Report

of the

Library Task Force

February, 2009

Summary

The past decade has witnessed continued growth in the production of library materials in journals, monographs, and other venues. Similarly, the transfer of this information to, and creation of new knowledge in electronic form has experienced an even greater explosion. The ways patrons use libraries have similarly undergone radical changes. Remote e-access for some and use of the libraries as Learning Centers for others has changed the nature of libraries in what can only be viewed as revolutionary ways.

In the midst of these changes, the University of Oklahoma Libraries have made remarkable progress in the past decade compared to peer institutions, especially in regards to acquisitions and current expenditures for library materials. This feat has been accomplished by the steadfast commitment to excellence by President Boren including his plan of bolstering the University of Oklahoma Libraries with the infusion of $1 million per year of additional on-going funding for the last ten years. This commitment has allowed the University of Oklahoma Libraries to pass many Big 12 competitors in essential library holdings. It has helped the University Libraries to reach a level where they can begin to compete seriously with some remaining high-ranked institutions in the crucial category of materials expenditures.

On the other hand, the University of Oklahoma Libraries remain quite uncompetitive in other areas compared to Big 12 institutions. Foremost among these areas is personnel. Oklahoma must substantially boost the number of library personnel if associated services and capabilities are to be maintained and expanded.

Considering the past, present and desired future, the Library Task Force recommends the following items for the University Libraries for the coming decade (2009-2019):

- Continue President Boren's initiative of increasing the operating budget of the University of Oklahoma Libraries by an additional $1 million per year

- Establish and aggressively pursue funding for various endowment and one-time funds for the University of Oklahoma Libraries.

- Convert a substantial fraction of the existing physical facilities into Learning/Information Commons with the concurrent movement of materials to off-site storage

- Establish of ca. 25 new library personnel positions in parity with peer institutions in the Big 12.

- Invest more fully in digitization efforts, particularly of rare books and collections

- Enhance user education, librarian and user collaborations, and develop and promote alternate scholarly communication mechanisms

Current State of the University Libraries

The Library Task Force was originally formed in the Fall of 2006 and actively undertook its work beginning in the middle of the Spring semester of 2007.[1] The Task Force examined the operations, facilities, personnel, materials holdings, and clientele of the University Libraries. The primary focus in this examination was on (1) the relationships between the multiple and diverse users (students, staff, faculty, and others) and the existing resources and (2) the evolution of these relationships over the past 5-10 years. This study incorporated interviews with pertinent administrative personnel, library faculty and staff, a University-wide Town Hall meeting, meetings with individual departments, a comprehensive survey of users, and multiple in-depth discussions among Task Force members.

The physical facilities of the University of Oklahoma Libraries considered included the Bizzell Memorial Library, the Architecture Library, the Chemistry and Mathematics Library, the Engineering Library, the Youngblood Energy Library, the Physics and Astronomy Library, the Western History Collection, the Harry W. Bass Business History Collection, the Bizzell Bible Collection, the John and Mary Nichols Rare Book Special Collections, the Fine Arts Library, Government Documents, and the History of Science Collections. Additionally, the University Libraries has off-site locations where less frequently used materials are being housed at an increasing rate. The facilities considered notably do not include the Law Library, the Bird Medical School Library or the OU-Tulsa Library.

The retrospective view of the University Libraries provided information that is highly pertinent and insightful in helping chart a course for the libraries over the next decade. The University Libraries have achieved a substantial improvement in both quality and quantity of materials over the past decade as a result of a fundamental commitment to the Libraries and the execution of that commitment by President Boren. Beginning in the mid-1990s with rankings well at the lower end of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and Big 12 University Libraries in terms of both materials and personnel support, President Boren undertook a bold plan to add $1 million in library funding for each year for ten successive years above and beyond the cost of living and other routine operational costs.   A steadfast commitment to this plan has yielded some very positive results. In the 1996-97 Association of Research Libraries (ARL) statistics, OU reported a modest 2.61 million volumes (ranked 57th out of the 110 reporting ARL libraries and 5th out of the 10 reporting Big 12 Libraries[2]). Expenditures on library materials were not competitive: OU ranked 75th out of the 110 ARL institutions and 9th out of the 10 reporting Big 12 Libraries. Such expenditures, in fact, exceeded only those of Oklahoma State University. The University of Oklahoma Libraries are now clearly comparable to or better than the

---

[1] The original charge given to the Task Force by the Provost is provided as Appendix I following this document.

[2] Both Kansas State and Baylor are not members of ARL and do not report comparable statistics publicly.

majority of Big 12 institutions in both volumes held and current materials expenditures. In the most recent ARL statistics (2006-07)[3] substantial gains are apparent for the University of Oklahoma Libraries. OU now holds 5.05 million volumes, ranking 27th among the current 113 ARL libraries and second only to Texas in the 10 reporting Big 12 institutions. These figures represent a remarkable enhancement in holdings in only a decade. Current annual expenditures on library materials by OU ($13.0 M) is ranked 30th among the 113 reporting ARL institutions and is exceeded in the reporting Big 12 institutions only by Texas and Texas A&M.

Unfortunately, salary expenditures for OU have not made substantial progress. The University of Oklahoma Libraries were 106th out of 110 ARL institutions in the 1996-97 ARL statistics in this category, saved from being last in the 10 reporting Big 12 institutions only by barely edging out Oklahoma State. The University of Oklahoma Libraries lagged well behind comparable institutions in the number of library personnel. In the more recent 2006-07 statistics, the OU Libraries have not substantially increased their standings in this regard.   Overall, the University of Oklahoma Libraries' salary structure recently ranked 99th out of the 113 reporting ARL institutions. The University of Missouri Libraries, which were ranked 100th of the 113, were the only reporting Big 12 library system below OU in this category. In total personnel salaries, the Oklahoma State University Library has moved up to a ranking of 81st, clearly besting the efforts of the University of Oklahoma Libraries.

Current average salaries for professionals in the Norman Campus portion of OU Libraries may more accurately be compared to others in the Association of Research Libraries using the more recently updated and more narrowly focused ARL Annual Salary Survey 2007-2008.[4] This selective report is routinely issued one year in advance of the general ARL report mentioned previously. Further, this report separates the professional salary data for all ARL reporting institutions into Main campus, Law and Medical Libraries information. Thus, we can more precisely assess the status of the OU Main campus professional personnel. Unfortunately, the comparison using this more targeted group and more recent information reveals that the average annual professional salary for OU is only $53,241. This value ranks 107th of 113 reporting ARL institutions. It also is below ALL other reporting Big 12 institutions, which range from Oklahoma State University ($54,593) to to Colorado University ($65,510).

Not all developments are so grim. President Boren originally set a goal for the University of Oklahoma Libraries to reach a standing comparable to that of the University of Kansas Libraries in materials holdings, subscriptions, personnel salaries, and library facilities in general. Indeed, this has been achieved to a great degree in regards to holdings and

---

[3] **ARL Statistics 2006-2007**, M. Kyrillidou and L. Bland, Association of Research Libraries, Washington, DC, 2008, pp. 1-142. [Note: These represent the most recent available comparisons for major university libraries. However, the data incorporate various combinations from Main, Law, and Medical Libraries.

[4] **ARL Annual Salary Survey 2007-08**, M. Kyrillidou, M. Young, and J. Barber, Association of Research Libraries, Washington, DC, 2008, pp. 1-116.

current materials expenditures. While the University of Texas still has substantially greater holdings and materials expenditures than all other Big 12 institutions, the gap for these two categories is also closing between OU and UT. Despite these admirable gains, personnel expenditures for the OU Libraries have not fared as well in the past decade. We continue to trail far behind our peers in both the ARL and the ten responding Big 12 institutions in this important category. In the total number of professional and nonprofessional staff in the 2006-07 ARL statistics, for example, OU reported 59 and 98 compared to KU's 103 and 110. Simply to reach the same staffing levels as KU, the University of Oklahoma Libraries on the main campus would have to hire another 28 professional and 7 nonprofessional staff immediately. Using Big 12 salaries reported in the 2006-07 ARL Statistics as a base, these additions would correspond to an additional annual cost of approximately $1.5-1.8 M.

Fortunately, the University of Oklahoma Libraries have been spared the painful cutbacks in periodical subscriptions and even monograph purchases that have been undertaken by many of the other ARL and Big 12 Libraries over the past decade. Such cutbacks have become necessary due to the inordinate inflationary cost of library materials. Annual increases of approximately 10% in existing materials, as well as the continuous appearance of newly essential items, have restricted the capacity to maintain comprehensive research library collections in educational institutions throughout the entire country. The lack of cutbacks for the University of Oklahoma Libraries is an even more remarkable feat when one examines the substantial relative gains made in materials holdings by the University of Oklahoma Libraries in the past decade. During this same time period, other libraries in both the ARL and Big 12 have also continued to increase their investment in materials considerably above and beyond the simple costs of living. Despite starting well behind its peer institutions, OU has been able not only to compete with the others but has meaningfully increased its relative position in both materials expenditures and holdings. This outcome is directly attributable to the visionary and steadfast commitment of President Boren to this fundamental component of the University.

The challenge of expanding the library staff and building collections will be on-going. In addition to these issues, the utilization of existing physical library facilities is undergoing a transformation that was, to many, inconceivable only a few decades ago. Indeed, many still view the University Libraries primarily as repositories of scholarly materials accessible through personal visitation and physical interaction. However, in many disciplines these functions have been totally replaced by electronic alternatives. Some students, staff, and faculty now use the physical library facilities only indirectly through the electronic media, servers, and gateways housed therein which provide enormously powerful search, discovery, and retrieval capabilities. These new alternatives provide the desired information directly to the user at a remote location via the internet in a manner which often is more convenient, more effective, and more rapid. Interestingly, many University of Oklahoma Libraries users think that much of the information and databases accessed through purchased OU portals are somehow "free" since such materials are obtained from the "internet." This conception needs correction. It also remains true that many of the same or other users have a strong personal relationship to hard copy

materials physically housed in the University Libraries. Some disciplines almost exclusively incorporate print monographs into their research and teaching processes, and, for these faculty, the use of the printed book is projected to continue well into the coming decade.

Regardless of these new developments, the fundamental qualities of research libraries continue to incorporate the identification of and the providing of access to resources and services while educating students and faculty on their increasingly complex use. In the past several years, the University of Oklahoma Libraries have implemented new services that have substantially expanded traditional library capabilities and essential outreach functions aimed at the University community. Instruction has embraced alternative options that either enhance or replace traditional lectures. Sooner Xpress (document delivery), email a librarian, chat reference, research consultation, digitization, RSS feeds, electronic reserves, laptop checkouts, personalization of the user's library website, online tutorials, Desire2Learn widgets, and podcasting have all been implemented and found to be successful tools for a wide variety of users. The University of Oklahoma will need to become even more active in these and other developing areas in the near future. Due to the increasing complexities of material availability and accessibility, user education by library personnel and various other modes of library-provided help will become important issues in the near future. Unfortunately, development and expansion of all these unique tools and abilities is intimately connected with the library personnel needed to perform these functions. As noted above, the University of Oklahoma Libraries are woefully understaffed. We simply must find some way to boost substantially the number of positions and the salaries associated with these positions if we hope to remain competitive.

The Task Force not only examined personnel matters, salary structures, current and future holdings, the emergence of electronic forms, and the new ways students and faculty are using the libraries. We also made every effort to contact and obtain meaningful input from any and all interested parties. We held a Town Hall Meeting open to all faculty, staff and students that was announced prominently in the student newspaper. We met with three different departments, asking faculty for input on a variety of pertinent issues. We have solicited input from library personnel. We met with specialty librarians to investigate needs in their particular sub-fields. We ran preliminary surveys on students in lower and upper level undergraduate courses to discover items of interest. Certainly our most ambitious and far-reaching outreach effort to students, staff, and faculty came via the administration of an on-line survey by the Public Opinion Learning Laboratory at the University of Oklahoma between April 9 and 21, 2008.[5] Out of 31,670 potentially eligible participants, we received 1,344 completed and 102 partially completed surveys. The 1,446 total respondents were judged reasonably representative of the population as a whole. There were some significant, but relatively minor differences between faculty/staff and students in individual areas. However, our attention will focus on the

---

[5] **Assessing OU-Norman Library User's Satisfaction and Needs**, **2008 Internet Survey for the OU Library Task Force**, Amy Sue Goodin and Michael Gallup, May 2008. The summary portion of this document is shown in its entirety as Appendix II.

combined responses. The majority of respondents had utilized the majority of individual services/facilities at least once per semester. In fact, most of the respondents indicated using each of the twelve library sub-areas identified in the survey. Individual trainings, library classes, and online library tutorials were judged helpful by a substantial majority of respondents ($\geq$ 73%). Positive responses were indicated for ease of website navigation (71-76%) and ease of finding materials in the library (60-72%). Students notably judged all of these factors, except the ease of website navigation, slightly less positive than did the faculty/staff. Greater than 75% of all respondents felt that Bizzell and the branch libraries should become more of a collaborative learning environment. Such a desire, however, ran counter to the majority of responses (58-70% among the groups) that supported the position that Bizzell and the branch libraries should remain mostly repositories for books. Similar sentiments for maintaining the repository aspect were revealed in the low support (28-29%) for having online resources replace print materials. In spite of these seemingly contradictory views, it is important to note, however, that greater than 80% of all faculty and students stated they were, overall, "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with the University Libraries.

The findings from the survey confirm a critical point: the future of libraries is perhaps more uncertain at this point in history than at any time in the past century. Clearly the simple view of the library as a repository of books and journals in hard copy format is no longer functional. We have seen considerable movement away from this position. Electronic access, electronic storage, electronic databases, and electronic media have changed libraries forever.[6] Some of our colleagues have not stepped into the physical library in the past five years, since all their library related needs have been served via e-access, thanks in large part to the work of the University Libraries staff. Nonetheless, others still rely to a large degree upon physical browsing and visitation to perform their research. Students have notably begun to view the library as a location to do joint research with their friends/classmates in an open "Learning Commons" environment. Many university libraries considered to be leading institutions in this and other countries are quickly beginning to renovate their facilities to transition to these new approaches to knowledge creation, access, and dissemination. More space is routinely being allotted to group and individual study areas, which constitute the primary new component of the Learning Commons. Materials that are less frequently being used are being transferred to remote storage locations. The physical space is increasingly occupied by computers, scanners, printers, and related equipment. There is little doubt that this move toward viewing the library as a Learning Commons will become increasingly important in the coming years.

The challenges do not stop here. New academic and non-academic programs are routinely added at the University of Oklahoma. Yet, little if no consideration is given to how such new programs affect the library and how the library can meet the needs of these programs. Building library sources for a new academic program costs money, and yet seldom if ever are such funds provided to the library when a new program is launched.

---

[6] "Google & the Future of Books, Robert Darnton," **The New York Review of Books**, vol. LVI, no. 2, Feb. 2, 2009, pp. 9-11.

As a result, the creation and maintenance of pertinent collections for novel programs must be obtained by decreasing support for existing and rapidly expanding areas. This unfortunate situation must be addressed.

Funds are not only needed to meet the needs of new programs. The University of Oklahoma's remarkable special collections need steady financial support. These collections are rightfully a point of pride for all members of the University community and clearly distinguish us from our peers. But maintenance, preservation, and conservation of such collections are demanding propositions from both a personnel and a financial viewpoint. Even more expensive but more exciting is the cost of digitizing these collections, thereby making them available to a worldwide audience.

The digital revolution has transformed the way students and faculty look at libraries but in so doing has introduced additional new costs. Students and faculty now demand 24/7 access to information. Such demands offer many novel challenges in providing services to users including the marketing of resources and services, educating library users on effective and critical use of resources, and integration of library services into Web 2.0 and related future technologies. The problems and demands upon modern research libraries, including our own University of Oklahoma Libraries, are growing almost exponentially, while our monetary and personnel resources are growing only linearly or are remaining constant at woefully inadequate levels. Yet, we feel confident that the University Libraries, with a modest increase in support, will be able to continue to attack these complex, extensive, and demanding problems with the same positive outcomes obtained in the recent past.

Goals and Action Plan

Libraries have played a central and essential role in higher education for centuries. Certainly they will play a significant role in the future of research universities. However, the rapid movement of much of the materials and content of libraries to electronic format over the past decade must give all academicians pause when attempting to predict the future of libraries. Libraries currently command a large amount of physical space, typically in the center of very desirable campus real estate. This necessarily means the universities must make extremely difficult decisions concerning substantial changes in the function of libraries, the utilization of the space currently associated with the libraries, and the job skills of the personnel currently employed as librarians. Hopefully, these decisions will be made in a manner that will ensure the centrality of the research library to the twenty-first century comprehensive university for years to come. The following recommendations for the next decade (2009-2019) are made in this spirit. Simultaneously, we are cognizant that the University of Oklahoma and other public institutions are entering into very difficult economic times. Such times may well require maximal efforts to maintain the status quo in the short term and, hopefully in the future thereafter, to appropriately inject expansions in budgets and basic functions for the Libraries. Looking past the current economic downturn, we hope that these goals will be pursued with renewed vigor in the good years that are sure to come.

Continue President Boren's Program of an Additional $1 Million Per Year.
Increases in the budget for library materials are crucial to holding, and having any hope of improving, the standing of the University of Oklahoma Libraries among their peers. Such increases will maintain the gains described earlier in this document and permit the OU Libraries to continue to improve their holdings and services. The rapid rate of inflation associated with library materials is a major concern in this regard. Additionally, the almost exponential increase in the publication of fundamental materials, the far-reaching involvement of much more complex and increasingly expensive electronic devices, and the rapid expansion of expensive databases only add to the financial burdens that the library will face in the near future. We would recommend a continuation of the program undertaken by President Boren a decade ago, namely increasing the University of Oklahoma Libraries materials expenditures by an increment of approximately $1 M per year over and above increases due to inflation. This plan should be continued for at least another decade to allow the University of Oklahoma Libraries to begin to compete favorably with the upper level institutions, such as those from the Big 10, Texas A&M, and the University of Texas. According to the 2006-07 ARL statistics, we would need to jump by $12 M in total annual library expenditures to reach Texas A&M and $25 M in total annual library expenditures to reach the University of Texas. These challenges are compounded by dramatic increases in both the number and costs of databases and full-text holdings which are essential to the research and creative activities of university faculty, staff, and students. It is expected that the near future will experience a steady increase in both the number and costs of such databases. Existing databases are predicted to rise in cost at the rate of 6-10% per annum. The number of databases is expected to increase as well, with more and more single subscriptions being wrapped into these complex, and often purposely non-separable, packages.

Establish Endowment and One-Time Funds and Aggressively Pursue Funding.
Some of the annual increases in materials expenditures are simply overwhelming. Thus, it is recommended that a major endowment be established for the on-going purchase of library materials into the foreseeable future. This endowment is anticipated to be a major difference maker for the University of Oklahoma Libraries. One-time funds will also be required for some materials and some of the items listed below.

Convert Areas within the University of Oklahoma Libraries Into Learning Commons. Space considerations are also critical. The University of Oklahoma Libraries have for several years assessed usage, circulation, and importance to the field(s) in determining the materials to send to off-site storage. Such sites have freed some space in Bizzell and elsewhere that can be reconfigured into learning commons. These efforts must be accelerated and expanded. Coincidentally, efforts will have to be undertaken involving the identification/remodeling and/or construction of appropriate off-site depositories as well as the remodeling of the newly created space(s). Such requirements are particularly amenable to the raising of one-time funds with the facilities and furnishings taking the name of the donor. We further recommend that a panel of experts including library representatives, staff, faculty, students and architectural consultants be assembled to assess the needs and propose specific solutions to these facilities, space, and remodeling problems. We currently anticipate that major contributions from outside donors will be necessary to support these essential space changes.

Increase Library Personnel. The personnel needs of the University of Oklahoma Libraries are undeniably considerable. These needs can be identified to be twofold in nature. First, the libraries need a substantial increase in the number of personnel to begin to reach parity with other comparable institutions. The total required to reach the average of the 10 reporting Big 12 institutions is currently estimated to be at least 25. Second, the University of Oklahoma Libraries need an increase in salaries for the existing personnel. In regards to increasing the number of library personnel, we recommend the addition of new professional and nonprofessional positions each year to reach staffing parity with peer institutions in the Big 12. Ten positions that have been identified as having a very high priority at the current time include:

Librarian/Professional Positions
1. Development and Public Information Officer
2. Metadata Cataloger
3. Digital Analyst
4. Instruction and Outreach Librarian
5. Assessment Librarian
6. University Archivist
7. Preservation Specialist

Staff Positions
1. Acquisitions Staff
2. Digital Media Specialist
3. Document Delivery Staff

The cost of adding 2.5 positions per year above the current baseline would require an approx. $150,000-$180,000 for each of the next ten years, reaching an additional annual amount (in today's dollars) of $1.5-1.8 million additional overall. While this may appear excessively burdensome in poor economic times, we should not forget this goal in the long term view. The second aspect of personnel needs involves an increase in the salary levels for the existing positions. These salary level increases for existing professional and nonprofessional staff would cost an estimated additional $200,000-$250,000 in the current year according to the 2006-07 ARL statistics if we simply raised them to the level of the average of the reporting Big 12 institutions. We envision that some of these personnel needs may have to be obtained through the endowment route, while others may be accessed through the increasing annual supplement plan of President Boren, and still others may require additional infusions of recurring annual operating funds.

Digitization of Rare Books and Other Library Assets. The University of Oklahoma Libraries have some incredibly unique treasures in the rare books categories. These include the Bizzell Bible collection, the Western History Collection, the History of Science Collection, the John and Mary Nichols Rare Books Special Collection, the Harry W. Bass Business History Collection, and others. The University of Oklahoma has an obligation to the world to share these treasures in as effective and efficient a manner as possible. Recent digitization developments have reached resolution levels that would allow the preservation of these items in a digital format for the foreseeable future and, simultaneously, make them available to users around the globe. In the immediate future, equipment, personnel and facilities costs for the digitization of these and other materials could benefit from an additional $1 million per year, and the Task Force recommends that such funding be pursued through the endowment and/or one-time funding route. Both endowment and one-time funding could advantageously be used for such collections (e.g., the History of Science Collection) to enhance and highlight their facilities. Spotlighting of such a collection would allow daily and special occasion tours (e.g., football Saturdays) that would allow us share and even showcase the unique and special character of the University with our supporters. The History of Science Library personnel have, in fact, expressed a strong desire to provide such an exhibition of the collection, but a much expanded Special Collections and Research facility would definitely be required to do this.

Enhance User Education, Librarian/User Collaborations, and Develop/Promote Alternate Scholarly Communication Mechanisms. Fortunately, there are a number of initiatives the University of Oklahoma Libraries should explore in the coming decade that are not cost prohibitive. These involve the development, expansion, creation, and discovery of unique, effective, and efficient ways to maximize the utility of the libraries and make the knowledge contained therein more readily and rapidly accessible. Many of these proposed items would necessarily include a substantial outreach effort by (additional) library personnel and/or collaborative efforts by library personnel and academicians in areas served. Some involve the active education of users to provide alternatives to established methods that are more desirable for any of a variety of reasons. Some items are included here as examples of meaningful campus-wide discussions and

initiatives which the Task Force feels should be undertaken and would be beneficial for all concerned. Such activities would include:

1. Information Literacy, Library Instruction, and Faculty/Librarian Collaborations

New library technologies arrive on a nearly daily basis. Librarians are using technology to provide useful collections and better service. Research libraries support the teaching and research needs of the university. It is the responsibility of libraries to teach students how to use print and electronic resources effectively and critically. Currently, OU librarians investigate and promote partnering with discipline-based classroom faculty to integrate library instruction programs into the university curriculum. Librarians establish professional relationships with individual researchers, attempting to provide a positive outcome for individual faculty as well as their graduate and undergraduate students. But better attempts by discipline-based faculty might be needed to utilize more fully the services the University Libraries already have in place, such as selective dissemination of information, table of contents feeds, RSS feeds, and widgets that link a student's course management account with vital and pertinent information. Substantial support by virtual reference access should support and expand library services in the near future. The skill sets for librarians is constantly and rapidly changing in response to the changing expectations of the students and faculty they serve and the nature of the materials with which they work. This group of personnel, like many other groups on campus, will see radical transformations in their job duties in the near future, as educational expectations by university stakeholders continue to shift toward a global and networked society. Although much change has already occurred in this regard, the future will see even more changes in job functions for librarians. We encourage the OU libraries to provide the training opportunities that will help their professional staff meet these new challenges

2. Promote Alternatives for Scholarly Communication

Scholarly communication is the system through which research and other scholarly writings are created, evaluated for quality, disseminated to the scholarly community, and preserved for future use. It is, perhaps, the single most important function of a research university. But the expense of commercial publications is challenging all research libraries in their capabilities to acquire the materials necessary to support existing and emerging academic programs. Research libraries may soon be overwhelmed by these expenditures. One proposed route to controlling this explosion and taking control over scholarly productivity is for the individual scholars and libraries to join forces in providing alternate, and more affordable access to high quality publications.[7] This conversation should be held by all academicians in the immediate future if libraries are to remain affordable

---

[7] Scholarly Communication Toolkit", Association of Research and College Libraries, Scholarly Communication. (See www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlissues/scholarlycom/scholarly-communicationtoolkit/faculty/faculty.cfm)

entities on research university campuses. We recommend that the University Library personnel help lead this effort in educating faculty, staff, and students about the differences between commercial and non-profit publishing. Individual departments at OU must also recognize and integrate non-traditional mediums of scholarly information into promotion and tenure processes to reflect full participation in these scholarly communication efforts. Research libraries, including those at the University of Oklahoma, should continue to explore alternative ways to promote faculty publishing. A variety of existing outlets also provide excellent advice to authors publishing in normal sources. The Association of Research Libraries, the Scholarly Publishing & Academic Resources Coalition, and the Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers all offer principles of scholar-friendly publishing practices that should be actively disseminated by the University of Oklahoma Libraries to faculty and students.[8]

3. Establish Institutional Repositories for the University of Oklahoma Community of Scholars

An institutional repository is a type of digital repository designed to collect the work of a particular institution (usually a university) that provides "...a set of services that a university offers to the members of its community for the management and dissemination of digital materials created by the institution and its community members. It is most essentially an organizational commitment to the stewardship of these digital materials, including long-term preservation where appropriate, as well as organization and access or distribution."[9] We recommend that the University of Oklahoma Libraries, or the University of Oklahoma at large, develop and maintain an institutional repository for all pertinent University of Oklahoma publications and works.

In short, there is much to be done in the next decade in maintenance and development of the University of Oklahoma Libraries. Substantial progress has been made with a relatively small number of personnel in the University Libraries. However, sustained efforts will be required to allow the institution to become competitive in the Big 12 with institutions like the University of Kansas in the area of personnel, and, simultaneously, to begin to compete with institutions like the Universities of Texas and Texas A&M in the most vital area of materials expenditures.

---

[8] See http://www.arl.org/sparc/) and http://www.pspcentral.org/publications/author_publisher_rights.pdf.
[9] Clifford Lynch, "Institutional Repositories: Essential Infrastructure for Scholarship in the Digital Age."

Action Plan

Implementation of the multiple suggestions in the above report will require continued monitoring by interested personnel. Fortunately, the University of Oklahoma Libraries have demonstrated a strong desire to support, maintain, and enhance the offerings of the libraries for the wide variety of users they support. The Provost has done an outstanding job of monitoring progress for the University of Oklahoma Libraries on multiple fronts. Over the past decade, the President has done an outstanding job in improving the libraries and making them competitive with peer institutions.

Current monitoring of progress should be continued. We also recommend that the charge of the University Libraries Committee be expanded in scope to aid in this process. We envision a committee that accepts a much more active role in not only monitoring the goals stated in this document, but in helping to develop further appropriate goals and oversee their progress. This active role is necessary to provide meaningful input for the individual areas identified in the previous section on Goals and Objectives as well as future items not currently anticipated. The full committee would necessarily have access to all needed information from the University of Oklahoma Libraries. The committee should additionally send an annual report to the Faculty Senate precisely outlining (1) the goals of the University Libraries [both those above and ones appropriately added by the committee], (2) the progress made toward completion of the goals, (3) the progress expected next year toward the goals, and (4) the progress expected in the next 2-5 years toward the existing and future goals. We envision that the committee would critically evaluate progress and the lack thereof in these annual reports.

Appendices

Appendix I

Original Charge to the

Library Task Force

The Library Task Force was formed late in the Fall of 2006. It began earnestly pursuing its charges in the Spring of 2007. The above document is the result of the work performed by the Task Force.

The Library Task Force was originally charged by the Provost as follows:

> The Task Force will develop a plan to guide the continuing evolution of the University Libraries over the next 10 years, with the understanding that the plan will be revisited during that period as circumstances change. The term "University Libraries" as used in this charge is broadly defined to include the Bizzell Memorial Library, its branches and special collections, with its current and archived scholarly works in both paper and electronic form, and the methods of access to those works. In order to be successful, the development of plan requires the flow of information between the stakeholders and the Task Force at appropriate stages of planning.
>
> The charge of the task force encompasses, but is not limited to, the following three areas.
>
> 1. The present state of the University Libraries
> This topic defines an initial information-gathering phase. The Task Force will examine how the resources of the University Libraries are currently used by faculty, students, distance learners and other off-campus users. The Task Force will also examine how the usage by these groups has changed in the last five years. This five-year retrospective will provide a starting guidance in planning for the future. The Task Force will also examine the Libraries' budgetary structure, the academic degree programs that the University Libraries is obligated to support and the Libraries' staffing levels.
>
> 2. Goals and objectives
> In order to articulate the goals and objectives of the Task Force, it is first necessary to identify changes (technological shifts, emerging disciplines, projected student enrollments, University revenue trends, structure of the University, etc.) that are expected to affect the nature of resources available, how consumers will access those resources and the best estimate of what those changes might cost to implement. The Task Force should provide this information to the faculty and students for their consideration and response. With detailed input from all consumers, the Task Force will then develop an integrated vision of the University Libraries in 2016 that will define goals and specific objectives.
>
> 3. Action plans
> After defining specific objectives and their associated costs, the Task Force will develop action plans to accomplish those objectives. The objectives should be laid out on a timeline so that the necessary planning (including fiscal planning) can occur. The Task Force will also develop a mechanism to prove "mid-course" corrections during the process as needed.

Appendix II

Survey of Students, Staff, and Faculty from the Norman Campus of the University of Oklahoma

Library Attitudes and Preferences

Executive Summary and Methodological Report

Conducted April 9-21, 2008

Public Opinion
Learning Laboratory

Assessing OU-Norman Library User's Satisfaction and Needs

2008 Internet Survey for the OU Library Task Force

May 2008

Amy Sue Goodin and
Michael Gallup

Public Opinion Learning Laboratory
University of Oklahoma
100 Fourth St., Alley House A-10
Norman, OK 73019
(405) 325-4655

Executive Summary and Methodological Report

The Study. This report presents a summary of the findings from the University of Oklahoma Library Task Force Study conducted by the University of Oklahoma Public Opinion Learning Lab (OU POLL). Data collection was via internet between April 9 and 21, 2008. The goal of this study was to understand the attitudes and preferences of library users at the OU-Norman campus to assure the library meets the needs and requirements of those it is intended to serve. The sample frame included the known email addresses of all faculty, staff, and students at OU-Norman. Potential respondents were all sent a first wave invitation to participate via email and a follow-up email reminder was sent out during the second week of the study.

Response Summary. Out of 31,670 potentially eligible participants, 2,282 responded to the survey in some manner or the email address received a final disposition code.[10] Overall, 1,344 completed and 102 partial surveys were obtained, with the balance of respondents using a variety of methods to make their preference regarding opting out known. These included having opted out of all studies of this nature during a prior contact using the survey source or doing so during this study, while others opted out directly by accessing the survey and clicking "no thanks" option on the introductory screen, and still others contacted OU POLL and asked to be removed from the list.[11] Table 1 shows the final disposition of attempted surveys and the final disposition rates for the sample with bad email addresses excluded from the calculations.[12] Overall, the response rate was 70%—although for the faculty/staff sample it was 58% and 82% for the student sample—and reflects the all 1,446 completed and partial interviews.

---

[10] This means a classification as undeliverable or as a refusal because we assume all emails were eligible based on the sample frame provided by the University of Oklahoma Open Records Office.

[11] This latter group was accommodated by labeling specific cases—denoted by email address in the primary database—as refusals upon a request tendered to the project director via email.

[12] RR6 was calculated using the following formula: Completes+Partials / Completes+Partials+Refusals+Others (this may include people who access the survey but do not respond); this represents the maximum response rate. A more minimal response rate is RR2 and is calculated in the same manner although also adding counts into the denominator for those email addresses not responding to the invitation at all prior to the end of the field period but for which there is no indication that the address was not eligible or the invitation not received—yet presuming eligibility; thus, Completes+Partials / Completes+Partials+Refusals+Others+Unknown Other. These methods are consistent with the standards published by the American Association for Public Opinion Research. For a formal discussion of these standards see The American Association for Public Opinion Research. 2008. *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for RDD Telephone Surveys and In-Person Household Surveys*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: AAPOR.

Table 1: Final Disposition of Calls

Category	Faculty/Staff	Students	Total
Completes	542	802	1344
Partials	44	58	102
Refusals (Survey opt out)	88	15	103
Refusals (Source opt out)	111	73	184
Opt out (Other means)	223	104	327
Bounce backs	5	3	8
Total active contacts	1013	1055	2068
Prior opt outs	110	104	214
Email addresses used	1123	1159	2282
Sample total	11955	19715	31670
Non-responders	10832	18556	29388
Maximum Response Rate (RR6)	**58%**	**82%**	**70%**
Minimum Response Rate (RR2)	**5%**	**4%**	**5%**

The sample. While this study sought responses from the entire universe of email addresses available for faculty, staff, and students at the University of Oklahoma Norman Campus, it is unrealistic to assume that everyone would respond. Nevertheless, the data is useful for explicating satisfaction and use statistics pertaining to the OU Norman library system. A plurality of responses were obtained from undergraduates (34%), 26% were from graduate students, about 20% from faculty, and 18% from staff. About 1% of the sample classified themselves as being part of the administration, while just under 1% indicated they didn't know how to classify themselves. Further, a plurality of respondents were from the College of Arts and Sciences (46%) and the balance was dispersed across a number of colleges or organizations. Overall, the next largest group of respondents was affiliated with the College of Education (7%), followed by the College of Engineering (about 7%), and the College of Business (just under 6%). Table 2 shows the distribution of respondents across colleges or other organizational units.[13]

---

[13] See Appendix A for a detailed report of the response frequencies for all questions; extensive listings of verbatim responses for questions 23-25 are reported in Appendix B.

Table 2: Classifications Across Organizational Units[14]

N=1344	Percent
Architecture	1.7
Arts and Sciences	46.0
Atmospheric/Geographic Sciences	2.8
Business	5.6
Earth and Energy	1.9
Education	7.1
Engineering	6.8
Fine Arts	4.1
Journalism/Mass Comm.	2.9
Law	2.2
Liberal Studies	4.6
University College	2.5
Administration [Verbatim Recode]	*3.2*
Libraries/Museums [Verbatim Recode]	*1.5*
Misc./Other [Verbatim]	*6.3*
Don't know	.8
Total	100.0

Overall, a majority of respondents use most of the OU Norman library services at least once per the semester; the exception are e-books and copy machines. The aggregate results for each of the questions addressing use statistics for various aspects of library services are presented in Table 3. The Table also reflects the rankings for the same items broken out by students versus faculty and staff. As is evident, the top three services—in rank order—are the same for both groups. Accessing library services via Internet is ranked first, followed by LORA or related services and then accessing e-journals. This is not a surprising finding in an era in which computer technology offers convenient access to an array of resources. However, this is where the similarities between the two groups of library users ends, prompting reflection about the nature of library usership among these two groups. For instance, consider that faculty and staff rank using books fourth in the hierarchy of frequency of use, yet students say they use Bizzell library for reasons other than to peruse books specifically. This seems to indicate a difference in perceptions pertaining to the functional utility of the libraries around campus. Consequently, this is an important issue to consider when contemplating making changes in the nature of libraries and the library system based on the type of users and the purposes behind library use.

---

[14] The three italicized categories are the principal categories that remain after recodes were completed. Some participants found it difficult to classify themselves as being affiliated with a particular college or organizational unit and others were affiliated with more than one organizational unit; the results for the recodes are reflected in the table.

Table 3: Frequency of Use of OU Libraries and Services
(sorted by most frequent use)

N=1446	Sample Percents		Group Rankings	
	Several times a week	At least once/semester	Students	Faculty/ Staff
Q3: Library Services via Internet	41%	89%	1	1
Q12: LORA and/or Related Catalogs/Reserve Features	37%	83%	2	2
Q8: E-journals	32%	79%	3	3
Q1: Bizzell	24%	84%	4	5
Q6: Library Computers	15%	64%	5	8
Q11: Books	15%	78%	7	4
Q9: Journals	10%	61%	8	6
Q7: Group/Individual Study Areas	10%	51%	6	12
Q2: Branch Library	7%	48%	9	10
Q10: E-books	6%	48%	10	9
Q4: Services of Library Personnel	6%	67%	11	7
Q5: Library Copy Machines	2%	41%	12	11

Table 4 reflects the results from an assessment about preferences pertaining to programmatic aspects of OU libraries and services among students and faculty/staff. As is evident, both groups are in general agreement on most issues, although there are some statistically significant differences in the level of agreement between groups for all but three areas of consideration. More than 71% of students and faculty/staff alike do not support replacing print with online materials, and more than three-out-of-four of respondents in both groups believe that Bizzell and branch libraries should become more collaborative learning environments. On the other hand, while there is general agreement about other programmatic aspects pertaining to the libraries and services, the levels of agreement differ between the two core groups in several areas. Generally, students are less likely to agree with each of the following statements and the relationships are statistically significant. They are less likely to agree that:

- Individual trainings are helpful.
- Library classes are helpful.
- Online library tutorials are helpful.

On the flip side, faculty and staff are less likely to agree with students about Bizzell and branch libraries remaining mostly repositories and these observed relationships are also statistically significant. Other areas involve attitudes about the ease of navigating the library website and finding materials in the library and the relationships are interesting in that they might be an indication that there are generational differences in how such issues are viewed. Specifically, it is worth considering the fact that while both groups generally disagree that it is difficult to navigate the website or to find materials in the library, faculty and staff are more likely to view the website as difficult to navigate and students are more likely to perceive difficulty in finding materials in the library.

Table 4: Preferences Regarding Programmatic Aspects of
OU Libraries and Services

(sorted by level of agreement)

"Libraries and library use are changing rapidly. How much do you agree with each of the following statements?"

	General Levels of Agreement (Columns=100%/Question)		Chi-square (Significance) n-size
	Faculty/Staff	**Students**	
Q22-Individual trainings are helpful.			**6.2**
Completely Agree/Agree	94.2	87.2	(.0129)
Completely Disagree/Disagree	5.8	12.8	n=427
Q21-Library classes are helpful.			**14.2**
Completely Agree/Agree	90.9	76.5	**(.0002)**
Completely Disagree/Disagree	9.1	23.5	n=396
Q16-Branch libraries … become collaborative learning env.			**1.2**
Completely Agree/Agree	80.9	77.3	(.2686)
Completely Disagree/Disagree	19.1	22.7	n=640
Q20-Online library tutorials are helpful.			**3.5**
Completely Agree/Agree	80.1	72.5	(.0614)
Completely Disagree/Disagree	19.9	27.5	n=466
Q15-Bizzell … become collaborative learning env.			**.0018**
Completely Agree/Agree	75.3	75.4	**(.9658)**
Completely Disagree/Disagree	24.7	24.6	n=817
Q13-Bizzell … remain mostly repository.			**5.6**
Completely Agree/Agree	62.6	70.1	(.0181)
Completely Disagree/Disagree	37.4	29.9	n=919
Q14-Branch libraries … remain mostly repository.			**7.4**
Completely Agree/Agree	58.3	67.9	(.0064)
Completely Disagree/Disagree	41.7	32.1	n=755
Q19-Difficult to navigate website.			**3.2**
Completely Agree/Agree	29.1	24.0	(.0730)
Completely Disagree/Disagree	70.9	76.0	n=1026
Q17-Online should replace print materials.			**.022**
Completely Agree/Agree	28.6	28.2	(.8827)
Completely Disagree/Disagree	71.4	71.8	n=1084
Q18-Difficult to find materials in library.			**13.4**
Completely Agree/Agree	28.4	39.6	(.0003)
Completely Disagree/Disagree	71.6	60.4	n=1016

One last area worth considering is that despite differences between students and faculty and staff in how they use the OU library system and in terms of how they perceive various programmatic facets surrounding the library system, nearly 84% of respondents indicated that they are satisfied "with the libraries at the University of Oklahoma." This point notwithstanding, 88% of students indicated that they were satisfied compared to only about 81% of faculty or staff (chi-square 13.8, p=.0002, and n=1313).

The final aspect of this study involved a qualitative component in which respondents were asked several open-ended questions about their specific likes and dislikes as pertain

to OU-Norman and what should be changed, if anything. Responses to these questions appear in their entirety in Appendix B and have not been recoded because they reflect detailed evaluations of service likes, dislikes, and prescriptions for change. A coding scheme was not devised for statistical analysis due to the fact that there is no easy way to sufficiently capture the breadth of the responses obtained. Nevertheless, the usefulness of these items should not be discounted. On the contrary, their worth can be characterized in terms of the level of detail provided herein that reflects the thoughtfulness of respondents on each of these items.