

The University of Memphis
Redefining the University Libraries Committee
Final Report

Executive Summary:

On February 4, 2014, the Provost issued invitations to members of the Redefining the University Library Committee, with the charge:

Today's University Libraries must face a rapidly evolving landscape from the changes surrounding information and technology that have occurred over recent decades. Managing the migration to digital information systems raises numerous challenges, and considerations requiring the collected wisdom of various constituents. The library's traditional role as a repository for physical books and periodicals is changing, with important implications for space utilization, resource acquisition, and deployment of staffing.

The purpose of the Redefining the University Library Committee is to propose a plan for how the University Library will flourish on that new landscape to best position future directions for the programs, services and physical configuration of the University libraries. The committee's recommendations for the library of the 21st century will consider best practices for serving the University community and meet both ideal configuration and realistic support models. The committee is charged to make substantive and visionary recommendations, and bring forward strategies and organizational structure to best meet future demands.

While details and a rationale are developed in the full report, the recommendations of the committee are summarized here:

- **Merge library and IT Services** into a single Information Services unit that will support a new structure to integrate the units of Library and Information Technology into a new administrative unit
 - Blending user services from library and ITS
 - Blending technical services from library and ITS
 - Supporting digital services
 - Alleviating the workflow bottleneck at the top
- Provide a collaborative and innovative **environment that inspires** research and creative thinking.
- Divide responsibilities into **user services** (front-office, direct customer-support), **technical services** (back-office, infrastructure), and **broader, newer services** (emerging technologies)
- Appoint **leaders** to oversee the user services, technical services and broader, newer services functions

- **Reevaluate the personnel job descriptions** and roles to bring them to modern standards and levels of compensation
- Deliver **resources, including collections, that are accessible** to our communities in ways that are expected and useful.
- **Integrate** library services **with campus-wide initiatives**.
- Establish **institutional collaborations** to obtain larger, more effective licensing, service, and purchasing options via efforts that with state or regional domains.
- Respond to the **growth of novel library services** while taking into account the needs of students across all disciplines.
- **Strengthen the relationships with key communities**
 - **Promote more effective relationships** between the library and University faculty.
 - **Encourage student engagement** of new and innovative resources. Experimentation and original research should be facilitated at all points, and the Library should function as a “Gateway to the University.”
 - **Engage the broader University of Memphis community** and encourage cooperation and resource discovery for current, former, and future students.
- **Remain adaptive and responsive.** Spaces must be reconfigurable and flexible, responding to demands as they arise.

The committee further recommends that:

1. **Increased funding** for the Library should be specifically linked to innovation and changes implemented.
2. **Collaborative, phased efforts** that will enhance, increase flexibility, and create efficiencies should be a priority for the library, such as: common catalog and library management system; agreement for collection development and management; agreements for common storage facilities.
3. **Follow-up committees** should be charged to work with existing data and choose the first pilots, to engage members of the staffs and faculties to be merged, and to engage the communities that will benefit by the transformation of these units.

The University of Memphis
Redefining the University Libraries Committee
Final Report

On February 4, 2014, the Provost issued invitations to members the Redefining the University Library Committee, stating:

I am convening a committee of University Library, Campus and Community leaders to discuss and draft a visioning report for the twenty-first century academic libraries, and requesting your service as part of this effort. A confluence of shifts in technology, changing user demands, and increasing budget pressures are now confronting academic libraries with new challenges and opportunities. To capitalize on the advantages of a close collaboration with all the University's information resources, I have asked Ellen I. Watson, Chief Information Officer and Vice Provost of Information Technology, to Chair this effort. The committee is charged with determining near and long-term goals for the University of Memphis libraries, and to produce a report with specific recommendations by the end of May, 2014.

Committee Charge:

Today's University Libraries must face a rapidly evolving landscape from the changes surrounding information and technology that have occurred over recent decades. Managing the migration to digital information systems raises numerous challenges, and considerations requiring the collected wisdom of various constituents. The library's traditional role as a repository for physical books and periodicals is changing, with important implications for space utilization, resource acquisition, and deployment of staffing.

The purpose of the Redefining the University Library Committee is to propose a plan for how the University Library will flourish on that new landscape to best position future directions for the programs, services and physical configuration of the University libraries. The committee's recommendations for the library of the 21st century will consider best practices for serving the University community and meet both ideal configuration and realistic support models. The committee is charged to make substantive and visionary recommendations, and bring forward strategies and organizational structure to best meet future demands.

To divide the work into manageable components the committee broke into three subcommittees, covering facilities, services, and organizational structure. This document is the combined report of the three subcommittees.

Specific requirements of the charge:

- a. Determine near and long-term goals for the University Libraries with specific recommendations for meeting those goals;
- b. Propose a plan that will enable the faculty and staff of the University Library to flourish in the new landscape of *Information Services*;
- c. Address both ideal configuration and realistic, directly pertinent models for the future of University Libraries;
- d. Make substantive and visionary recommendations for the University Libraries; and,
- e. Bring forward strategies and structures to meet future organizational needs.

To meet all of these requirements, the committee affirms the need for progressive, phased changes in moving from the current state toward the vision.

The Vision

Informally, the University Libraries (henceforth, “the library”) will be the information resource of the university’s academic community. It will be a flexible, adaptable, and resilient organization that enables its users to increase their level of expertise and engagement and to elevate their goals and ambitions. As an Academic (or Learning) Commons with its people working as an element of Information Services, it will serve as the principal or local physical site location for introducing students, faculty and staff to the human and material resources, services, and the facilities required for fulfilling the teaching, learning, and research functions of the institution. This new Information Services unit will enhance its ability to serve users at a distance and participate much more intensely in the ongoing changeover from an archived, physical collection (book stacks) to a unit that provides electronic access for the University community. Most of all, the Library will assist in meeting the University’s major goals regarding the recruitment, retention, and development of students of all levels, faculty members of many types, and partners in research, education and the arts.

In this vision:

- a. A student would be able to receive tutorial assistance in her preparation for classes, experimentation with emerging technologies, introduction to new resources, and incorporation into academic life;
- b. A faculty member would be able to build relationships with liaisons, receive information services support without needing first to acquaint herself with the library organizational chart, departments, or staffing categories, and be assured of research and teaching assistance for access, retrieval, preservation, and communication;
- c. A community member would be able to enjoy the facilities, access collections of public interest;
- d. The University will be able to adjust more quickly and cleanly to shifts in state funding and budgeting, new priorities, new models of scholarship and pedagogy, and demands for innovation and experimentation;

- e. Its users will engage more collaboratively with resources and entities beyond the university boundaries as participation in developing markets for information and its licensed transfers come to dominate over the physical collection.

Organizations capable of achieving this vision are well documented.¹ These organizations focus on services that distinguish the institution and promote the positions, functions, and roles that ensure the institution's distinctiveness. They are rethinking the scholarly publishing model, repurposing library space, and redeploying library staff to meet emerging information fluency needs. They are no longer measured by what they own, but by the obstacles they remove from their users in accessing resources beyond the collection and creating materials for users who are usually elsewhere and unknown.

The Current State of the Library

The current library is incapable of meeting this vision. Viewing these observations through a more common lens, that of deferred maintenance, may bring them into proper perspective. The library -- its structure, facilities, and services -- is a case of unevenly deferred maintenance. The structure is overly constricting for experimentation, adaptation, and extension of labor and expertise, unnecessarily segmenting workers into organizational "silos." Following these organizational segments or silos, the services of the library are limited, and they limit the faculty and students who depend upon new modes of service delivery as well as new services. Finally, the facilities are underused and misallocated on unnecessary and outmoded services, requiring employee labor from which the University derives little benefit.

In terms of its services, facilities, and structure, the Library lags behind the research library standard and, independent of that standard, fails to meet the university's demonstrated needs. Furthermore, the library has a history of soliciting input from internal and external customers without responding to that input. This condition makes the organization unattractive to new professionals and ineffective for users, wasteful, and leads to poor morale and premature attrition.

The Ongoing Technology Revolution and Broader, Newer Services

Many of the nation's libraries have book graveyards in their spaces as the ongoing technological revolution changes the user of curated information in fundamental ways. Electronic files and on-line services (Google and Amazon) enable students and faculty to work on-line, search for locations of words in individual books, and read the few surrounding paragraphs; such users now enter the library (or its portal) seeking specific items. Increasingly, databases are on-line and so intensely served by "artificial intelligence" programs that users have pertinent titles and authors routed to any on-line access point. Digitized collections both lessen the need for interlibrary loans and enable serving limited remote licenses for selected books or journals. The

¹ Please see Resources, especially Appendix A, "Redefining the Academic Library: Managing the Migration to Digital Information Services."

benefits of this technological revolution will accrue to the University, and particularly to groups of its students, faculty, and researchers, to the extent that our technological fluency increases, and our library leads in that direction. Libraries, their faculty, and staff, who are delivering more e-materials within limited budgets, must evolve a model of service that is focused on selected emerging elements of the technology revolution.

Recommendations

The three areas of services, facilities, and organizational structure are interrelated. Nonetheless, services are logically prior to facilities and organizational structure. The organizational structure must be designed for the programmed services. The facilities must follow the program for which they serve, and house portions of the organizational structure in meaningful proximity to their clientele. Consequently, the order of the report proceeds from the recommendations for services to those for structure and ends with recommendations for the facilities.

For Services

The Committee proposes the following recommendations regarding library services at the University Libraries. These suggestions were compiled after multiple discussions with current library faculty and staff, a review of existing literature, and an examination of similar institutions. This is only a preliminary list of recommendations presented by the Redefining the Library Committee for further discussion. Many of the proposed changes are contingent on changes to our existing facilities and a restructuring of the organization. Involvement of the Office of Space Planning and a phased implementation of the changes consistent with the SRI budgeting process are appropriate. Additional efforts by future committees will provide details.

To create services that place the Library in the best position to meet the needs of its multiple user communities, the Library must:

1. Provide a collaborative and innovative **environment that inspires** research and creative thinking.
2. Deliver **resources that are accessible** to all of our communities in ways that are expected and useful.
3. **Integrate** library services with **campus-wide initiatives**.
4. **Strengthen the relationship** between the library and University faculty.
5. **Develop metrics** that are used to support decision making.

In support of these broad recommendations, the library must create:

An Environment that Inspires

The current environment fails to inspire, and fails to draw students to the library in large numbers. Faculty and graduate students consider it irrelevant with the exception of specific services. In an era when collaborative discovery is reinforced in the classroom and demanded in the workplace, the Library is decidedly out of touch. The Library should be a place one wants to visit. It should be inviting, colorful, busy, alive, and certainly helpful-- so the customer feels satisfied.

- Provide inspiring spaces for students to research and learn: group study rooms, multi-purpose instruction spaces, collaborative learning commons, graduate learning commons, silent reading room, writing center and media center. "Work along" tables allow students, with various types of music and headphones, to join temporary communities without regard to common registration in classes or other obvious correlations. The traditional carrel is to a great extent, passé; the presence of food and drink is common.
- Each floor should have easily identifiable staff providing immediate assistance to users. They might wear identical brightly colored polo shirts so they stand out as they roam the floors. Each floor should have accessible charging stations.

Resources that are Accessible

As Roger Schonfeld has illustrated in relevant Ithaca S+R reports, faculty and students increasingly care only for access, and in many cases both parties begin their research with a search engine rather than a trip to the library or a discussion with a librarian. Consequently, access, a cornerstone of librarianship, has become synonymous with order fulfillment, and electronic interlibrary loan is the chief mode of access. To keep the Library relevant will require intuitive, self-service access.

- Invest in resources that will better serve our student population, such as: electronic databases, "big deal" serial packages, e-books (patron-driven acquisition), open access portals, reserve copies of textbooks currently in use, including e-texts.
- Increase promotion and accessibility of our unique collections (Music Library, Special Collections, and Government Publications): enhance digitization efforts, implement more streaming services, reexamine Government Publication reference service and cataloging efforts, expand Special Collections Department to include digital preservation.
- Expand circulation services: technology lending, self-checkout, and delivery by vending machines

Integration with Campus-Wide Initiatives

Providing resources that are accessible is a matter of addressing personal relevance, but to provide relevance across the major user communities requires relevance at a strategic level.

Relevance on this level means integration with and continuing alignment to the direction of the University and its priorities.

1. Student success: the establishment of a Writing Center
2. Support in efforts to help students and others reach high levels of information literacy
3. Support for faculty research efforts to assist in achieving the University \$100M research goal
4. Update reference and instruction services, such as: rethink how the reference desk is staffed (combine library reference and IT), expand and promote chat service, enhance the visibility and responsibility of student workers, employ roving librarians, incorporate embedded librarians into e-courseware, shift from “instruction librarians” to “learning librarians”

Strengthened Relationships

The most important of these recommendations addresses the relationship the Library has with the value-producing element of the university, the academic program. The key to success in this regard is to build trust. Building trust will require a campaign among the professionals in the organization to listen and learn and then promise and deliver.

1. Strengthen the alliance between librarians and campus faculty: employ subject specialist librarians, develop a firm order approval plan, create an institutional repository
2. Develop among current and future staff the three ways of service by a modern unit delivering information services: traditional user services, technical services, and the broader, newer services. These three ways should serve and strengthen all relationships.
3. Help all members of the Information Services unit take a “customer facing” view of their efforts. That customer will increasingly face the individual through a screen or an internet portal, yet the delivery of desired service should make the person want to return to the new UM service.
4. A cadre of community volunteers might be helpful to assist in greeting visitors, conducting tours, or even assisting in re-shelving projects. The Friends of the Library already exists as an under-utilized network which might form the core of such a group.

For Organizational Structure

The vision for the revised organizational structure is to create an academic support organization that can adjust to new challenges, work beyond the organizational chart, create ad hoc teams as necessary, and make blended groups rapidly. In short, the organizational structure must be less oriented to structure and more to an adaptive, responsive organization.

1. Merge library and IT services into a single information services support structure, by
 - a. Integrating Library and Information Technology Services into a single administrative unit
 - b. Blending user services from library and ITS

- c. Blending technical services from library and ITS
2. Address through restructuring the workflow bottleneck at the top
3. Allocate responsibilities into user services (front-office, direct customer-support), technical services (back-office, infrastructure), and emerging broader, newer services
4. Appoint leaders to oversee the user services, technical services and broader, newer services functions
5. Divide the IT services into user services and technical services
6. Reevaluate the personnel job descriptions and roles to bring them to modern standards and levels of compensation.
7. Bring a “customer-facing” viewpoint to the members of the new unit.

Steps 1-3 are short-term recommendations and should be completed as soon as the organization can bear it. Steps 4 and 5 are medium-range recommendations and deserve a slightly longer time to implement, given the priority of steps 1-3 and the limitations of any organization to undertake multiple changes simultaneously. Step 6 will follow upon the process reengineering and organizational restructuring of the first five steps. Step 7 should begin as the implementation is planned and be directed to all personnel. This effort needs to be ongoing and measured to ensure its positive implementation.

For Facilities

Based on discussions with faculty and staff in the library, known concerns, and pre-existing reports on the library the following recommendations are made regarding facilities. Facilities cannot exist in isolation of services and organizational structure, and these recommendations assume complementary changes in services where appropriate. This report, while considering spaces as they currently exist in the University Libraries system, does not concern itself with the redevelopment, reallocation, or repurposing of any existing spaces. Rather it approaches the facilities of the University Libraries as a comprehensive redesign with a focus on where facilities are most needed.

To create facilities that place the Library in the best position to meet the needs of its multiple user communities, the Library must design, develop, and construct facilities that:

1. **Respond to** the growth of **novel library services** while taking into account the needs of students across all disciplines.
2. **Encourage student engagement** of new and innovative resources. Experimentation and original research should be facilitated at all points, and the Library should function as a “Gateway to the University.”
3. **Remain adaptive and responsive.** Spaces must be reconfigurable and flexible, responding to demands as they arise.
4. **Engage the broader University of Memphis community** and encourage cooperation and resource discovery for current, former, and future students.

In support of these broad recommendations, the Library must resolve tensions among:

- Local and remote priorities
 - Reduction of stacks footprint
 - Investment in auxiliary facility
- Consolidation of spaces and segmentation of user communities
 - Improved access for commuter students
 - Consolidation of service points
 - Consolidation of faculty/staff spaces
 - Incorporation of multipurpose and event spaces
- The emphasis on institutional distinctiveness and cross-community relevance
 - Growth of special collections
 - Growth of digital repository/online content creation
- The need for innovation and the culture of classic, academic values
 - Instruction space growth
 - Development of experimental and collaborative spaces
 - Development of technology programs and resources

These tensions will require the Library, in progressive conversation with its user communities, to support emerging priorities and replace lower priorities, even when valued by some portion of the community. To address these conflicts, the committee proposes some strategies for implementation.

Strategies for Implementation

Key to making the recommended changes and achieving the vision are:

1. Accelerate the ability of the library to grow and adapt to emerging organizational needs, empowering employees to contribute to the governance and improvement of the library, ITS, and merged organizations. Reducing, if not entirely eliminating, the dependence of the organization on the head for decision-making authority
2. Build a positive view toward the separation of building site, physical collection, and service to users. Collaborate with the Office of Space Planning to meet requests for use of spaces and to renovate the interior of the building. Work with Academic Services to develop a new view of the building as an Academic (or Learning) Commons and of unit assembled from the Library and Information Technology as “Information Services” or similar name.
3. Develop funding for pilot initiatives and means to measure their outcomes within the SRI budgeting effort,
4. Train employees to engage in process improvement to make their desire to contribute count;
5. Develop partnerships in the context of cross-functional teams within Information Services and the University to organize them to meet customer needs current and future;
6. Cross-train within cross-functional teams;

7. Prioritize conflicting missions, especially where the library must meet two widely divergent needs (supporting undergrads and a research community) as well as meeting a community function;
8. Use teams driven by employees whose abilities, skills, and relationships enable them to exist successfully in ITS and library roles as well as front and back roles;
9. Go beyond conventional thinking and behaviors by joining the Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR) and its subsidiary, the Digital Library Federation (DLF), the Coalition for Networked Information (CNI), the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), the American Society for Information Science (ASIS), or Project Kaleidoscope (PKAL) to get connections and input from groups that go beyond American Library Association (ALA), and regional and local organizations,
10. Hire a consultant like Gene Spencer, the former CIO of Bucknell University and an independent consultant specializing in change management, who has expertise in large-scale reengineering and restructuring projects like this one; and,
11. Attend to change management issues.

Change Management Issues

Libraries are almost as difficult to change as curricula. The industry of higher education is change-averse, the profession of librarianship is conservative, and the expectations of users served by the library are varied, uneven, and often unsympathetic to shifts in structure, facilities, and service. To make the changes required to overcome the accretion of many years and meet the university's ambitions as well as the vision for its library and information services, careful change management will be a paramount concern.

Chief among the change management issues will be the values that will guide the transitions, the analysis of the strengths and deficits of the current structure with respect to the end-state, consideration of end-user populations and their expectations, resolution of conflicting goals and priorities, and earnest communication of the project and process of redefining the University Library.

The transitions must (1) not be irrational in the context of the current organizational culture or (2) incapable of delivering the organization into its end-state or new structure and culture. The values to guide this process will be to:

- a. Keep decisions close to the detail;
- b. Make decisions in cross-functional teams;
- c. Make decisions on the basis of relevant, validated, process data (especially where members of the team conflict); and,
- d. Pilot all decisions (rather than diving into a decision with abandon or waiting until full consensus has been reached).
- e. Use data collection and assessment methods like Balanced Scorecard or similar programs found useful by other universities.

Keeping decisions close to the detail means involving all the stakeholders, especially those in the library whose jobs will be significantly changed in the process. The process will proceed more slowly at the beginning, but the advantages will be faster movement later on, increased commitment on the part of the participants, reduced vulnerability to unforeseen and unintended consequences, and greater opportunity to communicate with users and other stakeholders. Staff and faculty close to the detail will have the information, interpretation, and judgment required to prevent many of the negative consequences of large-scale change while seeing opportunities for improvement that would be invisible to those far from the detail. Nonetheless, leaving decisions entirely to those close to the detail could stall the project or promote existing organizational “silos”; therefore, the change process should take place in cross-functional teams.

Cross-functional teams offer the opportunity to keep decisions close to the detail without reinforcing idiosyncratic or short-sighted perspectives. Addressing issues of improvement in cross-functional teams encourages the asking of “naïve” questions, such as “why do you do that?” or “why do you want that?” The organization learns faster from cross-functional teams, and in creating them for decision-making promotes professional development. Additionally, the library has an opportunity to resolve one of its lingering problems: appearing to be unconcerned with the perspectives, concerns, or insights of its staff and faculty. These perspectives, concerns, and insights are not aligned, however, and data-driven decision-making will be necessary to resolve the conflicts that will inevitably arise.

Using data to drive decision-making removes the strength of personalities and blunts the force of the culture of the current organizational structure. Unless the library can find a commonly supported mode of conflict resolution, moving to a new culture and its expression in a new structure will be difficult. Driving decisions with data, particularly when consensus is only remotely possible, is not only likely to be successful, but it also drives the kinds of behaviors that the university would want from its new organization, regardless of structure. The culture derives from the way that authority is constructed, and force of will is less powerful than joint, aligned trust in good data. Even so, data can be interpreted in more than one way; therefore, the library will need to be able to pilot solutions.

Piloting solutions involves testing out ideas that either divide the community or are ambiguously supported by the data. Because higher education and higher education libraries, especially, are averse to failure, they are unlikely to attempt new ideas unless compelled by the environment or an administrator. The culture that the vision implies -- one that is flexible, adaptable, and capable of innovation -- requires the ability to construct solutions, some of which may be structural, on an experimental basis. If the University Library is to be the capital of the university’s academic community and serve as the location for introducing students, faculty and staff to the human and material resources, the services, and the facilities required for fulfilling the teaching, learning, and research functions of the institution, then it must be able to build ad hoc tests of new ideas. Pilot projects free the organization from its fear of failure, enabling it to adjust to new challenges, work beyond the organizational chart, and blend groups rapidly.

Summary

The rapidly evolving landscape requires a bold plan for how the University Library will be best positioned in the 21st century. A criticism frequently voiced by various library faculty and staff is that the unit is not nimble: that its services, organization and facilities should adapt more quickly to changing circumstances. This report has considered best practices for serving the University community and meet both ideal configuration and realistic support models. It aims to make the University Libraries “more nimble.” The committee believes the report to propose both substantive and visionary recommendations, and brings forward strategies and organizational structure to best meet future demands.

Resources:

“Coherence at Scale and the Research Library of the Future”

<http://www.educause.edu/ero/article/coherence-scale-and-research-library-future>

From the Education Advisory Board, “Redefining the Academic Library: Managing the Migration to Digital Information Services”

Ithaka S+R Research and Publications <http://www.sr.ithaka.org/research-publications>

University Libraries current strategic plan:

http://www.memphis.edu/administration/stratplan_2013.php

NMC Horizon Report <http://www.educause.edu/library/resources/2014-horizon-report>

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen Watson, CIO and Vice Provost IT (Committee Chair)

Cody Behles, Asst. Professor, Libraries Information Systems

Jamie Corson, Library Assistant II, Libraries Collection Management

Eugene Eckstein, Professor and Chair, Biomedical Engineering

Bob Hetherington, Professor of Theatre & Dance, Provost Fellow (ex officio)

Tom Hrach, Assistant Professor of Journalism, Faculty Senate

D.R. Jones, Associate Dean for Information Resources, Law Library Director, Faculty Senate

Bob Johnson, VP, Student and Information Services, Rhodes College

Trey Martindale, Associate Professor, Instruction Curriculum Leadership

Susan O'Donovan, Associate Professor, History

Jennifer Schnabel, Asst. Professor, University Libraries

Sue Reid Williams, community member

Appendix A:

From “Redefining the Academic Library: Managing the Migration to Digital Information Services,” University Leadership Council

Transformational Change in the Information Landscape

While predictions of radical change in library and information services are by no means new, a confluence of shifts in technology, changing user demands, and increasing budget pressures are now forcing academic libraries to either adapt or risk obsolescence. The library’s traditional role as a repository for physical books and periodicals is quickly fading, with important implications for space utilization, resource acquisition, and staffing.

1. Collection Size Rapidly Losing Importance

Even the wealthiest academic libraries are abandoning the “collection arms race” as the value of physical resources declines. Increasingly, libraries must adapt to a world in which providing access to—rather than ownership of—scholarly resources is their primary role.

2. Traditional Library Metrics Fail to Capture Value to Academic Mission

Libraries can no longer demonstrate their educational and scholarly impact via traditional input measures such as the number of volumes and serial titles held, expenditures on monographs and staff, gate count, and reference requests. New measures of success (still under development) will emphasize impact on student learning outcomes, retention and graduation rates, faculty research productivity, and teaching support.

3. Rising Journal Costs Inspiring Calls for Alternative Publishing Models

Subscriptions to scholarly journals and electronic databases have steadily risen as a share of library budgets at what many believe is an unsustainable rate, particularly in an era of tightened budgets. While publishers see growing costs as an unavoidable consequence of expanded research output, many librarians and academic administrators feel that a transition to nonprofit, open-access journals would mean substantial savings and broader access for all.

4. Viable Alternatives to the Library Now Boast Fastest Growth and Easiest Access

With the rise of companies like Google and Amazon, as well as nonprofits like Wikipedia and HathiTrust, users now meet most of their information needs through sources outside of the library. The collections of articles, monographs, and e-books made available through these organizations dwarf library collections in size and scope, and content is increasingly accessed virtually through web- and cloud-based distribution portals.

5. Demand Declining for Traditional Library Services

Very few students and a decreasing number of faculty start research in the library building or via the library website, opting instead for search engines and discipline-specific research resources. Circulation and reference requests have been steadily declining for years, driving the

library's traditional core (providing access to books and guiding patrons through research) to the periphery.

6. New Patron Demands Stretch Budget and Organizational Culture

The modern library is caught between its historical role in managing print materials and new demand for digital resources and services, and it cannot afford to invest indefinitely in both. Today's users require a new set of services and accommodations from the academic library that necessitate a strategic paradigm shift: from building and maintaining a collection to engaging with students and faculty, as well as providing space for study, collaboration, and creativity. Traditional organizational boundaries are likely to fade and the word "library" will cease to adequately describe the suite of both virtual and physical academic support services offered to patrons.

1. Leveraging Digital Collections

As more books are either scanned and made available digitally or published as e-books, libraries will need to adapt by diverting funds toward licensed digital access, rather than physical ownership and storage. New patron-driven costing models will finally allow libraries to avoid the risk and inefficiency associated with prospective collection-building and pay only for what patrons use, at the moment they use it.

7. E-book Adoption Reaching a Tipping Point

In April 2011, e-books began to outsell all print books on Amazon.com. Surveys of academic library directors indicate plans to substantially increase spending on e-books within the next five years. While the move among students and faculty to e-books has been slower than many anticipated, growing investments by publishers, interactive functionality, and the advent of tablet PCs are building substantial momentum toward adoption.

8. Large-Scale Digital Collections Offer Promise of Widespread, Low-Cost Access

Google Books, HathiTrust, Internet Archive, and other efforts have digitized millions of volumes and have made them fully searchable and browseable online. While legal barriers and publisher resistance currently prevent full access to these collections, a growing corpus of material is being made available to the public at little to no cost.

9. Technological Constraints Unlikely to Prevent Digital Transition

The breakneck pace of technological innovation will ensure that most usability limitations involved in the consumption of digital information and text will be addressed before patrons are aware of them. Format incompatibility, missing functionalities, and hard-to-read displays are likely to give way to better, less expensive reading technologies as publishing continues its digital migration.

10. Usage Restrictions and Copyright Remain the Largest Obstacles to Access

Current digital rights management (DRM) restrictions on e-books and legal constraints surrounding copyright complicate the prospect of broad access to digital collections. Ironically,

it is now easier to share physical books than electronic copies. Until licensed or “fair use” access to the mass-digitized corpus is resolved, colleges and universities will be unable to begin replacing physical collections with digital access to scanned material.

11. Patron-Driven Acquisition Models Allow “Just in Time” Purchasing Approach

A new business model for eBook delivery, commonly referred to as patron- or demand-driven acquisition, allows libraries to shift from a prospective, “just in case” purchasing strategy to a “just in time” approach in which the library pays only for books actually used by patrons. Via a mix of free access, short-term rentals, and loans of purchased items, patron-driven acquisition more effectively calibrates the library’s investment to demand, while significantly expanding the universe of available titles in the local catalog.

II. Rethinking the Scholarly Publishing Model

The rapidly rising costs of scientific journals and databases have led many of our contacts to believe that the current commercial publishing model is unsustainable. Three potential approaches—centralized purchasing, pay-per-article, and open access—all have the potential to bring down costs in the long term, but all three also face significant short-term implementation challenges.

12. Centralized Purchasing Authority Essential in Deriving Savings from Library Consortia

Most academic libraries are involved in consortial partnerships in which resource, service, and infrastructure costs may be shared. Contacts from libraries, publishers, and vendors alike reported that truly substantial savings require a greater degree of both financial and organizational centralization, as well as a larger membership (e.g., a large university system or an entire state) than is typical with most consortia. Many contacts are planning to share an increasing number of resources and back-end systems among institutional partners in the near future.

13. Pay-per-Article Models Emerging as an Alternative to the “Big Deal”

While per-article costs of scholarly articles remain high, making large-scale subscription cancellations impossible for many academic libraries, several new services are beginning to relieve the expenses and delays associated with acquiring single articles for patrons, providing significant advantages over interlibrary loan. As libraries more carefully monitor usage data and continue to pressure publishers for more favorable delivery models, viable per-article services may gain traction over the next five to ten years.

14. Pressure for Open Access Likely to Disrupt Publishing Business Model

Public access mandates from federal research funders and increasing opposition to rising journal prices have begun to push publishers to make more content available on the web at no cost. While a complete transition to open-access publishing is unlikely to occur, many experts believe that the traditional business model undergirding scholarly communication will begin to unbundle as faculty embrace alternative modes of discourse and information consumers

demand greater access at lower cost. Most faculty, however, are more concerned with publishing in prestigious journals than in supporting open access.

15. Many Institutions Incentivizing and Providing Infrastructure for Open Access

In an effort to divert funds away from consumption and toward the creation, hosting, and dissemination of research, a number of colleges and universities are now investing in a variety of open access initiatives:

- Disciplinary repositories—Hosted by libraries and run by faculty and scholarly societies, these web portals host and disseminate relevant scholarship and provide free public access.
- Institutional repositories—Often run by the library, these portals provide a publicly accessible home for faculty research data and copies of published articles (typically one year after first publication).
- Open access fee subsidies—Institutional funds help underwrite publication by students, faculty, or staff in open-access journals.
- Open textbook pilots—Faculty are commissioned to create digital textbooks for introductory undergraduate courses, published by the institution and available for free or at a small cost.

III. Repurposing Library Space

Demand among students and faculty for comfortable, collaborative learning spaces, media resources, and easier access to academic support services is leading libraries to think differently about how to optimize their facilities. As the value of large print collections continues to decline, the case for reducing space allocations for material storage and increasing allocations for higher-demand activities grows stronger.

16. Local Print Collections Are Large, Expensive, and Rarely Used

At many institutions, less than half of the library's collection has ever circulated. Despite the steadily declining usage of print collections, they continue to occupy extensive (and typically central, and thus quite valuable) space on campus. Books housed in on-campus open stacks are five times as expensive to store as those kept in off-site, high-density storage. As library budgets tighten, need for space rises, and circulation continues to decline, more and more libraries will consider moving print materials off campus.

17. Emerging Virtual Discovery Tools Provide Alternative Paths to Serendipity

Some faculty, particularly in the humanities and social sciences, suggest that browsing open stacks constitutes a central and irreplaceable mode of scholarly research and therefore oppose efforts to relocate or condense print collections. Many librarians and library directors report very low usage by faculty, however, and note that virtual discovery now offers a much broader selection and more sophisticated research tools compared to roaming the stacks.

18. Leverage Data on Usage, Electronic Access, and Local Holdings to Prioritize Local Collections
Deaccession (or “weeding”) is practically and politically difficult when poorly planned. There are now a variety of resources designed to aid libraries in the process of determining which

volumes to relocate or remove. Librarians can prioritize resources and streamline decisions about collection management using objective data on usage, access to electronic alternatives, holdings by consortial partners, and preservation agreements.

19. Mitigate Opposition to Relocating Resources by Regularizing and Systematizing Deaccession
Resistance to deaccession is much more likely to arise when materials are withdrawn in one sweeping, public initiative by the administration. Contacts advise implementing regular deaccession “audits” into collection management protocols and asking faculty to appeal individual items on withdrawal lists, rather than encouraging them to nominate or approve candidates for withdrawal.

20. Avoid Unnecessary Duplication Through Collaborative Storage and Acquisition Plans
In order to more rationally match print collections with demonstrated demand, some institutions are working together to organize shared storage facilities that eliminate duplicate copies. These facilities ensure access to and preservation of materials and remove excess holdings from collections to free up room for new acquisitions. Others are taking collaborative collection management further, coordinating disciplinary areas of specialization and avoiding duplication in acquisition plans across institutions as well.

21. Repurpose Library Space to Support Collaborative Learning
Often the rationale for deaccessioning is to free up space for new uses. New or renovated library space is now commonly repurposed to bring students together to work, study, and socialize. The “learning commons” typically offers comfortable furniture for both individual and group study, modular furnishings that allow users to customize the environment to suit their needs, access to wireless networks and electrical outlets, multimedia labs and support, and often a café accompanied by relaxed food and drink restrictions. Related academic support units, such as centers for teaching and learning, specialized labs for math, writing, and languages, student advising, and technical support often share space in these new facilities, providing students with a “one-stop shop” for academic assistance.

IV. Redeploying Library Staff

As the focus of the library shifts away from the acquisition, preservation, and distribution of physical volumes, the role of librarians is changing as well. Many libraries, however, have been resistant to discontinuing in traditional activities and services, pulling staff in many conflicting directions. Library leadership must identify areas of activity that can be reduced or eliminated and begin to migrate staff to higher-value responsibilities.

22. Cataloging No Longer a Local Activity
As one contact put it, “We don’t need a thousand different descriptions of the same book.” The ability to standardize and share basic catalog entries for almost all holdings eliminates much of the need for dedicated catalogers in academic libraries. Books can now be purchased “shelf-ready” from vendors, arriving fully processed and ready to lend to patrons.

23. Tiered Reference Services Free Up Librarian Time

Reference librarians at most academic institutions are fielding fewer and fewer requests by students each year, though many still spend as much time behind the central help desk as ever. Some libraries are making better use of staff time and expertise by training students or paraprofessional staff to answer basic reference questions and providing in-depth research consultations with librarians by appointment.

24. Crowd-Sourced Reference Matches Supply to Decreased Demand

Libraries are also able to share reference staff among institutions, through various consortial, regional, and even international cooperatives. Institutions minimize the local staff time devoted to basic troubleshooting and common search questions, while librarians devote more energy to developing the library's unique assets and providing instruction and research support on campus.

25. Successful Integrated Information Technology/Library Units Rely on Expertise, Mission Congruence

The late 1980s and early 1990s saw a trend toward merged library and information technology units, as administrators hoped to leverage technology expertise across silos while reducing overall operating costs. Most institutions failed to make the marriage work, but joint library/IT units still thrive in some areas, particularly among small, liberal arts colleges. Contacts suggested that the success of such a merger hinges on the ability and expertise of the chief information officer and the extent to which both units share a common mission and culture.

26. Students in Need of Information Literacy Beyond "Library 101"

Though information literacy is a growing presence in student learning outcomes and general education requirements, most institutions currently offer little more than a brief introduction to the campus library and its website. Studies on the research habits and abilities of undergraduates suggest that students require a much deeper understanding of common information sources and reliable sourcing standards, and librarians are perfectly positioned to provide that education. Some are beginning to refocus student sessions on the inner workings of Google and Wikipedia, encouraging students to be better lifelong judges of information and better users of common search tools.

27. Embedded Librarians and Services Offer On-Demand, Online Guidance to Students and Faculty

Rather than hoping for reference and circulation trends to reverse, progressive librarians are bringing their skills directly to users, embedding in classrooms, online course portals, and even departmental meetings and research teams. As research and study sessions become more and more virtual in nature, libraries will have to migrate their staff and services online, integrating resource guides and on-demand guidance into the web.

28. Data Management Standards Require New Information Infrastructure

New rules from the National Science Foundation and other research funders will increasingly require faculty to think more carefully about organizing, storing, and describing their research

data. Contacts suggest that this is a perfect opportunity for librarians at research institutions to play new roles in shepherding researchers through effective stewardship of their work and in connecting various stakeholders on campus (from computing and legal services to grants and administration) in an effort to comply with evolving research standards.

29. Targeted Specialists Provide Expertise and Flexibility

Rapidly changing needs and tightened budgets have made long-term staffing decisions in academic libraries more difficult than ever. Some libraries have responded by hiring highly specialized professionals or postdocs, sharing their time with other units or departments on campus. By splitting the cost, both units are able to procure limited-term staff that they could not afford on their own, and effective hires are often able to bring a unique perspective to new library projects while teaching courses or conducting research in departments.

30. Publisher Partnerships Bring New Life to Special Collections

In an era when large collections of monographs and journals no longer signify distinction among academic libraries, special collections have become an oft-cited source of prestige. However, libraries struggle to derive maximal value from these archives and may not be able to afford to digitize, promote, and disseminate their contents. Partnerships with publishers and other organizations can transfer much of that responsibility to those with the appropriate resources, while granting libraries the chance to build their “brand” and expand the reach of their collections through digitization and distribution.

Appendix B

Library Staff and Open Campus Meetings

Redefining the University Library
Library Staff Meeting
April 28, 2014 – 9:00 – 10:00 a.m. UC Bluff Room

- Brief explanation of the Redefining the University Library Committee's directives from Provost Rudd
- High-level discussion at the meeting; not a granular discussion.
- Additional ideas, suggestions, concerns, may be submitted anonymously via Library intranet or directly emailed to Ellen Watson (eiwatson)

Services

- Location important, especially for public services
- Survey needed – faculty and students >> what they want/need
- Policies for services, especially for digital services, research requests, and also for whole library
- Same level of services at every facility we call “library”, including Lambuth
- More robust online reference (hours, especially)
- Support devoted to distance education
- More instruction librarians
- More databases/electronic resources
- Library collections >> separate entity >> high priority
- Value of tours to grade school students? Distraction (staff and time consuming)
- ADA accessibility of services
- ILL and document delivery (labor demanding)
- Limit time for student carrels
- Simplify how UoM and community can pay fines (Bursar and ILS not always in sync)
- Self-service checkout
- Access to historic government documents/primary sources (location >> remote storage and direct access)
- Common catalog (Jackson State, LeMoyne Owen, Law school) collaboration , especially for catalog maintenance - can be a problem for billing/use by affiliated students
- Technology availability (patrons and staff) – more robust software availability, especially specialized software from department labs

- “Gadget” availability / play space
- Charging stations
- Change machine for copiers/debit card access for copiers
- Provide same level of services at any library location – technology, personnel, facilities
- Quiet space/ presentation room/ writing center – larger implications for array of services that we can offer
- Upper floors largely overlooked; no clear picture of where people are
- Group study space and individual study space that is quiet
- Presentation rooms where people can practice their PowerPoint – learning commons was to be such before \$\$\$ ran out
- Easy and manageable study room reservation system; no policy and no enforcement
- Space for carrels for graduate students; no one is in them and they’re reserved for whole semester
- Presentation space for own speakers or programs space
- Remote storage is a problem; dirty, no climate control and small; electrical and wireless need upgrading
- No one can find RIS area -- only see back of people’s heads; signage needs updating
- Rooms are not accessible to staff or students – e.g. Hooks space
- Better space for public programming – rotunda okay but not ideal
- Electrical outlets needed in many places
- More instruction rooms
- HVAC issues – students bring blankets; reading room gets condensation on the inside – problem with 100 year-old books
- Lambuth campus – tie in facility – services & facility consistency
- Document delivery (including ILL) – not enough people – labor demanding
- Study rooms – people sense lack of security; HVAC could be too cost prohibitive to heat/air rooms; finite time of reserving would help
- Security in library non-existent; people walk out with material every day
- Self-service checkout

Facilities

- Quiet space / consultation space / Writing Center >> ties to services
- Both groups and individual study space
- Presentation space for students practice and library programs
- Easy online study room reservation process (and enforcement)
- Value of student carrels? Better usage?
- Remote storage very problematic – HVAC/access/volume of space/wireless/electrical outlets – action needed
- Presentation of space – hard to find and very confusing signage!
- ADA access, especially parking
- Spaces not accessible for library purposes (e.g., Hooks' office, etc.)
- Space for public programming
- Charging stations/electrical outlets
- Services/facilities need to align
- More instruction space(s)
- HVAC (students bring blankets; condensation on inside of windows (Special Collections reading room))
- Tie-in with Lambuth Library
- Re-evaluate security, especially in study carrels
- Security:
 - Gates not sufficient to prevent theft
 - Late night security doesn't always show up, especially during late study hours
 - Sign-in/know who's in the library
- Cleanliness lacking, especially during heavy use periods
- Document delivery from storage, especially government documents
- More technology overall (Camtasia, for example, also catalog access, etc.)
- Computers insufficient to do their jobs at all times with this many people; need more scanners, color copiers and printers
- Presentation space needs updating; computers on each floor need updating

Organizational Structure

- Government document is its own entity
- Fill vacant positions >> then what else do we need to do new services - “don’t know what we’re capable of”
- Focus on digital services (help with policy development, etc. - needs to be more than one person)
- Committee structure simplified > “at will”/interest/skills rather than assignment
- More Library Assistant levels to recognize skill levels
- Job descriptions updated/reviewed – duties vary by department but they are generic descriptions
- Larger staff needed to meet needs/expectations of patrons.
- Authority within library to determine skills required, salary levels
- More opportunity for growth/internal advancement
- RIS -- nebulous –staffed from throughout the library – focused group would improve service; RIS service not weighted sufficiently at evaluation
- Concern that evaluations feel punitive – also need 360 evaluations
- More nimble – change more quickly/easily
- Make sure evaluations are specific to the person
- Fill vacant positions to meet expectations – what else do we need?
- 3 levels of library assistants – need to be more to distribute workload more equitably

**Redefining the University Library
Open Campus Meeting**

April 28, 2014 - 10:30 – 11:30 a.m. UC Bluff Room

- Brief explanation of the Redefining the University Library Committee's directives from Provost Rudd
- High-level discussion at the meeting; not a granular discussion.
- Additional ideas, suggestions, concerns, may be sent to Ellen Watson via email (eiwatson)

Services

- Library collection, especially monographs for undergraduate instruction/research
- Books are a concern, especially in the humanities; new books are not being bought – Egyptology cited as an example
- Simplify search process, especially for the student; make webpage more user-friendly
- Resources will have to be provided to give added services
- Active engagement/group work – may be perception; need to foster community, especially for students who don't live on campus.

Facilities

- Remote storage/automatic/robotic storage/compact storage
- Automatic retrieval system; takes floor high weight capacity; suggested one area where microfiche is currently stored
- Reconfigure space to determine how students can (and do) use it (food service, group study, etc.)
- Partnership space for studying and other services – designated space apart from library, but still with access and library support
- Library as a "destination" - for services, food, multi-modal
- Quiet spaces – including for computer use; when using the computers in the library, there's almost always noise; not adequate computers to study where it's quiet.
- Can a branch of tutoring be in the library? The new Writing Center will be there.
- The entrance is confusing – better signage and displays/services in the rotunda; "village common" feel
- Matching service changes with "old fashioned" and fixed facilities
- Partnership with other UoM services/facilities

- Master Plan consultant:
 - Revitalize first floor by making space more collaborative
 - Engaging terrace on the east side, overlooking the ellipse
- Traffic study needed – all space and services
- Student Success Center in Library
- College library should “feel” different than a community library; maybe a marketing effort?

Organizational Structure

- Budget flexibility as well as service flexibility

Miscellaneous:

- Questions about library overall – where is process this going?
- Library budget will not be reduced next year per Provost
- Is there a document of the committee’s plan?
- Full report to the Provost by the Committee by end of May. He will then determine next actions.

Attendees who signed in for information:

Francis Mathews	fmathews@southwest.tn.edu
Terence Wallace	twllace4@memphis.edu
Bess Robinson	merobnsn@memphis.edu
Elizabeth McDonald	cmcdnld1@memphis.edu
Dan Bureau	dabureau@memphis.edu
Cathy Swearngen	cswearen@memphis.edu

Appendix C

McWherter Library – Observations and Recommendations Space Planning and Utilization

Observations

1. The entry is dark and a bit confusing.
2. The library has limited space and much of it is used for book storage. This storage in some areas blocks opportunities for natural lighting.
3. Offices are isolated from common areas and with no cameras
4. Windows are an opportunity that are underutilized
5. They have not taken advantage of Ellipse
6. Study rooms need to be analyzed for use/need/flexibility

Recommendations

1. Introduce light and take advantage of natural light; look at front desk use
2. Introduce color
3. Improve wayfinding and signage
4. Improve security
5. Create outdoor space facing Ellipse
6. Look at overall flow and function of building to determine most effective way to make it a destination
7. Take advantage of windows on every level highlighting more movement/activity
8. Identify alternative conditioned space for storage of books that need to be accessed, but not immediately accessible.

Submitted by Kathryn Johnson, Director
Space Planning and Utilization
5/21/14