

Discussion Group on Academic Technologies and Libraries

Report to the Strategic Planning Steering Committee

April 10, 2009

Tim O'Donnell, Associate Professor of Communication, Dir. Debate (Chair)

Martha Burtis, Teaching and Learning Technologies

Teresa L. Coffman, Associate Professor of Education

Tom Fallace, Assistant Professor of Education

Leanna Giancarlo, Associate Professor of Chemistry

Betsy Gips, CGPS graduate student

James Groom, Instructional Technology Specialist

Donna Hudgins, Serials Librarian

Charlotte Jones, Reference-Social Sciences Librarian

Carolyn Parsons, Special Collections Librarian

Brian R. Rizzo, Assistant Professor of Geography/GIS

John St. Clair, Director of Distance and Blended Learning

Kelly Wuyscik '09, student, SGA Technology Coordinator

Khalil Yazdi, Vice President for Info. Technology, Institutional Research & CIO

Steering Committee Liaisons:

Dana German, Director, UMW Data-Management

Jeff McClurken, Associate Professor of History & American Studies

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| Charge | 3 |
| Rationale | 3 |
| Goals | 3 |
| Summary and Background..... | 4 |
| Recommendations | 6 |
| Appendix A: Goals, Objectives, Benchmarks | 7 |
| Appendix B: Report on Student Focus Group | 16 |
| Appendix C: Database Comparisons – Virginia Public Institutions..... | 20 |
| Appendix D: Database Comparisons – Virginia Private Institutions | 21 |
| Appendix E: NCES Library Statistics for UMW and COPLAC Institutions | 22 |
| Appendix F: Plan For the Year of the Digital University (YDU)..... | 24 |

Charge

Recommend goals, objectives, and some possible benchmarks on how the University can identify, develop, and sustain those practices and resources that will produce high quality service, support, and innovation in our academic technologies, library services, and our information resources; consider how our libraries can be at the center of our University intellectual and academic life; provide a plan for 2009-2010 as the Year of the Digital University at Mary Washington.

Rationale

The world is rapidly changing and UMW should be an incubator of individuals by situating them in technologically enabled and information-rich environments which allow them to grow as digitally literate citizens who lead meaningful and dynamic lives. Academic technologies, information resources, and libraries are the basic assets and infrastructure around which such environments are built and they remain essential to realizing the university's mission, especially in the areas of teaching, learning, research, and leadership. Moreover, academic technologies, information resources and libraries are prerequisites for realizing many of our strategic goals and objectives, including efforts to enhance connectivity, engagement and accessibility, promote alignment, and cooperatively solve complex problems—in the region, across the Commonwealth, around the nation, and throughout the world.

Goals

Although we identify a series of smaller sub-goals and objectives in Appendix A, we believe there are two overarching goals that should be central to UMW's overall strategic plan:

Goal 1: The University of Mary Washington's libraries will become the university's knowledge center--a physical and virtual manifestation of the institution's missions of connected, integrated, and engaged teaching, learning, research and service to our communities. Specifically, the Libraries will become:

- spaces where people collaborate, gather, research, and share;
- technology- and human-enabled engines, showcases, and catalysts of innovation;
- dynamic repositories of the university's teaching, research, and creative activities; and,
- a model of support and service that is responsive to the needs and status of diverse users and learners.

Goal 2: The University of Mary Washington should be a leader in the fields of academic technology, library services, and information resources by identifying, developing, investing in and sustaining those practices and resources which produce the highest quality of service, technology and support, while promoting, celebrating, and preserving innovations in teaching, learning, and scholarship.

Summary and Background

To achieve these goals, UMW has a great deal of work to do on a wide variety of fronts related to academic technologies, information resources, and libraries. The most pressing issues involve cyberinfrastructure, resource allocation and cultural transformation. Foremost among these challenges is the fact that academic technologies, information resources, and libraries have been inadequately supported for a number of years. Maintenance of and planning for the university's cyberinfrastructure has been inhibited by a lack of consistent leadership, bifurcated decision making processes, ad hoc budgeting, and expediency--rather than long term strategic thinking.

For example, the library budget has remained flat for more than a decade (see Appendix E), while it has been asked to take on additional mission critical objectives such as accommodating the advent of digital databases and supporting a second campus with new and growing graduate programs¹. Similarly, in academic technologies, despite dramatic increases in the number of faculty and students using digital technologies for teaching, learning, and research, the staff of the Division of Teaching and Learning Technologies (DTLT) has been reduced. Moreover, investment in IT infrastructure has been chronically inadequate relative to the increased dependency of the institution on information technologies and access to digital resources.

Irrespective of the larger goals outlined in this report, provision of adequate support and resources in the area of academic technologies, information resources and libraries is tantamount to fulfilling the institution's teaching, learning and research missions. Further, we concur with and strongly affirm the Ad-Hoc Committee on Digital Initiatives' conclusion that "a robust and well-supported foundation of hardware, software, and network resources" is essential.² In times of economic challenge, when resources are scarce and budgets for libraries and technology become ever tighter, we have no illusions about the challenges and tradeoffs that lie ahead.

However, even in times of plenty, increased resources and adequate support would be insufficient to realizing more aspirational goals. Instead, transforming the ways in which members of the university community think about and use academic technologies, information resources and libraries is equally crucial. There are deep-seated fissures, suspicions and frustrations percolating in parts of the university community that also must be understood. They involve questions such as is the library primarily an archival repository for preserving and collecting knowledge or a dynamic social center for producing it? They are evinced by low morale in the face of an institutional reward system that has little place for innovation, the frustration that comes with inadequate support, outdated equipment, and slow connections, or the fatigue that comes with false starts or empty promises. They play out in the disconnect between early adopters who take solace in their visionary perch and stalwart detractors disdainful of allocating scarce time and resources to technologies which have yet to demonstrate their pedagogical value. And most of all, they reside at a very fundamental level in the primary

¹ See the database comparisons between UMW and other schools in the Commonwealth and/or the COPLAC list in Appendices C, D.

² Final Report from the Ad-hoc University Committee on Digital Initiatives, May 28, 2008. Available at: <http://umwhistory.org/diginit/files/ReportDigInit.doc>

relationships that structure the scholarly life of the university—teaching, learning, research, and creative activity—and the disciplines that inhabit it.

On this count, we found a student focus group to be particularly revealing (Appendix B). There, we observed that students were reluctant to embrace and use new technologies and applications in their disciplines because they felt that they would not be rewarded for doing so. In fact, some seemed aware of a pervasive “anti-technology” attitude in their departments and argued that this discouraged new and innovative uses of technology in their academic programs. In addition, students expressed a desire both to be acknowledged and rewarded for investing in new and emerging technologies at the forefront of academic technologies and suggested that the present academic environment discourages innovation.

Consequently, to reach the goals outlined above depends crucially on changing the way we think and talk about the ways in which technology, information, and the libraries are central to our mission. Such a cultural transformation will require leadership, a well articulated vision of the role of information resources, technologies and libraries relative to the university’s mission, thoughtful and inclusive planning involving different constituencies and interests, and an institutional commitment to recognizing and rewarding innovation.

Despite these challenges, there are considerable opportunities on the horizon. For example, planning for the University’s future convergence center, irrespective of budgeting and completion date, is an opportunity to rethink, reimagine, and rebuild the library as the institution’s knowledge center. Meanwhile, the projected growth in the Stafford and Dahlgren campuses create conditions ripe for partnerships, collaborations, and shared resources. Most significantly, the institution’s vibrant academic core constitutes a standing reserve of human and intellectual potential capable of catapulting the university forward as a recognized leader in 21st century digital teaching and learning.

Recommendations

Apart from the goals and objectives outlined in this report, the Discussion Group has two recommendations for immediate action. First, recognizing that attention to academic technologies, information resources, and libraries is a matter of extreme importance to the future of the institution and that it involves the active, honest and thoughtful participation of and communication between many members of the university community, the discussion group recommends the creation of a presidential advisory board on academic technologies, information resources, and libraries.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE PRESIDENT: The Discussion Group recommends that the president should establish a permanent presidential advisory board on academic technologies, information resources and libraries. The advisory board should be chaired by a faculty member and would include at least: the chief academic officer, the chief information officer, faculty, librarians, staff, students, and community members.

Second, since accreditation, high quality academic programming, and the evolution of the library into the university's knowledge center requires thoughtful planning and strong advocacy, the Discussion Group recommends the creation of an ad hoc working group on libraries. This committee should be convened by the chief academic officer.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER: The Discussion Group recommends that until a permanent standing committee on academic resources is established through the adoption of a faculty governance plan, the chief academic officer should convene an ad hoc group of faculty and librarians to examine library acquisitions and services for the purpose of ensuring that library collections, resources and services are consistent with the degrees offered and sufficient to support all of the university's educational, research, and public service programs.

Appendix A: Goals, Objectives, Benchmarks

GOAL 1: Objectives & Benchmarks

Goal 1: The University of Mary Washington's libraries will become the university's knowledge center--a physical and virtual manifestation of the institution's missions of connected, integrated, and engaged teaching, learning, research and service to our communities. Specifically, the Libraries will become:

- *spaces where people collaborate, gather, research, and share;*
- *technology- and human-enabled engines, showcases, and catalysts of innovation;*
- *dynamic repositories of the university's teaching, research, and creative activities; and,*
- *a model of support and service that is responsive to the needs and status of diverse users and learners*

Objective 1 – Simpson Library and the Convergence Center: The University of Mary Washington should create physical spaces within existing library facilities to support collaborative study, learning and research between students, faculty and staff and promote effective and interactive access to and use of information resources. While such spaces may eventually exist at the university's planned convergence center, budgetary exigencies and construction delays should not delay the ways in which the libraries and academic technologies can converge to create a vibrant and robust learning center at the heart of the intellectual life of the university.

Objective 2 – Building a Knowledge Center: The University of Mary Washington libraries should be the center of the institution's intellectual creations by students, faculty, and staff.

- The university should recognize and further encourage the ways in which librarians occupy an important and increasingly central role in all facets of the life of the institution, including: administration, teaching and research. Further, insofar as they are exemplars in the methods of findability and cataloguing, librarians should play important roles as the institution seeks to better leverage its information resources for strategic purposes
- The libraries should become a central hub for finding and sharing the intellectual creations of the University's communities. This hub should include a range of integrated tools and interfaces for accessing and preserving such assets, including repositories for capturing, organizing, managing, sharing and aggregating digital content, including the institution's intellectual commons, individual creations, and information gathered, researched, and shared. Such a hub would include the institution's signature digital collections as well as individual creations by faculty, staff, and students. The university's libraries should be charged with creating processes for building and adding to such repositories in a way that catalogs holdings and enhances accessibility both internally and externally.

- The university's libraries should develop a more meaningful and visible web presence, and should be featured on the university homepage.
- The libraries are and should continue to be a model of excellence in the discovery, creation, utilization, and dissemination of methods and best practices for knowledge navigation (access, discovery, information mentoring) in an information society. This includes cultivating the habits of mind and practice among students, faculty and staff for shared creation, use, organization, and dissemination of our collective information resources.

Objective 3 - Assessment, Evaluation, and Ensuring that the Libraries are at the Leading Edge of Best Practices: The University of Mary Washington should utilize Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) standards and guidelines which are appropriate to and consistent with the institution's mission, programmatic goals, and strategic plan. Specifically, ACRL guidelines could be used to inform a wide variety of issues in the area of libraries including: assessment, evaluation, instruction, services, resources, access, staff, facilities, cooperation/communication, administration and budgeting.

Objective 4 – Forging Collaborations and Partnerships: The University of Mary Washington libraries should seek to expand relationships with other constituencies both locally, regionally across the Commonwealth, as well nationally, particularly among peer institutions. This includes, but is not limited to:

- Continuing to work with VIVA (the Virtual Library of Virginia) and other consortiums to encourage cost and resource sharing collaborations.
- Identifying and forging relationships with other libraries and library consortiums for the purposes of resource sharing and service collaboration, including the enhancement and promotion of interlibrary-loan (ILL) services which adequately support the sharing of both traditional print library holdings and new and emerging digital assets and information resources.
- Enhancing support for the institution's continuing education and certification programs.
- Conducting and participating in conferences, both locally and nationally, to provide a conduit for collegial partnerships and exchange of research and best practices.
- Identifying and forging relationships with community partners in the fields of information technology, preservation, scholarship, e-learning, and multimedia.

Objective 5 - Planning the Library of the Future: Subsequent planning and innovation in the libraries should follow after careful study and assessment. For example, existing circulation and usage data should be culled to understand the information-seeking characteristics of constituencies, to inform decision making on resource allocation, and to plan and design space, support and services. We recommend that the following assessments and or programmatic elements should be undertaken in the 2009-10 academic year:

- Completed assessment of current UMW students, faculty, staff and administration of their information seeking behaviors, usage or avoidance of UMW Libraries spaces, services, and resource, and their perceptions of existing and ideal academic library services and resources.
- Completed assessment of current usage and needs and anticipated usage and needs from the community and region.
- The university should prepare to meet current and prospective student's needs and expectations in the areas of academic technologies, information resources, and libraries. It should do so through the creation of an ongoing program to share knowledge and ideas between UMW faculty, librarians, academic technologists, faculty and the librarians and academic technologists and faculty who serve the institutions now forming our future populations, to include Pre-Kindergarten through 12 schools, community colleges, and public librarians.

To design, fund, build/remodel, and furnish the university libraries in cost-effective, future-thinking ways as the university's knowledge center we must do so in ways that are appropriate to the needs and aspirations of the institution's different campuses and programs. We recommend that the following assessments and or programmatic elements should be undertaken in the 2009-10 academic year:

- Completed time-lapse video study of the ways in which users use and move existing furnishings to meet their needs in existing library spaces.
- Completed study of the ways in which users share or would like to share technology while working on teams or in groups in existing library spaces.
- Completed study of the ways in which individual users employ or would like to employ furnishings and technology in existing or anticipated library spaces and the identification of furnishings and equipment appropriate to these uses. This study would include opportunities for user feedback.
- Completed inventory of existing technologies used for administrative activities in existing library facilities (for example, acquisitions, interlibrary loan, printing, faxing).
- Identification of possible spaces and technologies for virtual collaboration, meetings, video-conferencing, and collaborative work rooms in existing library spaces.
- Completed assessment of usage of current electronic information resources, such as databases and electronic books.
- Completed survey of our users and non-users to identify barriers to and incentives for use of electronic information resources.

- Completed plan to maximize usage of electronic information resources, including the acquisition and implementation of federated searching tools.
- Completed assessment of current sharing practices for physical resources, such as books, between the Fredericksburg and Stafford campus.
- Completed plan for distribution of physical resources for students enrolled in distributed learning.
- Completed plan for future sharing practices for physical information assets among the university's campuses.

Objective 6 – Marketing the Library: To market the facilities, resources, and services of the UMW Libraries and academic technologies to our communities.

- Involvement of the libraries in planning for and discussion of social networking and communication tools so that the libraries can reach students, faculty, staff, and the local and regional community.
- Creation of an ongoing marketing plan, which includes designated staff responsibility for marketing, integration of new services and resources as a central dimension of the marketing plan, and mechanisms for evaluation.

Objective 7 – Staffing: To provide sufficient staffing to meet the new purposes of the knowledge center in their interim and built-out form.

- Identification of types and number of staff required to support the activities of the new knowledge center.
- Completed assessment of current workflows and organizational structure in the library and identification of sources of staffing and/or support in other units of the university.
- Adjust the existing organizational structure to meet the goals.
- Identify, fund, and search for new positions necessary to meet goals.
- Provide adequate training and retraining for new and already-appointed staff.

Objective 8 - Cultural Transformation: To support the cultural change necessary to place the UMW Libraries at the center of the university's teaching, learning, and community life.

- Increased use of the Libraries, both virtually and physically, by faculty.
- Visible presence by key administrators in the life of the Libraries, at events, all campuses, and day-to-day.

- Placement of the libraries (knowledge center) on the university homepage.
- Financial and managerial support for professional development for librarians and library staff.
- Utilization of librarians as liaisons and spokespersons for the institution where appropriate.
- Completed assessment of the needs and desires of school administrators, teachers, and historical societies, throughout the region.

Objective 9 - Budgeting and Resources: The University of Mary Washington should allocate appropriate resources in the university libraries concomitant with their central role within the university and ensure that allocated resources match with the institution's programmatic and curricular commitments.

- Enhanced communication between faculty, departments, and libraries to guide acquisition and resource decisions either through the formal structures of a new faculty governance or an ad hoc working group convened by the provost.
- Increased or redirected budget and/or external funding to support library services and expand library content (scope, depth, and access), particularly e-resources and databases in the areas of greatest need. (See Appendix C).
- Coordination between the libraries and the advancement/development office to launch a "Friends of the Libraries" campaign and to demonstrate that the growth and maintenance of UMW's libraries are an institutional priority.

GOAL 2: Objectives & Benchmarks

Goal 2: The University of Mary Washington should be a leader in the fields of academic technology, library services, and information resources by identifying, developing, investing in and sustaining those practices and resources which produce high quality delivery, service, support, and innovation.

Objective 1 - Preservation of Digital Assets: The University of Mary Washington should launch an aggressive effort to address, collect, manage, and protect the institution's information resources and digital assets.

Objective 2 - Promote Access and Sharing: The University of Mary Washington should become a leading producer of open content and develop an identity as good stewards of information resources through increased accessibility to our internal proprietary information and digital assets. Efforts to develop and share open content should make use of best-practices with regards to content, format, and meta-data standards; wherever possible, UMW should be engaging with peer institutions in the conversation about developing and extending these standards to meet the needs of higher education.

Objective 3 - Support Informed Decision Making: The University of Mary Washington should become a model for the ways in which the adoption and deployment of business intelligence applications and methods enhance institutional decision-making and performance in higher education and beyond.

Objective 4 - Regional Information and Technology Hub: The University of Mary Washington should be positioned as a leader in the collection, integration, dissemination and application of information resources among various local and regional communities, organizations, and agencies (including K-12, business, GIS, etc.). In addition, the university should harness its expertise in academic technologies and information resources in service to a wide variety of academic, regional, and international communities.

Objective 5 – Cyberinfrastructure: The University of Mary Washington should develop a plan for the maintenance, renewal and future development of the institution’s cyber-infrastructure. This plan should include collaborative input from relevant constituencies on technological systems and equipment purchases with a direct impact on instruction, clear policies for replacing existing computers, accessories, and peripherals, utilization of high performance computing, and long term infrastructure planning.

- Establish an input mechanism for polling, surveying, committee, or otherwise allowing input on purchases of technology impacting instruction.
- Survey students to determine their specific needs and wants for academic technologies and library resources that could better impact their learning and instruction.
- Provide an online database of equipment inventory by classroom, office, or personnel showing model, purpose, and scheduled replacement date.
- Develop a replacement cycle for classroom, faculty, staff, and administrative computers, accessories, and peripherals.
- Survey faculty on current and expected technology needs and make the results available online for departmental, college, and university planning.
- Develop a plan for installing a standard set of academic technologies in every classroom based upon results of faculty survey of needs.
- Provide an evaluation and adoption system for free and open source software.
- High-performance computing (HPC) will be used to enhance productivity and the solution-oriented aspirations of the institution.
- Ongoing and future improvements, additions, and renovations to the physical facilities and infrastructure will be designed in ways which support advances in the cyber-infrastructure and new and emerging technologies in.

Objective 6 - Green Initiatives: The University of Mary Washington should utilize academic technologies and information resources to enable and promote green initiatives, including going paperless. Departments and committees will uniformly use digital document delivery methods to conduct business by the 2010-11 academic year.

Objective 7 – Create the Conditions for a Cultural Transformation: The University of Mary Washington should promote engagement among faculty, staff, administrators and students on issues related to academic technologies and information resources. This includes:

- Rewarding faculty and staff involvement, innovation, and action research in the areas of academic technologies and information resources, including through existing annual evaluation and/or tenure and promotion processes.
- Encouraging innovation and creativity in the use of technology among the institution’s constituencies.
- Exploring and promoting the ways in which mobile, ubiquitous, and cloud computing can aid the mission of the institution’s various units.
- Fostering dialogue between and among constituencies on the divergent expectations and subsequent tensions that arise from ubiquitous and mobile computing in the classroom and beyond.
- Removing obstacles to creative exploration and project building.
- Promoting understanding of digital identity and academic social networking and disseminating best practices.
- Utilizing information technologies to improve communication channels and build networks to promote transparency, accountability, exploration, and education.
- Establishing benchmarks for digital literacy that enable the institution to meet people “where they are” and devise methods and plans for moving forward with them.
- Creating a culture of service which recognizes that those on the front lines of academic technologies and information resources provide a tremendous service to the institution.
- Allocating new faculty lines to departments who would invest those lines in personnel who are working with digital technologies in their disciplines.

Objective 8 – Technology Requirements: The University of Mary Washington should study the advantages and disadvantages of academic technology requirements, including mandating “one laptop per person” and/or other technology devices such as smart phones, netbooks, and/or other devices.

Objective 9 – Distributed and Blended Learning: Provide access to high quality educational programs and courses to students whose work or life schedules prevent routine classroom attendance over a sustained period of an academic term in the areas of business, management, information systems, education, and other areas for which there is a demonstrated need.

- Develop a plan for distributed and blended learning that incorporates industry quality standards and meets the academic rigor, faculty-student contact requirements, and collegial tradition of the University of Mary Washington.
- Develop a set of policies and procedures for online courses to include ownership of intellectual property, compensation, academic approval and quality review, technological and administrative support, identity management, and articulation.
- Develop and support the services infrastructure to provide quality services to students and faculty who are teaching and learning at a distance, including the support and expansion of library services for distance students and the evaluation of university policies and procedures that may pose obstacles for distance students.
- Develop the technological infrastructure needed to deliver a quality experience for those courses delivered by distributed or blended learning.
- Develop an evaluation system for courses and programs to be delivered via distributed and blended learning.

Objective 10 – Learning Management Systems:

- Develop an evaluation, adoption, and upgrade/replacement cycle for learning management systems.
- Develop single sign-on capabilities between campus enterprise systems, email systems, libraries, and learning management system.
- Implement grade reporting directly from the learning management system.
- Implement a digital learning object repository system with the ability to import and export objects to learning management systems and content management systems.

Objective 11 – Support and Services:

- Conduct a study of student and faculty technical support needs to determine days and hours of operation for technical support offices.
- Conduct a study of faculty and student needs in the areas of instructional design, audio and video production, computer scripting and/or programming support, graphic design development, and other academic support needs.

- Employ via contract, hourly wages, or student interns, adequate expertise to develop academic support materials.
- Support professional development of instructional technology staff in support of faculty teaching and research.
- Assure effective cell phone coverage within all campus buildings.
- Provide a system by which faculty use of emerging technologies is accommodated considering the bounds of the campus IT security standards.

Appendix B: Report on Student Focus Group

Chair's Report on the

Discussion Group on Academic Technologies and Libraries
Focus Group with College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) Students (March 19, 2009)

8 students, representing seven different departments as selected by the SGA President

Information Technologies:

- a) Internet Access for Nonresidential Students. Students voiced concern about the inability of nonresidential students (i.e. those who are not signed up with Apogee) to access the internet when working with residential students in residence halls.
- b) Impressions of Internet Service/Access. Students reported that wireless access in residence halls has improved this year and are thankful for faster access. However, they reported that the signal in the student apartments is weak and were uncertain who to contact to improve the situation.
- c) Email. Although students seem pleased with the new email system, they still voice frustration with the transition, particularly the timing of the transition and the difficulties it caused during the end of the Fall semester.
- d) Help Desk. Most students in the group were not aware of the location of the Help Desk. Those that did questioned whether or not its placement in the basement of GW was student friendly.

Academic Technologies:

- a) Laptop requirements. Students resisted a laptop standard, although they said that it should be made clear that laptops are essential. They suggested that irrespective of a requirement, financial aid should understand the essential nature of mobile computing.
- b) Laptops in classrooms. Students argued that the anti-laptop attitude was pervasive among faculty and they bristled at being told that their laptop was not welcome on campus. *Faculty attitudes toward mobile computing in the classroom was the singular complaint against faculty.*
- c) Smart phone requirements. Students appeared to be resistant to developing a smart phone standard. Their primary motivation was cost, citing the fact that most students are on affordable family plans. That said, when pushed on the benefits of mobile devices free from long term phone plans, students acknowledged their utility and their potential for

transforming campus communication and pedagogy. They acknowledge the inevitability of the game changing nature of such devices. However, they did not believe that UMW was a place where a culture of leadership existed to be at the cutting edge and that “we” are much better suited to following the lead of other institutions.

Libraries:

- a) Internet Access. Students were particularly frustrated with the deficiencies of the wireless network in the library. The problem is compounded in their view by the fact that they believe these issues could be solved inexpensively by deploying more routers.
- b) Hours. Students expressed frustration with the library hours. While they seemed ready to agree that 24-7 access was unrealistic on a small campus, they argued that extending library hours until 2:00 am was not unreasonable. Similarly, they viewed the early closing on Friday, as well as limited weekend hours as both a practical problem and a symbol that the university believes the life of the mind shuts down on Fridays at 5:00 pm and is only functional for a few hours during the weekends. Several in the group expressed the view that limited hours sends the message that this is a “party school.” One student noted that the administrators seem to think that this is a 9 to 5 campus ignoring the fact that “this is our home.”
- c) Computers. Students expressed frustration at the age of the desktops in the library and lamented frequent crashes when using those machines.
- d) Computer Software. Students expressed frustration about their inability to use library computers to use Microsoft Office. When it was pointed out that those machines are used for reference work, they countered that the library is a prime printing location and they sought to use those machines to print (and while they believe printing should be free, they hoped for a pay-to-print option in the library).
- e) Study space. Students expressed a frustration with a lack of study space in the library, particularly group study space. There seems to be a palpable divergence among students about the purpose of the library. Some students view it as the alternative to a “real campus center” with plentiful study space. Others view it as a storehouse for information they need to access.
- f) Seacoebeck – Dome Room. While students are happy with the coffee and space in the dining hall, they clearly do not think that the dining hall is a comfortable space conducive to studying (they cited seating and smell as the two biggest impediments to conducive space).
- g) Inter-Library Loan – Students are happy with the 20 ILL/per semester and credit President Hample for this change. Two students expressed an interest in having more than 20 ILLs free of charge per semester.

- h) Teaching and Learning Technologies in the Library. Several students in the group were unaware of DTLT and what it offers students. Two others who have worked with DTLT argued that its presence in DuPont was misplaced and that its home should be in the library (at least until the Convergence Center is completed).
- i) Coffee and Vending Options. Students were under the impression that the library is drink and food friendly and they seemed pleased that they could purchase food in the Nest and take it to the library. They lamented the lack of coffee and vending machines in the library.
- j) Atmosphere after 5:00 pm. Students were particularly animated when discussing their perceptions of the atmosphere in the library after 5:00 pm. They all agreed that the environment changes dramatically when the librarians go home. They were particularly critical of the security guards who roam the library. They cited condescension, “harassing” comment, unwelcoming dispositions, and dirty looks. One student said that it is disturbing to over hear security talking on their cell phones bemoaning the fact that students are arriving during the library’s closing hour.
- k) Closing bell. Students cited the closing bell as “unfriendly” and one student said that “it shakes you to your core.” Students suggested that lights not be turned off before closing and that constant flickering of lights is alarming.
- l) Student perceptions of the utility of the library. Several students expressed their belief that the library is a place for history majors (and those doing similar work).

Academics:

- a) First Year Seminar. Students expressed regret at the loss of the Writing Workshop. They also argued that the first year seminar should include an introduction to the library and academic technologies.
- b) Technology Workshops. Students expressed a desire to have workshop opportunities to enhance their skills using technology. They cited Excel, PowerPoint, graphics manipulation, website design, etc.
- c) Discipline specific computing technologies and software. Students, especially those in the natural sciences, lamented the lack of both high performance computing and essential software. One student noted that he had 45 days to complete a research project before the trial run of his essential software expired. Another held up his iTouch and argued that it was more powerful than any of the computers he had access to in his department. Another student noted that essential software for their discipline was more than a decade (5 versions) too old.
- d) Achievements with Technology. Students were reluctant to embrace and use new technologies and applications in their disciplines because they felt that they would not be rewarded for doing so. Some seemed aware of a pervasive “anti-technology” attitude in

their departments and argued that this discouraged new and innovative uses of technology in their academic programs. Students expressed a desire both to be acknowledged and rewarded for investing in new and emerging technologies at the forefront of academic technologies and suggested that the present academic environment discourages innovation.

Year of the Digital Campus:

Discussion and brainstorming on the Year of the Digital Campus was difficult because the concept was universally panned by the students. Strikingly, they compared the concept of the year-long event/celebration to the university's efforts on diversity – i.e. its all public relations with little substance. Students were unable to conceive of the benefits of a year of discussion, contemplation, and discovery because of the basic infrastructural hurdles which they encounter on a daily basis.

Additional Discussion Points:

Although unrelated to our areas, students were vocal and adamant about several additional points and wanted them to be reflected in the record:

- a) Classroom buildings: Students cited a desire to have access to classroom buildings after hours. They voiced frustration with their lack of access to facilities in the evening hours. They were particularly frustrated with the seemingly ad hoc and unpredictable nature of access to campus buildings. The most commonly cited example is when habitual workspaces in classroom buildings are randomly shut down by campus police.
- b) Lee Hall: Students reported that the execution of the Lee Hall remodeling is fundamentally flawed. They were unanimous in saying that it was “screwed up” and “a mistake.” While students universally praised the advent of a “real bookstore” they were ambivalent about the building as a “one stop shop.” One student noted the irony of placing disability services on the “4th floor in the back of the building.” Another student said that “it turned out to be anything but the promised student center.” Students unanimously agreed that the parceling of the ballroom was a mistake and that a “great space” that was previously available to students was now “run by admissions” and is “off limits to students.”
- c) Interdisciplinarity: Students seemed to understand the value of interdisciplinarity and wished that department's took it more seriously. They noted a pervasive culture of competition among departments, backed by a condescending and adversarial assessment of cross-disciplinary endeavors.

Appendix C: Database Comparisons – Virginia Public Institutions

| State Universities | ABI- Inform | JSTOR | Sci. Direct | Web of Sci. | Sci. Finder | Biosis Previews | Early American | Historical Newspapers |
|--------------------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| CNU | x | x | | | x | | | NYT |
| W&M | | x | x | x | x | | Series I and II | NYT/WP/WSJ/LAT |
| GMU | x | x | x | x | x | x | Series I and II | NYT/WP/ WSJ/AJC /BG/Chi. Trib/ CSM/LAT |
| JMU | x | x | x | x | x | x | Series I and II | NYT/ Wash. Post |
| Longwood | x | x | | | x | | | NYT |
| Norfolk State | | x | | | x | | | |
| ODU | x | x | x | x | x | x+ Archives | Series I - V | |
| Radford | x | x | x | x | | x | | NYT/WP/WSJ |
| UMW | | x | | | x | | | NYT/WP |
| UVA | x | x | x | x | x | x | Series I and II | NYT/WP/WSJ/ Chi Trib |
| VCU | x | x | x | x | x | x +Archive | | |
| VMI | | x | | | | | | NYT |
| VA State | x | x | x | | x | x | | |
| VT | x | x | x | x | x | x | | NYT/LAT/Chi.Trib. Chi.Tribune |

Appendix D: Database Comparisons – Virginia Private Institutions

| Private Universities | ABI- Inform | JSTOR | Sci. Direct | Web of Sci. | Sci. Finder | Biosis Previews | Early American Imprints | Historical Newspapers |
|----------------------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---|
| Liberty | | x | x | | | | Series I | NYT/Wash.Post/ Chi.Trib |
| RMC | x | x | x | | | | | |
| Regent | x | x | x | | | | | NYT/Wash.Post/ WallStreet J./ Christ. Sci. Mon./LA Times |
| Roanoke | x | x | | | | x (Basic) | | |
| Swt. Briar | x | x | | | | | | |
| UR | x | x | | x | x | x | Series I and II | NYT |
| W&L | x | x | x | | x | x (Basic) | | NYT/Wash.Post |

Appendix E: NCES Library Statistics for UMW and COPLAC Institutions

Created by Renee Davis, Collection Development Librarian
(See attached Excel Spreadsheet)

The accompanying spreadsheet displays comparative statistics for UMW Libraries and the libraries of other COPLAC schools as collected by the National Center for Education Statistics in 2006. These are the most recent statistics available from the NCES website as of March 2009. Statistics are given for all of the COPLAC schools except for the University of Alberta at Augustana (not reported to NCES) and Ramapo College of New Jersey (reported only zeroes to NCES).

On the spreadsheet, the row depicting data for UMW is highlighted in yellow. While UMW might ideally aspire to provide library services and materials at the highest level of any COPLAC school, it may be informative as a starting point to compare UMW's numbers with the averages for the group as a whole. A row depicting the average (mean) values for all 22 COPLAC schools is shown directly above UMW and is highlighted in light blue. Just above that, the row depicting the median value for all of the comparison schools is shown in light green. Among the many observations that may be made are the following:

- UMW Libraries are in line with the average and median for COPLAC schools with respect to Librarians and Other Professional Staff per 1,000 FTE (2.76). UMW falls somewhat below the mean, and slightly below the median, in terms of Total Staff Per 1,000 FTE (8.04, compared to mean 9.36 and median 8.09).
- UMW Libraries appear to be doing well in terms of Expenditures for Books, Serial Backfiles and Other Materials (\$309,211 compared to the group mean of \$188,242 and group median of \$143,773). However, it could be that UMW placed some expenditures in this category that other COPLAC schools assigned to another category. In terms of cumulated holdings of Books, Serial Backfiles and Other Materials per Person Enrolled (FTE), UMW at 85.93 titles falls far below the group mean of 98.96 titles per FTE and slightly below the median of 86.24 titles per FTE. UMW Libraries have been purchasing some 500 fewer titles each year for the past three years because of escalating book prices and the diversion of the book budget to increased subscription and licensing costs for serials and databases. If purchasing power continues to be lost at this rate, the Libraries would be unable to purchase any books at all just eight or nine years from now.
- With respect to Expenditures on Current Serials Subscriptions, UMW at \$219,646 falls quite short of the group mean (\$376,261) and median (\$301,383). Expenditures for Electronic Serials at \$117,508 fall somewhat behind the group mean of \$154,075 and a bit shy of the group median of \$118,542. Again, some of these differences may be explained by variation in how the different schools allot their expenditures into the NCES categories. However, the inference that UMW is spending less than the other schools for current serial subscriptions and electronic serials seems correct because it is reinforced by the higher costs UMW incurs for Interlibrary Loans (\$12,381, compared to the group mean of \$8,898 and median of \$4,155).
- Salaries and wages of UMW library workers appear to be above the COPLAC average for all categories of employees except for student assistants. Compensation information needs to be

viewed in light of the exceptional longevity of employment of many of the UMW library staff, as well as variations in the cost of living in the scattered locales of the COPLAC institutions.

- The column entitled Total Library Expenditures Per Person Enrolled (FTE) is perhaps the most informative. Because it includes and combines all of the materials expenditures and operating expenditures previously laid out, it removes the need for guesswork as to how the COPLAC schools might have varied in how they assigned their expenditures to the various narrower categories.

UMW Libraries spend a grand total of **\$472.07** per enrolled student, compared to the COPLAC group mean of **\$521.89** and group median of **\$474.82**.

If UMW were to set a goal of increasing total library expenditures per student enrolled (FTE) to meet the COPLAC group's mean 2006 expenditure, that would mean increasing the library's budget by nearly \$50 per FTE, or approximately \$216,000 per year. Additional funds would be required if UMW's goal were to exceed that average amount and to make up for losses of material purchasing power over the past decade.

Appendix F: Plan For the Year of the Digital University (YDU)

Responsibility: Concomitant with our charge to provide a plan for the YDU, the Discussion Group on Academic Technologies and Libraries recommends that interested members would continue on after the period of its charge expires on April 10th (at least until such a time as a permanent presidential advisor board is established) as the core of the group responsible for subsequent planning and execution for the YDU. Of course, all interested constituencies would be welcome to participate, but some not presently part of this group will need to be included to accomplish the goals of the plan outlined below.

Themes: The YDU should focus on issues, by identifying a few central themes that can be woven throughout the various programmatic elements of the year. Such issues, might include:

- Learning Spaces
- Digital Identity
- Social Networking
- Copyright/I.P.

Calendar: The YDU should influence, enhance, and work in common purpose with many aspects of the institution's existing programs and calendar of events. Aggressive and widespread efforts should be made to invite and solicit contributions from all constituencies responsible for programmatic efforts. For example:

- Signature events in the life of the university should be infused with the ethos of the YDU. From first year orientation, honor convocation, and the opening meeting of the faculty to Homecoming and the graduation ceremony – each of these events should be planned to connect to the YDU.
- The Great Lives series could have one or more lectures tied to a great life connected to the themes of the YDU (e.g. Bill Gates and Steve Jobs).
- The theater and music departments could be approached about creating performances linked to the theme of the YDU.

Academic Components: The YDU should foster a significant academic component which weaves themes, elements, and projects related to the YDU into the institution's academic and learning environments. For example, this component might include:

- Classes tied to or designated as YDU learning communities (for example, the Fall 2009 course catalog lists several courses which could be solicited to be part of the YDU's learning communities). Such classes would include content and assignments related to the YDU.
- Student affairs events or programming tied to or designated as YDU events or programs.
- Training and/or development workshops for students, faculty, and staff.

Projects: The YDU should serve as the pilot year for a number of discreet projects stemming from goals forwarded from the Discussion Group on Academic Technologies and Libraries for the strategic plan. Such projects might include:

- Administrative units of the institution could collaborate on a number of business intelligence projects designed to collect, share, and analyze internal UMW data.
- The libraries could undertake a project in conjunction with other libraries to collect, make accessible, and analyze library circulation data.

Assessment: The YDU should include an assessment/data collection/listening component that seeks to answer questions such as:

- Where are we?
- What are the barriers?
- What would encourage people to come, to join in?

Transmissions from UMW: The YDU should have a tele-presence which transmits the university and it's year long celebration to audiences across the globe. Events targeted for simulcast include:

- Keynote speakers and scheduled events.
- Research and creativity days and/or symposia which showcase student, faculty, and staff work.
- Athletic events, concerts, performances.
- Always on tele-portals from key out posts of the university (e.g. the fountain, the rock, the gates, Ball circle).

Speakers: The YDU should bring external speakers to campus. Examples include:

- George Lucas
- Individuals representing ECAR/EDUCAUSE/NITLE/HASTAC
- K-12 EdTech – Will Richardson
- Student speakers
- Vendors/engineers who can help us understand where technology is headed
- TED.com – TED speakers

Forging External Relationships: The YDU should link UMW in purposeful collaborations and exhibitions with external partners, including:

- Universities. Institutions that the university has existing relationships with, both domestically and internationally, should be sought as collaborative partners on specific projects and events (which may last a day, a month, a semester, or for the full academic year).
- Vendors/companies. At the direction of the CIO, the institution should launch one or more collaborations with vendors designed to explore, develop, and/or further one or more of the goals of the university's strategic plan.

