain the scheme of increasing quiet as one descends from level 4 to level 1, although we continue to address this challenge on levels 1 and 2.
- Individual and group study – We have observed significant changes in the last 10 years in student study habits. Ten years ago, individual study carrels were preferred. Today students prefer to study in groups, and library study spaces reflect this change. We have reconfigured furnishings to accommodate groups of students working together on projects. We have added more tables and chairs in the reference area, purchased new computer tables to accommodate group work, and installed two Smart Boards. Room 170 has been restored to its original use as a study room. We have experimented with moveable partitions for “create your own work area” spaces. The reversal of the order of the book collection was planned to place the science materials on level three, a more social floor, adjacent to group study rooms, to support the study habits of science majors.
- Browsing – We know anecdotally from students and faculty that serendipitous discovery is a common and treasured experience in libraries. The addition of compact shelving has allowed Carleton to keep as much of the collection as possible on campus, preserving the possibilities for serendipity in the stacks.
Research and learning facilities

- Computer Use – Library lab computers are the most heavily used computers on campus. There are currently 60 public access computers in the building, including the lab computers.
- Finding information for class assignments and academic projects – The re-design of the reference room is allowing us to experiment with new approaches to reference, makes us more visible, and supports the goal of personalizing the contact with expert information support in finding library materials.
- Teaching and learning – In addition to informal and individual interactions with librarians, scheduling formal classes in the library is popular. Faculty like to teach in the library. The e-classroom, combining flexible, seminar-style seating in the center with computers on the periphery, is highly adaptable to the teaching needs of librarians and faculty. The e-classrooms double as a computer lab and small group tutorial space when not in use for teaching.
- Information production: computing, writing, and creating presentations – In writing papers and preparing for presentations, students need workstations that allow them to scan materials; access and edit music, video, and still images; print color documents; and use software to facilitate analysis and visualization of data. Research/IT provides the convenience of one-stop shopping. In the redesigned reference room, we are also using SMART Boards to create technology-rich venues to support peer-to-peer teaching in the library.
- Using other academic support services – We have experimented with giving space to the Write Place and the Career Center. Students clearly like having these services in the library, but more experimentation is needed to determine the best location for visibility and privacy. We have not begun to work on the potential for programmatic synergies.

Social spaces

- Meeting and socializing – Libraries are a commons. Many students spend countless hours in the library and appreciate an environment that places serious study in an appropriately social context.
- Having fun – Carleton characterizes itself as a serious place that does not take itself too seriously. The “word of the week” and puzzles and games provide a welcome diversion from academics. During study week the student Friends of the Library group hosts a nighttime study break (outside the library). The night before finals begin, students gather in the lobby of the library for performances by the campus groups the Knights and Cujokra. Athenaeum events have included celebrations for Burns night with a bagpipe procession in the library, and Shakespeare’s birthday featured readings and reenactments (the sword scene in the final act of Hamlet performed by student fencers was particularly memorable).
- Visiting/touring – Since Gould Library is open long hours and is prominently located, it is a welcoming, comfortable place for campus visitors. The appearance and atmosphere of the library play a role in shaping the experience of visitors. The library presents specially tailored exhibits and exhibitions for alumni visitors returning for Reunion and for periodic LGBT Family Reunions and MCAN (Multicultural Alumni Network) gatherings.

Art and Cultural events

- Viewing exhibitions – Cocurated by students, faculty, and library staff, and connected to coursework and campus conversations, our exhibits often highlight library and archives collections as well as Carleton creativity. About 24 exhibits are produced annually under the direction of the Curator of Library Art and Exhibitions. The library is considered a prime venue for exhibits ranging from rare book displays to comps art installations.
Attending and presenting public programs – The library’s Athenaeum is the site of programs co-sponsored with departments as community-wide offerings. During 2003–04, over 2,250 people attended 65 programs held in the Athenaeum. Carleton faculty members, students, and guests present lectures, readings, comps presentations, and discussions.

Appreciating art, design, and nature – While most libraries contain some artworks, it is rare to find a library with a thoughtfully curated art program. The 1984 library addition was designed in part “to educate the eye and aesthetic judgment of students through familiarity with artistic works of high quality in a space they frequent.” In cooperation with the Carleton College Art Gallery, and with the essential expertise of a part-time library curator, the library has advanced this vision with rotating artworks and new commissions. The library is itself treated as an exercise in design, through conscious selection and interpretation of period features as well as new furnishings. Since just as many students visit the library in a week as visit the campus art gallery in a year, we dramatically increase student exposure to art and design. A memorandum of understanding with the art gallery is designed to help ensure complementary, cost-effective and synergistic programs in support of the College’s broader arts goals.

CREATING PLACE 2001-2004
Carleton has maintained and upgraded an excellent library facility through ongoing modest annual investments with periodic enlargement and renovation. The 1956 library building was nearly doubled in size with a 1984 addition on its south and west sides. While this addition was designed to accommodate collection growth for 20 years, the move of the science collection to the Gould Library in 1994 led to our reaching capacity in 2000–01.

In 2001, the College hired two architectural firms to conduct a space utilization study that outlined options for addressing collection growth. The study recommended the renovation that began in the summer of 2002 and concluded in the summer of 2004. (See copy on Open Reserve)

This renovation was undertaken as a five-year interim solution to our space needs, as well as an opportunity to experiment with spaces, services, and collaborations that will help determine the long-range plan for a library building addition. The bulk of the renovation funds have gone toward compact shelving. However, the project has also improved spaces for a range of student uses and for support of the library’s role in teaching and learning.

The 1984 library addition was designed before the revolution in computing and networking that is transforming scholarly communication. With the 2002–04 renovation we have begun the process of renewing this building for information access and use.

Guided by the goals detailed in the December 2001 Library Space Utilization Study by Meyer, Scherer & Rockcastle and Shepley Bulfinch Richardson and Abbott, we installed compact shelving and made a number of changes to improve study and research conditions for students. Among the goals of the renovation was to improve collection access and study spaces for science students after the science library was closed in 1996. Other outcomes of the renovation are listed in Appendix T.

The College set the renovation budget at $1.5 million in October 2001, before the architects completed their plan in December 2001. The actual project cost was $1.92 million. We gave priority to meeting the immediate collection space needs, making changes that support student research and computing, and enhancing the teaching role of the library.
Chapter 9
The Library Expansion

Carleton is fortunate in having one of the most handsome, comfortable, and highly functional college library buildings in the U.S. However the building will reach its collection storage capacity in 2007–08 and has already reached its capacity in terms of faculty and student workspaces, staff workspace, and accommodation of new genres of information. There is an urgent need to establish a specific timetable for planning a library addition. Most importantly, the formal planning process must begin within the next year if we want to avoid collection damage from overcrowding and seriously compromising the development of the library over the next decade.

In planning a library addition we have the potential to transform the library into a groundbreaking intellectual center for the campus, effectively developing a new model for 21st century liberal arts college libraries. If planned with intelligence, imagination, and deep thinking about the role of the library and its many partners in academic support in learning and teaching, this addition will contribute substantially to achieving a range of Carleton academic goals. Realizing the full potential of this addition is arguably the key challenge facing the library over the next decade and should be a key concern for the College.

The College has already established the priority of the project. The decision to expand the library was based on a series of campus conversations, College reports, and an architectural study. The 21st Century Committee Report (1998) recommended that the capacity of the building be expanded, stating, “…because of the immediacy of the problem, we urge the College to begin discussions next year to decide how we will add library space.” The 2001 Library Space Utilization Study by architects from MS&R and Shepley Bulfinch Richard and Abbott (on open reserve) recommended that planning for the library addition begin in 2003. The 2002 Update of 21st Century Committee Report recommended that a “study be commissioned in the Summer of 2005 to determine future planning directions.” The 2003 Campaign Priorities Committee identified expanding the library as a priority for the upcoming comprehensive campaign. The College librarian has been granted a professional leave in 2005 to study library design and visit libraries and architects in preparation for the building project. The time has come to begin the actual planning process.

The original building was completed in 1957, and the 1984 addition was planned to accommodate 20 years of collection growth. In 1996, the Science Library was closed and the collection moved to Gould Library, consuming three years of collection growth space and precipitating a need for immediate space planning. The 2001 Library Space Utilization Study recommended a renovation and installation of compact shelving to meet space needs for the next five years, optimizing the use of existing space and giving the College time to plan an addition to be completed in 2007–08. The study also identified collection space needs for the next 20 years, suggested a site, and identified some preliminary goals for the library addition. The renovation is now complete and the five years of collection growth space we bought with compact shelving will be full in 2007–08. It will be possible to make do with crowded collection conditions for another year or two after that without doing too much damage to the collection. Campus conversations and planning discussion examining the option of offsite storage for lesser-used materials have consistently determined that, for our intensely academic, residential learning community, retaining the collection intact and onsite is a fundamental value for Carleton.
In terms of collection capacity, staff workspaces and student use, the building is beyond the capacities for which it was designed. With the addition of 60 public access computers, more seating, more staff, an e-classroom, more furnishings for group study, and the media collection and screening facilities next fall, we are on the brink of outgrowing the building. The building is often overcrowded on Sunday through Thursday evenings, resulting in noisy conditions and students unable to find free workspace. By squeezing the current active library program into this space, we are now making compromises with the design of the building that threaten to further increase noise levels, degrade the ambiance, and adversely affect student behavior.

In expanding the building it is imperative that we retain the qualities that make the current building so successful. These include its welcoming ambiance, “lived-in” feeling, quiet space, views, natural light, and openness.

The library addition will encompass far more than increased book storage space. We believe the library of the future will continue to be both a central academic support unit for reading, study, research, group work, and a community space. Carleton has a modest student center, in part because the library is an academic community center. The library provides a space in which faculty and students from across the disciplines gather for serious academic purpose, for cultural events, and for chance social and intellectual encounters.

The 2001 Library Space Utilization Study recommends a number of goals for the addition, and many others have surfaced from faculty, library staff, and students. In addition to increased collection space, some of the ideas and types of spaces we wish to explore in the planning process are:

1. Improving learning and teaching spaces, including technology-rich teaching spaces for faculty to use in formal and informal teaching.
2. Creating a variety of study spaces throughout the collections supported by a range of technology tools.
3. Increasing seating spaces for individual study and group work.
4. Creating spaces for on leave and emeritus faculty.
5. Relocating service desks to a more central location and bringing circulation services together with the reference desk to improve sight lines and better serve patrons.
6. Enhancing movement and orientation through the building by improving vertical circulation and signage.
7. Relocating administrative offices and opening up the relationship between the building’s interior and exterior.
8. Creating more opportunities for collaborative and cross-functional staffing by consolidating dispersed staff work areas.
9. Moving special collections up from the ground level to a more prominent location, improving environmental controls, providing improved reading room security, and locating special collections closer to curatorial staff.
10. Exploring opportunities for co-location of academic support units, such as the Learning and Teaching Center, Writing Program, Academic Skills Center, and the Career Center.
11. Building a connection to the Computing and Mathematics Center and Laird Hall.
12. Locating a café in the connector.

We strongly recommend that the College quickly develop a timetable that ensures completion of a library addition in 2008–09, and that architects be selected and the planning process begin when the College librarian returns from leave in Fall 2005.
Chapter 10
Staff and Organization

ORGANIZATION
Current
The Library is organized into five departments: administration, loan services, reference and instruction, technical services, and collection development (see Appendix U for Organization Chart). The library also employs 82 student employees, which translates to 13 FTEs.

Each department has a department head who reports to the College librarian. All other staff members report to their respective department heads. Prior to 1999, all librarians reported directly to the College librarian, and the library staff was organized in more numerous smaller departments. The current structure was put in place in 1999 to:

- Create a year-round collection development department to maintain the quality of the print collection, pay greater attention to our special collections, and electronic resources;
- Bring many small departments together into larger teams to improve communication, promote more collaboration and cross training, and facilitate work flow redesign;
- Establish committees and channels of communication according to the recommendations of the 1991 departmental review (See Appendix A);
- Reduce the number of staff reporting directly to the College librarian in anticipation of growth in the number of staff.

More broadly, the purpose of this organizational change was to better position the library to respond to the increased pace of change in the world of scholarly communication, and therefore in libraries. In addition to dealing with change in the profession, at Carleton we have done some extra catching up and reaching out in the library. Over the past six years the College librarian has pushed hard to implement an ambitious agenda of change in service to the community. This push, involving a great deal of change in a relatively short time, has been a real strain on the library staff at times. It has involved a great deal of hard work and an expansion of the number of fronts on which we are working. During this period we have periodically undertaken organizational development and staff development activities to help with stress and change management. For example, in 2001 we developed an “Organizational Growth Action Plan” after an intensive period of organizational development, in which we concentrated on: enhancing focus, priority-setting, organizational clarity, and communication. Each year we have adjusted the number and type of committees and taskforces and other communication structures to meet current needs.

The library staff has responded admirably, rising to the challenges we faced and, in the process, transforming the library, the organization, and their jobs in countless ways. As a staff we have developed an agility and an embrace of change that will serve us well in the decade ahead.

Future
While our current organizational structure has served us well, we recognize that reorganization may be necessary in the future as we respond to changes in our work and the needs of the College. The changes will be driven by user expectations and new technology.

The staff met in early November 2004 to discuss what changes we expect in the future and identified the following trends:

- As students become more accustomed to the instantaneous nature of the Web, we expect to see an increased demand for instant gratification in materials access. People now expect to satisfy their information needs in one place.
• In the summer 2005, the library will assume responsibility for video material, which will require new services and expertise throughout the library.

• New technologies give users more freedom to initiate service requests without assistance from library staff. These complex systems require more staff time on analytic activities such as problem solving and troubleshooting system malfunctions, improving and linking system interfaces, and monitoring and enabling new vendor supplied functionalities.

• Our collections are far less static than they have been, particularly with electronic databases, where we are not in full control of the material. We must keep up with changes that vendors introduce, and selectively communicate changes to faculty members and students.

• The College is increasingly using information systems campus-wide. Currently, these information systems are not integrated. We hope that these systems will be increasingly integrated to provide a seamless interface for the users.

• Federated search technology offers new ways for users to search the many databases to which we subscribe. We will look for ways to make the best use of such emerging technologies that satisfy demand for ease of use without sacrificing depth of content.

• We see a need for a research and development capability within the library that can keep up with technological changes and can develop new tools and approaches for dealing with those changes.

We expect these needs will continue to push us towards more collaboration within the library, between the library and other groups on campus, and with our colleagues in regional academic organizations (MITC, MnObe).

Improved communication, a nurturing environment, flexibility, and the need to manage change effectively must be part of any future structure. In 1991 work was done within many small departments. Today the library departments are interdependent so there is a stronger emphasis on formal and informal communication so staff members know what is happening in other parts of the library.

A key issue during the November 2004 staff discussions was change and its management. The staff all understood that change is inevitable and can be good, but the pace of the change must be manageable. Change must be approached with a critical eye towards our mission and our primary purpose as expressed in our mission statement (Appendix C). As the pace of change increases, we will assess changes to the environment and determine how best to incorporate them into daily workflow.

While describing the characteristics of a future organization took only a half-day retreat, the process for changing the organization will be much more involved. Job titles and classifications may need to be changed to reflect a new organizational model and the unique skills and competencies needed for the roles.

STAFFING

Current
The current permanent staff of the Gould Library has a wide range of experience, with some staff members having more than 20 years of experience at the library, and others having been hired in the past year. The average time of service is more than nine years. In recent years, we have slightly lowered the average age of the staff and increased the gender diversity. Today, the average age of the staff is 49. We are currently a staff of six males and 24 females, and include no under-represented minorities.

As the library has expanded to use more electronic tools in all aspects of the workplace, we have had to learn new tools and expand our skills. For instance, when we merged our catalog with St.
Olaf, it became clear that we needed more staff development to establish deeper technical expertise with the III modules. Our website is another example of our changing needs. Many staff members are responsible for keeping their portions of the web updated. This requires an understanding of HTML and skill with using Dreamweaver.

The staff members have many "soft" skills, which are well utilized. We value good leadership, good time and workload management, a sense of humor, and interpersonal and collaborative skills. As the number of projects and collaborations continue, the need for these skills will only increase.

All staff members are encouraged to participate in professional development. The library currently has a staff development committee that identifies needs and plans in-house workshops. The staff development budget has tripled over the last six years to allow staff more opportunities to pursue training, attend conferences and workshops, and present at regional and national professional forums.

Future
In the future, we will configure our staffing to both continue our traditional library activities, and to meet changing expectations with new services and projects in response to new technologies. We will continue to look employees who can adapt to change and have knowledge or experience with specific tools. Employees must be flexible, creative, and confident enough to make mistakes with a good sense of humor. We believe that people with these characteristics can more easily learn specific technologies as necessary. Even though we cannot say what the specific software or hardware technologies will be, we expect that an understanding of digitization and metadata standards will be necessary in the future.

With the blurring of departmental lines, we recommend increased cross-training between departments and even more opportunities for regularly scheduled staff development. Collaboration with groups outside of the library will increase as well, underscoring the need for cross-training and collaborative skills.

One timely topic is the question of the exempt status of the staff. The work that is done at the library is complex, entails considerable autonomy of operation and responsibility for outcomes, and in many cases is unique to the library. About a third of the staff is nonexempt. We recommend that many of these positions be reviewed to determine if they should be reclassified as exempt.

Our staff development program needs to keep up with the changing skill sets through ongoing training in technological tools, library trends, and collaborative work. One opportunity for staff development is learning from and within regional academic organizations such as the Bridge Consortium, the MnObe Group, and MNIUG. Work with these organizations can take the form of email lists, local conferences, meetings, and workshops. We wish to provide time and support for interested library staff to pursue research leaves. We will look at existing research leave models, such as those in place at the libraries of Dickinson College and Lawrence University. We currently provide $30,000 per year of support for travel to conferences and workshops, both locally and nationally, and this support should be continued and expanded.

RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION
As the library grows, we will need to continue to recruit high-quality employees who more closely resemble the age, ethnic, and racial makeup of our constituents (faculty, staff, and students). At the same time, we need to retain our existing staff and their vast store of knowledge. Some of the actions that we take to make the Gould Library more attractive to new recruits will also keep the library an attractive place to continue working.
The competition for hiring librarians is intense, and we have had trouble building strong applicant pools for a number of positions. To attract a diverse pool of quality candidates, we need to stay competitive with the metro areas of Minneapolis/St. Paul and with our peer institutions nationally. We may also need to actively solicit applications if we are not attracting enough candidates, and consider recruiting directly from graduate schools of library and information science. For some positions, we currently require an MLS or equivalent degree. For others we have dropped this requirement.

Once candidates are identified, the selection process should be streamlined. We need to keep the interview process appropriate to the positions that we are filling, while ensuring that future colleagues are active in the hiring process. The College policy of not allowing us to post salary ranges is, in our view, an unnecessary handicap to recruiting efforts. We may also want to explore internships as a way of recruiting new employees and a way of increasing the diversity of the staff.

We will continue to explore mentoring opportunities to help integrate new employees into Carleton and the library culture. Mentoring can have the added benefit of ensuring that the knowledge that current employees have is passed along to other staff members.

The best way to maintain the knowledge and experience of our staff is by retaining staff members. We have experienced average staff turnover in the past nine years (1995–96 through 2003–04 (See Appendix V). Of the 23 positions vacated during this period, seven (30 percent) vacancies were due to retirements, three (13 percent) were due to non-renewal of contracts, four (17 percent) were due to the planned expiration of temporary positions, and nine (39 percent) were due to people leaving for new jobs. However, with an average staff age of 49 and competitive pay pressures, we expect to experience more turnover in the next decade. Ways to keep the library attractive to current employees include providing increased staff development/professional leave opportunities, more staff diversity, opportunities for telecommuting and flextime, staying competitive with salary, and recognizing increased work responsibilities with commensurate status and benefits. It is inevitable that some people will leave the library, and we need a plan in place to maintain and pass along the experience and knowledge of those leaving.

**STAFF SALARIES**

We increased salaries in recent years to become more competitive in recruiting and to keep retention rates up. While we have definitely made gains in this area, there is still need for improvement. Compared with library exempt staff salaries at peer institutions (2003–04 Oberlin Group survey), 50 percent of our salaries are below the 50th percentile. We recommend that the College set a long-term goal for bringing staff salaries in line with those of peer institutions. Given the difficulty of attracting librarians to Northfield and the increasing competitive pressures within the profession and the information sector generally, we recommend aiming for the 75th percentile within the Oberlin Group. For biweekly staff salaries, we recommend aligning wages with the metro area.

**OPTIMAL STAFFING LEVEL**

Carleton’s library has long been understaffed in comparison with peer institutions. When the College librarian was hired in 1998 he identified a range of budgetary needs required to bring Carleton’s library closer to the level of libraries at peer institutions. The College granted a permanent increase to the base budget of the library of $200,000 (a 7 percent increase to the operating budget) over two years, allowing the College librarian to determine how best to use this increase. He chose to allocate all the funds to additional staff, because it was clear that more staff would be needed to provide the range of resources and services available at comparable
institutions. Through this and other budgetary strategies, the library staff has been increased by 7 FTE (35 percent) over the past six years.

Without this infusion of additional staff we could never have accomplished what we have in the past six years. Even with it, our accomplishments have come with some strain and anxiety as we have labored with significantly fewer staff resources to catch up with our peers. And the struggle is not over. The staff size continues to grow at our peer institutions as the challenges facing libraries grow. Without additional staff in the years ahead we will once again fall behind in service quality, particularly in the areas of reference and instructional services, technology support, interlibrary loan, and expanding the scope of resources to which we provide access.

Two staff comparisons provide a sense of our relative position. Both of these are careful to distinguish between libraries that are merged with IT operations, i.e., the staffing comparisons are for library-related functions only and do not include IT functions. In the first, the 2002–03 staffing comparison among COHFE (Consortium on the Financing of Higher Education) schools, Carleton’s library staffing is in the 36th percentile, the lowest ranking for every COHFE comparison at Carleton, except for business and finance and security staffing.

In the second, our ongoing comparison of Carleton’s library with those of the 17 Highly Selective Liberal Arts Colleges that is Carleton’s comparison group (See Appendix H), we are 13th of 17 in staffing. This puts us at the 24th percentile among the schools to which we compare ourselves and with which we share the highest level of cross-applications.

Achieving the median library staffing level in the COHFE group would require adding nine FTE, and achieving the median among our direct comparison group would require the adding 11 FTE. These comparisons are inexact; most of our peer libraries include archives, larger special collections programs, and significant holdings of audio and visual materials. These are areas that we are only beginning to develop, or that do not fall under the library. Nevertheless, we will clearly need more staff in the years ahead to keep the College in step with its peers in terms of information resources and services.

We recommend that the College identify a goal for gradually increasing library staffing over the next five years, aiming for something closer to the mean for the 17 Highly Selective Liberal Arts Colleges. We recommend a goal that is tied to our rank in terms of endowment size and student enrollment (10th and 9th respectively in our comparison group).
Chapter 11
Budgetary Support

OVERALL BUDGETARY SUPPORT
Historically the College has provided strong budgetary support for its library but support has lagged in the past few years. This seems to be due primarily to the overall budget situation of the College. However, it may also reflect a shift of funding priorities and/or a lack of understanding of the effect of the growth digital publishing and information technology growth on library program development and costs.

While we are by no means in dire straits, remaining competitive in information resources and services will require significant increases in budgetary support in a few key areas. What follows is a brief overview of budgetary support since the last departmental review and some comparison with peer institutions. While there are many areas that will require future funding increases, the emphasis in this chapter is strictly on the areas in which we project shortfalls that could compromise our ability to develop the library program: collections, staff, and, woven throughout, technology support.

Budget history
Appendix W provides an overview of funding trends since 1990–91. However, due to accounting changes implemented in 1995 the data before and after 1994–95 are not precisely comparable. Thus in Appendix Y the period 1990–91 through 1994–95 (part 1) is treated on a separate spreadsheet from 1995–96 through 2003–04 (part 2). Note that the data used in Appendix Y, part 2 to track trends in library funding are for operating expenses only. Grants and one-time investments, such as for ILS software upgrades, are excluded from “Total Library Operating Budget.” However, these exclusions are included in a separate line “Grand total: operating and non-operating budget.”

A clear trend emerges from the data: the library budget is growing more slowly than the College budget as a whole and has, therefore, decreased as a percentage of the College budget.

During the five-year period 1990–91 through 1994–95 the average annual budget increase for the library was 4.72 percent. In this five-year period the library budget increased 25.6 percent, while the overall College budget increased by 22 percent.

During the five-year period 1995–96 through 1999–2000 the average annual budget increase was 6.88 percent. In this five-year period the library budget increased 37.8 percent, while the College budget increased by 50.3 percent. In the three-year period 2000–01 through 2003–04, a time of severe budgetary constraint for the College, the average annual budget increase in the library budget was 1.6 percent. In the nine-year period 1995–96 through 2003–04 the library budget increased 49.4 percent, while the overall College budget increased 53.9 percent.

In 2003–04 the library operating budget was 3.91 percent of the overall College budget, down from highs of 4.97 percent in 1994–95 and 4.85 percent in 1995–96. Between 1990–91 and 1995–96 the library budget averaged 4.44 percent of the College budget. Since then it has averaged 4.04 percent of the College budget. This .4 percent difference translates to a loss of about $354,000 per year in permanent operations funding compared with relative funding levels of the early 1990’s. This “funding gap” approaches what it would take to raise Carleton, compared with our peers, in

---

5 No, the library is not in “Chapter 11” proceedings with its budget!
its level of overall budgetary support for the library to a rank commensurate with its rank in endowment and enrollment.

**Comparison with peer institutions**

To the extent that institutional wealth correlates with spending on libraries, we have slipped somewhat in library support in comparison with peer institutions. As our endowment has increased, library support has decreased slightly in comparison with our peers (see Appendix H). While Carleton ranks 9th in enrollment and 10th in endowment, we rank 12th or 13th in total library expenditures, in staff and salaries, and in acquisitions expenditures. As previously acknowledged, such comparisons are not exact, as each library contains different programs. For example, Carleton’s library budget does not currently include media resources and does not include the archives. However, these particular peer comparisons consistently provide an extremely good indicator of where we need to be in comparison with our peers to remain competitive in recruiting faculty and students. While Carleton definitely does more with less, we cannot rely on that strength alone to meet the challenges we face in adapting the library to the changing worlds of pedagogy and scholarly communication.

**COLLECTIONS**

As indicated in Chapters 1 and 4, a key challenge we face is maintaining the quality of the collections – print and digital – in the face of costs that consistently rise at a rate greater than inflation and greater than the budget increases the College provides. This basic economic tension is exacerbated by the need and opportunity to expand information access beyond printed books and journals into e-equivalents and *de novo* e-publications, and, increasingly, into new genres of information. The College will have to significantly increase its budget support for the collections if we are to successfully address the revolution we are experiencing in publishing and scholarly communication.

Faculty are understandably concerned that the library is being asked to do too much with too little in its efforts to find the right balance between print and electronic resources. Faculty in the social sciences, humanities, languages, and literature are concerned that their allocations for purchase of books are insufficient. And faculty members in all disciplines are pressing for access to more e-resources. As a result the pressure on the collection budget is greater today than it has been at any time since the last departmental review.

**Collection budget overview**

Appendix X provides a summary of collection budget increases and allocations from 1993–94 to the present. Please note that the data in the main body of Appendix Z show actual expenditures in each collection category, along with the percentage of total expenditures represented by each collection category. The final row of the spreadsheet shows the percentage increase in funds allocated for the collection budget in each year.

Looking first at allocations, in the five-year period 1993–94 through 1998–99 the average annual collections budget increase was 8.35 percent. In the next five years, 1998–99 through 2003–04, the average increase was 3.9 percent, for a cumulative total of 24 percent increase. During this same five-year period (1998–99 through 2003–04) journal expenditures alone increased by 55 percent.

In the 1990s there were large surpluses carried from year to year in the book budgets of academic departments. This largely explains the significant fluctuations in expenditures from year to year and the discrepancy in many years between allocations and expenditures. At the same time faculty were simultaneously pressing for more journal subscriptions and e-resources.
As a result, beginning in the late 1999–2000, with the cooperation of the faculty, we effected a structural adjustment in the acquisitions budget. We gradually reduced departmental book allocations for departments that consistently under-spent their book funds, and increased allocations for journal and e-resources. The net effect of this change, along with some healthy acquisitions increases in 1998–2000, was to meet much of the pent-up faculty demand for new print journals and to intensify the building of our digital resources. However, the healthy budget increases did not continue, journal prices rose dramatically, and the number and cost of e-resources soared. The net effect on our allocations from the collection budget are clear in Appendix Z and neatly summarized in Figure 2 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print books</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print journals</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding &amp; preservation</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-resources</td>
<td>&lt;1%t</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2 Percentage of Collection Budget Expended by Types of Materials*

It is easy to see why faculty members are complaining that their book allocations are insufficient. What is less obvious are the compromises we are making in preservation and binding to keep the level of acquisitions up. And what is remarkable is that an allocation of 19 percent of the acquisitions budget for e-resources is rather conservative compared with many other liberal arts colleges. Clearly something has to give if we are to continue to build both the print and electronic collections to the standards that our faculty expect.

**Key factors affecting future collection support**

In addition to the high cost of both print and e-resources, several other factors affecting the need for collection support must be mentioned. Some of these factors will clearly drive collection costs, and others are issues of significance to our continued ability to build an excellent collection.

1. Transition from print to e-journals – While the proliferation of e-journals is a marvel, archiving policies and other license terms make it impossible to make the transition from print to e-journals in a way that saves us any money. We are paying for both print and e-versions of hundreds of journals, and will likely need to continue this for some years to come. We have learned by surveying the faculty during journal reviews that most faculty members are still reluctant to give up print subscriptions for e-access only. We expect that we will be able to cancel more print journals in favor of e-versions within the next 5-10 years. Whether this will actually save us any money depends entirely on the success of libraries and the academy in negotiating license and payment terms and in supporting open access journals in the next few years.

2. E-books and digital collections – As mentioned in Chapter 4, we are beginning to see the fruits of a number of years of commercial digitizing efforts in the form of amazing digital collections of historical documents and books. We need to figure out how to budget for these expensive sets. They range in price from $25,000 - $50,000 each, and we are likely to see several new sets each for year for the foreseeable future.
3. New information genres – Over the next decade our transition from a library collection comprised almost exclusively of text will accelerate greatly as we provide access and services to visual, data, and multimedia resources.

4. World resources – With an increasingly diverse student and faculty body, and increased focus on globalization in the curriculum, we must expand our collection to support the reading and research needs engendered by this College initiative.

5. Collection endowments – The College is fortunate in having sufficient endowments to completely fund the annual collection budget from endowment income. However, there are two rather unusual College fiscal policies that we believe should be reviewed and revised. The first is the practice of charging a 30 percent “tax” on all endowment funds to help fund general operations. The net effect of this policy for the library is that a portion of restricted library collection endowment funds is being used as budget relief, i.e., to fund library operations such as acquisition and cataloging activities. If this tax were eliminated it would likely provide all the collection support we need to achieve the collection aims outlined in the self-study. The second policy is one in which the income from any new book endowment is used to substitute for the allocation of other College endowment funds for library acquisitions. The gift of a book endowment fund, for example, results in no increase in the library’s purchasing power in a field, i.e. the donor is not providing a margin of excellence, but is providing budget relief. This strikes us as a disincentive to alumni donations, a concern as the College enters a comprehensive campaign.

6. Special collections – We are not building and caring for our special collection in a manner worthy of their value to the College and the curriculum. Modest increases (e.g., $10,000 per year) in conservation and acquisition of special collections would ensure proper stewardship.

7. Preservation/digitization – We have not yet begun to digitize materials from the collection and archives. Modest investments in digitizing will both provide greater access to College collections and more options for preservation of our printed heritage.

8. Technology – As we grow to handle more and different formats and genres of information, and provide services associated with these resources, we will need staff skills and technology infrastructure to access, manipulate, store, and deliver them. Whether parts of this expense come from the ITS budget or are in the library budget, we need to invest in more hardware, software and staff expertise in technology in support of library resources and services.

STAFF
The need for staff is addressed in a general way in Chapter 10 under “Optimal Staffing Level.”

Over the past six years we have significantly increased the staff of the library and our need for additional staff is not great in the short term. At this time our primary staffing needs are in technology support (we have requested an educational associate) and to support media and visual resources (we are expecting additional staff FTE as part of the media services collection transfer). We anticipate that over the next five years the need for staff will grow acute in direct services (interlibrary loan support and reference and instruction), and in support of the organization and new genres of information (data and multi-media). We also anticipate the need for technology support for more research and development to help create a more seamless information environment. This need might be met by ITS, but not at its current staffing levels. Thus our recommendation on staffing is necessarily general and meant to stimulate long-range budget and fundraising planning more than identify immediate needs.

In sum, as indicated in Chapter 10, we do not require a staff approaching the mean of our peer group (38 compared with our current 27FTE). However, the library will simply not be able to
meet the challenges ahead without another infusion of staff (beyond the immediate needs identified above) in the next three to five years. We are in the 24th percentile in relation to our group of 17 comparison schools (See Appendix H) and in the 36th percentile in comparison with the COHFE group. We should be aiming at something closer to the mean for our comparison group. We will make a strong case for additional staff when the workload and services needs require it. We hope our Self-Study prompts the college to factor this inevitable need into its long-term financial planning.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Collections – We recommend that the College budget for increases of at least 8 percent per year for the next five years for the collection budget. This will cover inflation and allow us to make some progress on the collection challenges identified in the self-study.

2. Staff - We recommend that the College librarian work with the administration to set a long-range goal for increasing the library staff over time, and that the College plan to increase staff when workload and service needs justify it.

3. Technology – We recommend adopting the goal of moving to the position of “close follower” in library IT innovation, and committing to the financial support and/or partnerships with ITS that will make that possible. We recommend that the College take a more holistic, long-range approach to planning and budgeting for technology investments, and that the technology needs of the library be considered in this long-range planning.