



**LOYOLA
UNIVERSITY
CHICAGO**

CHARTING THE FUTURE:
**A Report on the
Future of Loyola
University of
Chicago
Libraries**



**Prepared by the Task Force
on the Future of University Library Services**

November 2005

**REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON THE FUTURE
OF LOYOLA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES SERVICES
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Forward	2
▪ Background & Charges	
▪ Intended Audience	
▪ A Value Based Approach to Envisioning the Future	
▪ How Should This Report be Used?	
Introduction	4
The Learning Environment	4
▪ An Overview of the Environment	
▪ The Loyola Environment	
▪ Recommendations	
Library Support for Research	8
▪ An Overview of the Environment	
▪ The Loyola Environment	
▪ Recommendations	
Library Use of Information Technologies	12
▪ An Overview of the Environment	
▪ The Loyola Environment	
▪ Recommendations	
Library Resource Allocation	14
▪ An Overview of the Environment	
▪ The Loyola Environment	
▪ Recommendations	
Library Staffing	19
▪ An Overview of the Environment	
▪ The Loyola Environment	
▪ Recommendations	
Library Acquisition & Retention Policies	21
▪ An Overview of the Environment	
▪ The Loyola Environment	
▪ Recommendations	
SPACE: Cudahy, Lewis Towers, Lay and LSC Library Annex	24
Afterword	26
References:	27

APPENDICES

- APPENDIX I: Report of Task Force Library Site Visits
- APPENDIX II: Comparisons by Library: “Middle Weights & Heavy Weights”
- APPENDIX III: Service Trends and Expenditures in Academic Libraries

FORWARD

Background and Charge

In January 2005, Fr. Garanzini, President of Loyola University of Chicago, established the Task Force on the Future of University Library Services. The Task Force was charged with developing a white paper to provide guidance to the University in its decision-making concerning future library services, facilities and finances. Areas of consideration included:

- ***The learning environment of the library***, reflecting on how primary users (students, faculty & staff) presently use the library and how they might use the University Libraries in the future for engaged, collaborative, hands on, and lifelong learning.
- ***Loyola's research agenda***, considering what areas of specialization are critical and how the University can develop cost-effective means to provide common access to knowledge-based research tools and collections as collaboration between university departments and among universities begins to bring research and knowledge into cross-disciplinary enterprises and collaborations.
- ***The influence of information technologies on our library facilities and services***, how they affect our ability to acquire, store and disseminate information, provide distributed learning environments and what our libraries of the future should offer to our students.
- ***Library financial support***, addressing the issue of what is a reasonable LSC & WTC library budget for a university with 14,000 students (8000 of whom are undergraduates).
- ***Library staffing and policies***, considering how the above impact the quality, quantity and structure of library staffing and policies regarding the acquisition and retention of library materials and resources, especially its book collections.
- ***A learning resource annex to the Cudahy Library***, reflecting on the basic elements that should be a part of the function of a new addition to Cudahy Library and how we should envision their relationship to other university units.

The Task Force met monthly to discuss the six specific charges and explore others. It conducted surveys to assess student, faculty, library staff, and other library users' needs and to reach greater consensus on critical issues; consulted with local and national library leaders; and several Task Force members visited recently constructed academic and public libraries (See APPENDIX I: Report of Task Force Library Site Visits) to gain greater awareness of trends in library design.

Intended Audience

The intended audience for this report includes Loyola leadership and key decision-makers. Loyola leadership needs to be aware of the significant accomplishments and potential that the University Libraries possess and take advantage of the breadth of expertise available in knowledge management, information services, and collaboration.

A Value Based Approach to Envisioning the Future

The Task Force believes that libraries and their staff must be committed to being user-centric, service oriented, and highly collaborative and it believes in the centrality of knowledge to all academic missions. The world is viewed through these filters and from a set of guiding principles:

- No single paradigm exists for library design and services
- Library space and services are driven by an understanding not only of what users do but also of how they work
- Envisioning of future library space and services involves the active participation of many stakeholders – students, faculty, academic officers, information technologists, and librarians.
- The library as place reflects serious consideration of institutional mission and how space can advance that mission – whether it is learning, knowledge production, or civic engagement.
- The future of the library involves imaginative and entrepreneurial risks, and staff prepared to take on new roles and opportunities to enrich a library's services.
- The library as place should inspire, reflect the community's vision of itself, reinforce connections within and among communities, and accommodate the varying needs of users.
- Projects that bring research materials online are welcome developments, bringing us one step closer to the ideal of the universal library – as desirable today as it was in the reign of the Ptolemies.
- Access alone is rarely enough to serve the needs of scholarship, teaching, learning, and public inquiry. In an evolving information environment, library users will be well served by a combination of information service roles.

How Should This Report Be Used?

This report is intended to sensitize decision-makers to the unique strategic and operational roles that the University Libraries currently play and could play in the future of ensuring the success of the institution. It is focused on areas that can make a significant difference to excellence in teaching and learning, to research competitiveness, to faculty and student recruitment and retention, and to the bottom line. The examples of success or suggestions for future collaborations, while not comprehensive, are aimed at suggesting to Loyola University leadership the critical areas in which libraries and librarians provide the most value to the institution. The report may also serve as a model for other university libraries planning for future library services and facilities.

Task Force on the Future of University Library Services

Fred Barnhart, Law Library

Logan Ludwig, Chair

Robert Bucholz, History

John Pelissero

Asim Gangopadhyaya, Physics

Karla Petersen

Adriaan Peperzak, Philosophy

Therese Pigott, Education

Mark Van Oyen, Business

Pauline Viviano, Theology

Dan Vonder Heide, Information Services

INTRODUCTION

To meet today's and tomorrow's academic needs, the library must reflect the values, mission, and goals of the institution of which it is a part, and be sufficiently flexible to accommodate a myriad of new information and learning technologies and the ways we access and use them. Significantly, the library must serve as the principal building on campus where one can truly experience and benefit from the centrality of an institution's intellectual community.

Today's academic libraries must bring resources to the user rather than hiding them and in the process create a one-stop shopping experience. Whether users access e-mail, digitized resources, or special print collections, or are reformatting and publishing a paper, the modern academic library is a place to enable them to advance their learning experiences. To draw users into the library, the library as a place must be self-organizing—that is, sufficiently flexible to meet changing space needs. Further, library managers must be more entrepreneurial in outlook, periodically evaluating the effective use of space and assessing new placements of services and configurations of learning spaces in response to changes in user demand. [1]

Thus, the academic library as a place holds a unique position on campus. No other building can so symbolically and physically represent the academic heart of an institution. If the library is to remain a dynamic life force, however, it must support the academic community in several new ways. Its space must flexibly accommodate evolving information technologies and their usage as well as become a “laboratory” for new ways of teaching and learning in a wired or wireless environment.

At the same time, the library must continue to reflect the unique legacy and traditions of the institution of which it is a part. It must include flexible spaces that “learn” as well as traditional reading rooms that inspire scholarship. [2] By embracing these distinct functions, the library as a place can enhance the excitement and adventure of the academic experience, foster a sense of community, and advance the institution into the future. The library of the future remains irreplaceable.

THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Overview of The Environment:

The library today must function foremost as an integral and interdependent part of the institution's total educational experience. As an extension of the classroom, library space needs to embody new pedagogies, including collaborative and interactive learning modalities. [3] In conceptualizing the library of the future and its role in educating students, consideration must be given not only to anticipated learning patterns but also to the goals and the culture of the institution. We must consider the type of student and faculty we want to attract and retain; the library plays a critical role in this respect.

Library experiences of undergraduates *positively relate* to select educationally purposeful activities, such as using computing and information technology and interacting with faculty members. Those students who more frequently use the library reflect a studious work ethic and engage in academically challenging tasks that require higher-order thinking. Although certain student background characteristics (race, major, year in

school, transfer status, access to computers) affect the nature and frequency of students' library activities, the library appears to be a positive learning environment for all students, especially members of historically underrepresented groups. [4]

At the same time, library use does not appear to *contribute directly* to gains in information literacy and other desirable [educational] outcomes. Because students want to be part of the richness of the tradition of scholarship as well as its expectation of the future, the character of the study environment matters immensely, and that environment must foster effective learning in direct and tangible ways.

Faculty also play a significant role in drawing students to the library. Now that information is available almost instantaneously anywhere on campus, faculty expect their students to use their time in the library thinking analytically, rather than simply searching for information. Faculty also see the library as an extension of the classroom, as a place in which students engage in a collaborative learning process, a place where they will, it is hoped, develop or refine their critical thinking.

Today's libraries recognize several attributes of learners and the learning environment [5]:

- Students today are multitaskers, engaging in simultaneous activities and relishing a variety of stimuli.
- Students are increasingly concerned about safety and value public spaces in which they can relax and study without worrying for their safety.
- Students associate the library with the privilege of being part of a scholarly community; in this respect, it ranks second only to the classroom. The library is perceived as a comfortable, ecumenical, and welcoming place of serious academic purpose.
- The preferred configuration for library study seating is shifting from individual study carrels to table-and-chair ensembles. Nationally, the traditional library reading room is enjoying a renaissance as a place to study in the presence of others; it is a place to see and be seen while working privately.
- Group study is popular and increasingly encouraged by faculty through assignments. In response, libraries are providing more group-study rooms. These typically include large worktables with seating for three to six students, white boards, and network connections.
- The network is an integral part of student life, and computer labs are widely used for nonacademic as well as academic purposes. Many students visit the library several times a day to do e-mail, copy files, and use the Web for club activities and purely recreational purposes.
- Students combine information from a wide range of sources and genres when producing papers and presentations. They need computer workstations for comfortable group work and expansive surfaces to spread out their study materials. Increasingly, students also require workstations that allow them to scan materials; access and edit music, video, and still images; do color printing; and use software to facilitate analysis and visualization of data. These activities require carefully designed facilities with convenient access to consulting support

- for finding intellectual content and for using technology to understand and present it.
- In addition to serving as a place for informal and individual interactions with librarians, campus libraries are becoming sites for scheduled, formal classes. Faculty members like to teach in library classrooms because of the handy access to learning resources and the idea of teaching “among the books”. Further, students like the convenience of staying in the library after class or coming in early to work on assignments. Library classrooms are popular group-study spaces in the evening. E-classrooms, combining flexible, seminar-style seating in the center with computers on the periphery, are proving highly adaptable to the teaching needs of librarians and faculty. E-classrooms can also double as computer labs and small-group tutorial spaces when not in use for teaching.
 - Although we have no way of knowing how many library users are rewarded each day in their print and electronic browsing by an unexpected encounter that produces a new clue, opens a new train of thought in an intellectual puzzle, or provides the missing link in their argument or understanding, anecdotal evidence confirms that serendipitous discovery is a common and treasured experience in libraries. Building expansions and compact shelving allow universities to keep as much of their collections as possible on campus, preserving the possibilities for chance learning and enlightenment in the stacks.
 - A striking trend in library design today is the inclusion of decorative touches that give spaces a sense of warmth, style, history, and locality. These include fireplaces, the use of local materials for floors and countertops, decorative stairwells, globes, ceiling paintings, busts, quotations, and elegant, but comfortable, reading rooms. The artful use of plants and natural light, care in opening and preserving views to the outside, and display of natural history objects give a library a sense of life and of connection to the natural world.

The Loyola Environment

Traditionally, Loyola has operated under the paradigm that it exists to provide instruction. Subtly but profoundly we are shifting to a new paradigm that says we are an institution that exists to produce learning. We now see that our mission is not instruction but rather that of producing learning with every student by whatever means work best and this shift changes everything. . . . The library needs to join the institution in this paradigm shift and understand that the success of an academic library is best measured not by the frequency and ease of library use but by the learning that results from that use. The University Libraries purpose should not be to circulate books, but *to ensure the circulation of knowledge that produces learning*.

Rather than discuss the amount or size of space that is needed, we must first ask about two factors known to be critically important to successful learning: time on task and educationally purposeful activities, such as discussing ideas from classes or readings outside of class. [6] Unfortunately, most existing University Libraries space, with perhaps the exception of some space in the Lewis and Law libraries, was not designed as inviting space that honors study and is not likely to encourage students to study longer. The success of future library construction and renovation should be best measured by the project’s ability to draw students to the library.

Additionally, the libraries do not manage well the social aspects of study –relaxation and collaboration- mostly because at the time of their design, expectations about conduct discouraged it, prohibitions against food and beverages did not permit it, and habits of solitary study conflicted with it. Nor does current library space actively manage the study environment by controlling social distractions.

Good study space is responsive to the academic and social dimensions of study in ways that allow students to control them both. Such space encourages study and fosters learning by supporting a distinction between studying and socializing that does not deny the social dimension of study. Good study space ranges from personal seclusion to group study and variously reinforces the discipline needed for study while permitting territorial claims for study. This enables students to govern the social dimension of their study space, fosters a sense of community among students, and allows them to be seen as members of that community while they take strength from seeing other community members.

Recommendations:

- In addition to a centrally located reference room or information commons, there is a need for distributed computing resources throughout the libraries. The traditional centralized “computer farm,” designed to squeeze as many computers as possible into one room, should give way to smaller clusters of computers. Spread throughout each library and placed on more flexible and commodious furniture. These minilabs should contain a rich suite of productivity processing tools and act as a Kinko’s-like service center that enables students to find, manipulate, and create information.
- The University Libraries provide far too little “domestic space” (space that is congenial to conversations that share knowledge gained in class). Domestic space is by far the most frequent venue for conversations about class content and clearly food and beverages are a part of these conversations and should be permitted in many library locations where they do not represent a danger to collections (e.g., rare books). Food service needs to be seen not as an end in itself but as a means for creating community among learners.
- As part of an overall review of Loyola’s physical facilities, the University should undertake a study of the Lewis and Law Libraries to determine the adequacy of space and the appropriateness of their locations within the 25 E. Pearson building in juxtaposition to the academic programs served.
- To qualitatively enhance the University Libraries as a resource and to create an atmosphere conducive to sustained, serious academic work, a number of non-library services should be considered. Shill and Tonner’s research (2003, 2004) shows that many functions traditionally considered “non-library” were included in 182 surveyed academic libraries built or renovated between 1995 and 2002. For example, 25 percent of survey respondents included art galleries, 32 percent cafés,

- 20 percent auditoriums, 53 percent seminar rooms, 83 percent conference rooms, and 17 percent writing labs. [7]
- As much of the Libraries' collections as possible should be kept on campus to preserve the possibilities for chance learning and discovery in the stacks. As a minimum standard, all University Libraries held materials whether stored in compact shelving within the libraries or at off-library sites on campus, should be accessible within 24 hours of request.
 - The University Libraries should develop criteria for what constitutes appropriate renovated library space. Cudahy is in need of an "extreme makeover" but before embarking on renovating the library, criteria is need to ensure the desired results.

LIBRARY SUPPORT FOR RESEARCH

Overview of The Environment:

When we think of research libraries, we think, first of all, of books and journals—lots of them. The fate of the research library, then, is closely tied to the fate of the book itself. The good news is that the traditional printed book is doing better than ever and that digital technology is giving us "print on demand," making it easier and cheaper to produce books, reissue them, and publish new editions, all in relatively small print runs. The real problem for libraries is not the death of the printed book but the profusion of new titles, reissues of old titles, and new editions of scholarly books by living authors.

Additionally, the explosion in the supply of and demand for information has been set against a decrease in the resources available to acquire and to manage that information. The growth of published output which for academic/professional monographs has risen by 30% in the past 5 years; continuing price increases significantly in excess of the prevailing rate of inflation (particularly in the case of periodicals, the average price of which rose by 40.6% in real terms between 1995-2000); reduction in real terms of library acquisition budgets; and the need to fund the additional cost of electronics resource, combine to result in library budgets stretching less far and, in consequence, institutional and overall collection building is diminishing. [8]

At the same time, the need for duplication of core materials continues. Libraries are abstaining reluctantly from building collections in non-core areas and fragmentation of overall collection provision within individual disciplines continues to occur. These factors contribute to an adverse short-term impact on current research and undermine the long-term capability to support future research.

Moreover, even power users of devices such as personal digital assistants (PDAs) overwhelmingly say that they prefer printed books to books online. Consequently, we are unlikely to have digital versions of every last obscure text and document for a long time, if ever. Digital-conversion projects must contend with the realities of economic constraints that force us to set priorities for what is converted and to confront the ever-dreaded roadblock of copyright protection. So, the transition from the printed book to the book online is going to occur slowly, if relentlessly. Even the massive digitization project announced in December 2004 by Google will not include books under copyright or the bulk of the world's collections of unpublished manuscripts. The reality of the

Google project is far from certain as it will take years to complete and is currently facing mounting legal problems. [9]

Further, as a result of electronic access to information, the pace of research has increased exponentially. What used to take two weeks can now be completed in two hours. As a result of this efficiency, postdoctoral fellows are often asked to be in the library on a regular basis and charged with evaluating resources and acquiring publications at a pace never before imagined. Since it is unlikely that the pace of research will slow and likely that research libraries will continue to exist as the repositories of manuscripts, rare books, and printed books not yet available in digital format, libraries are likely to face new opportunities and responsibilities in the digital age.

First, in the digital age, the research library will be special not so much because of the quantity of information it can offer the user but because of the quality of the experience in which that information is presented. [10] We have tended to measure the importance of a library primarily by the number of books on its shelves and the quantity of journals to which it subscribed, but in the digital age, information online will soon far outweigh information stored on a particular site.

Second, producers of digital content need research libraries every bit as much as print authors because digital products need to be preserved just as much as books do. Digital products, moreover, may be more fragile than printed publications not only because of the vagaries of the storage medium but also because of the ephemeral nature of the hardware and software that supports them. Libraries have an important responsibility to preserve high-quality digital products.

Finally, in the age of cyberspace, real space and compelling architecture will matter more than ever. Users of physical libraries want and need to experience something in a library that cannot be had in the office or home, and that something is the drama of community. Library facilities that communicate and foster a sense of that awe will be a centripetal force on our increasingly silo-ridden campuses, drawing people in and facilitating contact between faculty and students and between colleagues in different fields.

The Loyola Environment

To assist the University's research endeavors, the University Libraries must provide an appropriate and sufficient research collection, services for obtaining materials not owned by the libraries, and instructional programs to assist researchers in locating and using those materials. Surveys of university librarians and faculty discussions noted the importance of Archives, Rare Books and Special Collections in support of the University researcher. Further, the University Libraries well-known manuscript collections (Insull Papers, Catholic Church Extension Society Records, National Interscholastic Catholic Basketball Tournament Records, etc.) attract many outside researchers.

Additionally, the University Archives website has been redesigned and provides good access to collection information. Although University Archives is well located on campus, it is quickly running out of adequate secure storage space for both University Archives and Rare Book collections, especially in light of new university record retention

policies and it is unlikely that Piper Hall will be able to accommodate much growth for the Women & Leadership Archives. Both budgets and staffing are minimal and there is some concern as to whether this service has the appropriate administrative reporting structure.

University Libraries services such as interlibrary loan (ILL), Circulation, Reserves, and Reference provide the critical link for obtaining these valuable research materials. Loyola ranks well among its peer institutions in its provision of ILL, Circulation, and Reserve services. Restrictive University Library budgets and the depth and breadth of scholarship done by Loyola students and faculty will continue to make ILL an important service. It is likely that more efficient delivery methods for electronic content will make the process even easier in the future and that ILL will go toward more user-initiated online requests. In the future, Circulation Services will probably rely more heavily on patron self-checkout and Reference Services may incorporate a tiered system of referral (e.g., Information Commons staff will handle most inquiries and refer in-depth research questions to reference staff). As Reserves continue to move online, it will be increasingly important that students are able to obtain reserve materials in a timely fashion.

Perhaps most critical to the support of research activities at both the undergraduate and graduate levels will be the provision of instruction in how to locate knowledge resources. As more and more information is available electronically, more instruction will be needed, partially because many electronic databases require different searching strategies to use them in the most efficient manner and to get the desired results. Also, as more information is available on the web in general, the more students and researchers will need help to identify credible and useful information.

The University Libraries have an active instruction program that encompasses hands-on course integrated instruction, user guides, web-based tutorials, orientations, Internet workshops and individual instruction. In FY 2004 Cudahy library provided approximately 300 research skills instructional sessions to nearly 4,200 users; Lewis provided 272 sessions to more than 2,220 users, and the science library provided 52 sessions to over 500 users. [11] Bucking national statistics, Cudahy has seen double digit increases in reference stats over the last several years. The Libraries are also seeing a trend towards instruction in the upper level classes, especially as more primary source material becomes available through the Internet. This has really driven the teaching of primary source research at the undergraduate level and these resources are often difficult to use effectively without training.

Recommendations

- With appropriate input from users, the University Libraries should begin work on the development of a new generation of Websites that not only provide easy access to the new collections of full-text knowledge based information, but also provide improved means to manipulate the content to increase access to specific information rather than just specific articles or monographs.
- Researchers need to read or browse through many books in a day, and often many books are open on their desks at the same time, as they compare one passage to another. In the age of the digital library, this will still remain the case. In the future, researchers will need PCs that can open many windows and somewhere on campus where they can find special digital work environments with multiple screens and multiple log-ins so they can have the equivalent of 10 books open before them at the same time. Further, we will increasingly live in a hybrid world in which the information we need will come both from traditional and from new media. The University Libraries may want to consider becoming the primary place on campus that offers such a workspace (e.g., Information Commons).
- There should be new space in the University Libraries (probably in the Information Commons) for products made possible by digital technologies that are immersive and interactive which include photographic technologies (QuickTime VR, IPIX, Reality Studio, etc), 3D technologies (VRML, QuickDraw 3D, etc.), and 3D modeling tools, and that are not primarily intended for dissemination over the Internet.
- The University Libraries need to become a place for the production, not simply the distribution and consumption, of knowledge. University Libraries can do this by using technology to facilitate information gathering and by creating hybrid workstations where students and scholars can work and interact as individuals and as parts of larger collaborative work groups.
- The University Libraries should consider the establishment of an “Excellence Fund” to cover the purchase of material to special areas of research excellence in the University, but very much social research. It could also be used for the purchase of special collections/archives materials.
- The Libraries should consider developing a web research portal to help researchers on both the university and medical center campuses to discover who is working on a particular research topic; what they've taught or published recently; where the facilities might be and what online tools are available to expedite the research.

LIBRARY USE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES

Overview of The Environment:

Academic libraries must not only be concerned with the management of physical resources, but also with the exploitation, support and creation of pathways and links to support our core mission of learning, research and innovation. In the future, such services will be even more focused on the user and his or her needs more than before, to the extent that they will become highly personalized. Libraries will need to add real value to these processes in a way that is both measurable and unique. Information technologies will play a key role in providing these services. [12] Information technologies will increasingly help us to inform the learning experience, and any institution seriously considering the future of its libraries must reach a consensus on the role that it wants these technologies to play in meeting the needs not only of its current academic community but also of the community it aspires to create in the future.

Libraries are becoming a logical extension of the classroom as they become places to access and explore with fellow students information in a variety of formats, analyze the information in group discussion, and produce a publication or a presentation for the next day's seminar. As we examine our use of information technologies and how they relate to library space and services, we need to recognize that:

- Elderly library facilities constructed a generation or more ago, cannot be adequately retrofitted to function within a network environment. This impedes a laptop program and the integration of information technology into teaching and learning.
- Because so many research materials are available electronically, library connectivity is indispensable. Web-based resources of all kinds, available free or by institutional license, have made the computer an indispensable research tool. Portability and wireless connectivity simply enhance its power.
- Sufficient bandwidth is critical to let students fulfill electronic course assignments. Wire and bandwidth are the shapers of our libraries today. Whether library users actually visit the library facility will depend on several factors including their research-level skills and the type of information they seek.

However, helping users is not just about education. It is about providing interoperability between very different data sets, about helping students distinguish between Web-surfing and electronic research, about permitting users to move seamlessly from document to document, from idea to idea, and about providing an atmosphere in which technology enhances education.

The Loyola Environment

In general, the Task Force believes that the University Libraries are well positioned in their basic (network, desktop, and server) computing infrastructure. Their use of information technology is on a par with what should be expected of a university with 14,000 students (8000 of whom are undergraduates), 59 master's degrees, 36 doctoral, and 3 professional degree programs. Their public and staff computing capabilities are generally appropriate and such services as e-reserves are appreciated by the students although a relatively small number of faculty have taken advantage of this service. However, the need for collaborative space is evident as existing rooms are seldom

available and those that are available have only power outlets and lack network connections. The University Libraries web sites are well designed, heavily used, and provide access to off-campus users. The Voyager system is in the process of being upgraded and includes add-on software that enhances functionality and has allowed for some reduction in Technical Services staff.

Technology planning needs to be consistent and integral with the library's long-range planning. Although the library has produced several long range planning documents, technology planning does not appear to be addressed within a separate document, as part of the existing long-range plan, or as part of a University-wide information strategy plan (See Acquisition & Retention Policies). This lack of a comprehensive technology plan contributes to several information technology concerns:

- ***Continued funding of network infrastructure:*** Cudahy & Lewis Libraries are included in the current Information Technologies infrastructure refresh program. This program is based on a five-year cycle that replaces all end-point switches. Wireless capabilities have been added to the libraries on both campuses. At Cudahy the main floor was upgraded last fall and this past summer the 6th floor of Lewis was done. Bandwidth, which is largely determined by the services (especially graphical services) and products the library wants to provide and the estimated number of simultaneous users, will also need to be expanded.
- ***A computer replacement/migration strategy:*** The University Libraries lack a central plan to continually replace or upgrade public computers. While the Libraries have benefited from the current LUC PC Replacement Program, receiving over 20 new patron computers this past year, the program is currently designed for only staff and faculty machines. Thus, a significant legacy environment (roughly 20% - 25%) contributes to increased support costs.
- ***Technology mix.*** The University Libraries continue to have significant heterogeneity in their technology mix; however, they should limit or reduce their technology mix where feasible. A reduction in technology would reduce overall systems complexity and thus reduce training, maintenance and support costs.
- ***Staff skill sets.*** An insufficient number of present library staff support the libraries' information systems technology. Keeping abreast of new developments in information technology is a constant challenge. It is critical that plans be developed to assist current staff with obtaining skill sets to support future technologies, to maximize cross-training opportunities, to facilitate multi-tasking, and further collaboration Information Technologies.

Recommendations

- There is a pressing need for numerous technology-infused group study rooms and project-development spaces. As "laboratories that learn," these spaces should be increased in number and designed to be easily reconfigured in response to new technologies and pedagogies.
- In the future, it will be essential to determine the levels of connectivity needed to support planned library services, technology, and networks. While the University Libraries have made considerable investment in their technology network, continued funding and upgrading of these resources are required.

- Wireless access should be expanded and additional capabilities for laptop connections provided.
- The University Libraries should undertake a review of their information technology application environment as a first step towards developing a comprehensive technology plan. Particular attention should be given to legacy systems, interfaces (PeopleSoft, Lawson and Voyager systems), public access systems, ILS systems, office software, and web browsers.
- With the advent of the Information Commons a focused partnership should be developed with the Library and Information Technology Services to create a collaboration of system support, new learning initiatives, and future technology planning.
- The LUC PC Replacement Program should be expanded to include user machines on a regular basis.

LIBRARY RESOURCE ALLOCATION

Overview of The Environment:

Today, library budgets are under intense budgetary pressures regardless of institution size or type. Most of this pressure is directly or indirectly related to the rising cost of information access. Thus, determining what to collect and/or how to access information or what is the “right size” for collections and access to information is one of the library’s greatest resource allocation challenges. One only needs to examine the epidemic of journal cancellations in American libraries to get a sense of the magnitude of the difficulty in determining the “right size”.

Statistics from the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) show that over the fifteen years from 1986 to 2001 the prices of serials generally increased by 215%, library expenditures on serials went up by 210%, and the number of serials titles purchased by large academic research libraries decreased by 5%. Of the twenty-five libraries reporting in the above-cited survey, fifteen canceled serials on an average of 244 subscriptions per library in 1999/2000. Five reported canceling over 300 subscriptions (Indiana, Iowa, Rutgers, Washington, and Wisconsin). Washington cancelled the most, 884. Some of them reported cancellations based on redundancy with electronic subscriptions. Twelve reported planning on canceling serials subscription in 2000/2001. Additionally, an ACRL May 2003 survey indicates that 75% of ACRL libraries intend to cut print in cases where they hold both print and electronic versions of the journal. Cancellations are likely to continue as 2006 cost projections for the 2,665 titles in a recent journal pricing survey indicate an overall 9.3% cost increase. [13]

One possible hope for relief from the current scholarly communications crisis may lie in Open Access (OA). OA is simply literature that is available free of charge on the Internet and that is also free of most copyright and licensing restrictions. There are a few major players who are publishing OA journals, many minor players and individual societies, and even some for-profit publishers are getting into OA publication. The number of OA

journals stood at 1,463 in February 2005, double that of a year ago with substantial numbers of peer-reviewed titles in fields like biology (61), chemistry (40), philosophy & religion (48), and education (110). An ISI study found that the OA journals it tracks for impact are doing well and there are signs that more commercial publishers are willing to experiment with this new publishing model. [7]

Coupled with the issue of rising materials expenses is the large, unanswered question of how much to spend on access versus ownership. That is, how much to spend on mechanisms for getting access to materials not owned or leased (through ILL, document delivery, bibliographic utilities) and how much to spend on acquiring and maintaining materials (print and electronic purchases, binding, etc.). The current strategies for materials budgets employed by libraries include elements of both experimental and traditional library practices.

For example, data from the results of the 2000/2001 library materials budget survey of the ALCTS/CMDS/Chief Collection Development Officers of Large Research Libraries illustrate various extremes of collection development budgeting. [14] From its FY2001 materials budget, Arizona spent over \$400,000 on document delivery and ILL, \$318,404 on bibliographic utilities, and only \$186,500 on binding. From its materials budget, Berkeley spent only \$60,000 document delivery and ILL, nothing on bibliographic utilities, and \$750,000 on binding (7% of materials budget). Berkeley also spent the most on monographs as a percentage of expenditures (48.0%) and Arizona nearly the least (29%). It is important for Loyola to watch these two approaches to collection development, to see how much an institution can rely on accessing materials it does not own and how important it is to build strong local collections.

Several other factors besides rising journal costs and the access versus ownership issue must also be considered when allocating resources. The “right size” for library collections and access to information is also a function of the University vision and goals. In a research extensive university, it is more of a function of graduate programs and faculty research than it is of undergraduate programs because graduate programs and research place greater demands on the library. It is also a function of the ways in which research is conducted. In some disciplines, the library is the laboratory and the presence of a comprehensive, systematically developed collection is essential. In other disciplines, the library is a repository for providing access to needed information. Further, the “right size” of a library collection is a function of the cost effectiveness between library collections and information supplied to individual requesters (document delivery, interlibrary loan).

The Loyola Environment

Loyola University’s aspirations are high for academic excellence and these expectations have implications for the University’s need to support Libraries services and resources. Expectations for faculty teaching and research are higher than ever but the faculty generally rate library performance as substantially below their expectations when it comes to access to information, including the completeness of journal titles and comprehensive print collections. Additionally, major strategic goals for academic life are demanding even more from library collections and access to electronic information.

Loyola Libraries, like all academic libraries, cannot acquire or gain access to all useful information, nor even to only that information required by Loyola faculty and students, with the resources the University currently allocates. Two strategies, document delivery and consortia purchasing, have helped to stave off but not entirely eliminate more drastic results often associated with reduced or level library funding, e.g., limited hours, smaller collections, hiring freezes, personnel elimination, and reduced library programming. The first, document delivery or the ability to deliver information content “on demand” on a more timely basis, can be effective in responding to individual faculty needs and is becoming more “acceptable” as a regular means of meeting information needs. Among its peer libraries, Loyola Libraries rank well in the use of this service.

The second strategy, consortium purchasing, has always been used by Loyola Libraries to obtain discounts for materials and database purchases. In fact, of the top ten most used resources at the Lakeshore libraries, seven are provided free-of-charge from either the State Library or the CARLI library consortia. It is also likely that the growth of the AJCU schools as a consortium will offer a significant opportunity for cost reductions. Banding together with a number of Jesuit institutions to gain consortia pricing has recently purchased a number of databases with special interest to Catholic Universities. The University Libraries also use all consortia available to get the best price for electronic resources and regularly negotiate pricing with vendors.

Using these strategies and others including a review of the library management literature can be helpful to Loyola in determining the appropriate library budget and how to allocate financial resources within that budget. Library management literature frequently cites an old rule of thumb for determining the resource allocations appropriate for the normal administration of university libraries: 50-60 percent for *personnel expenditures*, 30-40 percent for *material expenses*, and 10 percent for *general operations expenses*. In libraries emphasizing service or with multi-sites, the cost for personnel will be more. Other factors such as the rising cost of scholarly communications and the need for technology to support access rather than ownership of materials may have made this rule of thumb obsolete and contributes to the difficulties in comparing one library’s budget allocations to another’s.

Examining benchmarking data can also be helpful in assessing the “right size” for a library’s budget, but there are many confounding factors inherent in library benchmarking data. These include but are not limited to: the fact that libraries don’t always count things the same way nor do they count the same things; multiple library branches skew expenditures for staffing and collections; programmatic support varies widely from institution to institution; support for professional school libraries are sometimes reported separately especially as with Loyola, if those libraries do not report to the main campus library; and there is often a lag of several years before national comparative data is compiled and available.

The Task Force did, however, examine benchmarking data from the above mentioned surveys, ACRL statistics, and developed additional comparative data for fifteen (15)

institutions that University administration have previously identified as “middle weight” peer institutions and eleven (11) “heavy weight” doctoral-/research extensive private institutions (**APPENDIX II: Comparisons by Library: “Middle Weights & Heavy Weights”**). These data have helped the Task Force develop a sharper picture of where University Libraries are positioned relative to these other institutions, but because of the benchmarking difficulties previously mentioned, conclusions derived from this data are limited.

Based on FY2004 data obtained from the ACRL statistics, Loyola Libraries total base budget (including law library plus spending from non-library budgets such as gifts & endowments) was approximately \$8.4 million. The average base budget of the 15 “middle weight” libraries was \$6.7 million. Total expenditures within these libraries ranged from \$2 million to \$13.1 million. The “heavy weight” comparison group base budget averaged \$19.0 million within a range of \$8.2 million to \$34.4 million.

In FY 2004 University and the Law Library reported a *total materials collection expenditure* of \$4.0 million. The average materials budget for the “middle weight” comparison group was \$3.1 million within a range of \$663,000 to \$6.3 million. Materials budgets for the “heavy weight” group averaged \$8.1 million within a range of \$3.7 million to \$12.6 million. The materials budget permitted Loyola to maintain a collection of 1.8 million volumes and 9,230 serial titles. The average number of volumes for the “middle weight” group was 1.1 million with collection sizes ranging from 301,265 to 2,370,959 volumes. For this group total serials averaged 9,573 within a range of 712 to 18,678. The average print collection for the “heavy weight” group was 2.7 million volumes with collection sizes ranging from approximately 1 million to 4.5 million volumes. Total serials held averaged 24,377 and ranged from 11,635 to 44,066 titles.

Personnel expenditures of \$4.3 million for University Libraries (plus Law Library) in FY 2004 supported a total of 150 FTE staff. Within the “middle weight” grouping, personnel expenditures averaged \$2.9 million and the average number of staffing was 92. Personnel expenditures for this group ranged from \$816,413 to \$5.3 million and staffing ranged from a high of 194 to a low of 27. Within the “heavy weight” grouping, personnel expenditures averaged \$8.2 million and the average number of staffing was 244 FTE. Personnel expenditures for this group ranged from \$546,140 to \$16.4 million and staffing ranged from a high of 424 to a low of 115 FTE.

The ACRL data indicate Loyola allocated 47% of its total base budget for personnel expenses as compared with an average of 44% within the “middle weight” group and 42% within the “heavy weight” group. This variation may be explained by differences in the number of library branches within the institutions of each comparison group and the presence or non-presence of health sciences centers.

A similar situation is observed when looking at collection expenditures as a percentage of total base budget. In the ACRL data, Loyola reported spending 44.5% of its base budget for materials collections. The “middle weight” group averaged 45.9% and the “heavy weight” group averaged 41.7%. Interestingly, Loyola and the libraries within both

comparison groups are tending to spend a little more on collections and a little less on personnel than the old rule of thumb suggests as appropriate.

Expenditures by *Types of Materials* also tend to vary greatly in academic libraries. The ACRL data does not provide clear trending data by type of material; however, the ALCTS/CMDS study reported that the average percentage of the total materials budget devoted to electronic resources was 13.5% (Loyola reported devoting 14.6% of its materials budget to electronic serials). The average expenditures by libraries in the ALCTS/CMDS study in 1999/2000 for serials, monographs, and binding were 62.2%, 33.5%, and 3.2% respectively. The average percentages of the budget spent by subject category among the twenty respondents in this category were 15.6% in Arts and Humanities, 17.9% in Social Sciences, 45.1% in Sciences, and 17.2% in Interdisciplinary. Only five libraries reported using the library materials budget for bibliographic utilities (RLIN and OCLC fees). ACRL statistics indicate that expenditures by university academic libraries for electronic serials have increased by 75% in the last two years alone and by 900% since 1994.

Recommendations

- A commitment to on-going increased investment in the library is required if Loyola wishes to remain in the top 25 private universities ranked by US News and World Report.
- Choices on funding levels should be based on University goals and programs, including:
 - A gross target of maintaining library parity with schools ranked in our peer group because to do less would endanger ranking and national prestige
 - A direction aimed at supporting areas of historical strength or new programs to be supported with specifically allocated funds with the library budget, e.g., create a “Special Emphasis” fund.
 - A direction influenced by availability of financial resources and/or library materials in specific subject areas.
- It is recommended that the Library devise a systematic means to allocate acquisitions resources, with goals of developing a system for acquisitions budgeting which protects the interests of library users (largely faculty and students), responds to changing informational needs in the University, and reflects the current and near-future intellectual structure of the University. To do so will require the provision of multiple opportunities for key library stakeholders to provide input during the budgeting process.
- Endowed and gift funds also make up a significant amount of total library expenditures for many libraries [The ALCTS/CMDS study reported an average of \$623,248]. In the academic libraries visited by the Task Force, it was obvious that the libraries have a sustained and assertive gift funding development program. University Development and Loyola Libraries must establish an ongoing gift-funding program.

- One-time money, which refers to money that supplements the base budget in any given year, in the ALCTS/CMDs study averaged \$384,208. Loyola Libraries needs to develop a five-year plan for identifying and estimating potential projects for one-time funding.
- In the future, it is imperative that university administration articulate a commitment to library resources, including personnel, collections and physical facilities.

LIBRARY STAFFING

Overview of The Environment:

It is anticipated that within the next decade labor shortages will occur within the library and information sciences field. Several professional library associations and organizations are currently conducting studies to determine the number and types of library and information science jobs that will become available in the U.S. either through retirement or new job creation, the skills that will be required to fill such vacancies, and recommendations for effective approaches to recruiting and retaining workers to fill them. Five library-staffing issues that will be of critical importance within the next decade are staffing mix, recruitment and retention, staff development and training, library organizational structures, and the changing constituencies or communities served by our academic libraries. *[15]*

Currently, a shift in the duties of professional staff from traditional “in the library” duties, such as reference desk time and collection development time, to “out of the library” liaison activities, such as curriculum development and faculty instructional support is occurring. This has many implications for how libraries will be staffed – ratio of full time versus part time staff, a potential move toward using more part time employees - to avoid benefit costs, decisions about what positions will be most likely to exist/change and what the salaries/benefits of positions are likely to be, and decisions about the appropriate balance between MLS and non-MLS for professional positions. *[16]*

With an anticipated shortage in qualified personnel, we will need to gain greater knowledge about factors that drive recruitment – degree requirements, salary, benefits, library culture in general and the culture of specific libraries. We will also need to explore how libraries of all kinds will compete with the business world as the profession loses large numbers of employees to retirement and review how limitations on upward mobility (e.g., salary scales and assignments) contribute to individuals remaining in the library – professionals and support staff.

The library community also faces challenges associated with providing critical staff training/development, with determining the primary barriers to supporting currency in staff knowledge and skills, and with finding new ways to deliver training and learning in the future.

Other important areas to examine will be the desirable characteristics of the library organization so that it will be able to respond to a changing environment, the role of library governance in recruitment, retention, developing new services, etc., and how

important administration of a library will be in recruitment, retention, developing new services, etc.

Another large, unanswered question is how likely is it that libraries will be faced with continuing changes in the primary clients they serve – e.g., more diverse immigrant populations, etc.

The Loyola Environment

At the Lakeshore campus alone the University Libraries have lost librarians over the last several years to Tulane, the University of Virginia, the University of Wisconsin, UIC, DePaul and Roosevelt among others. Although salaries appear to be competitive both locally and nationally, University librarians sometimes cite the lack of some type of updated librarian ranking system as a cause of concern. Such a ranking system would provide a vehicle to “promote” librarians in spite of the existing “flat” administrative structure and will also “promote” those librarians who do not seek administrative positions but simply want to remain as senior reference/ instruction/ catalog librarians etc.

The University Libraries have seen much growth in several areas such as electronic serials collections, web development, archives and bibliographic instruction. This growth has not only created additional demands on space but have also created additional demands of the staff that provide the associated services in these areas.

Additionally, new alliances and partnerships will be needed – with pedagogic experts, document managers, publishers, and especially with the University IT unit. Librarians of the future will need to be even more skilled than ever and keep on being re-skilled as technology changes.

Recommendations:

- The University Libraries need to reassess roles and the workforce to better realign staff effort in growth areas such as portal development and web support and at the same time re-address the centrality of other functions (e.g. Should some technical services functions be outsourced?).
- The Task Force supports the current work to more clearly define librarian status as faculty and provides for upward mobility within the library’s administrative structure and supports its inclusion in a revision to the faculty handbook.
- Library technology staffing is insufficient to support the libraries’ information systems technology and staff in other library departments may need additional technology skills. It is critical that additional staffing be added in this area and that plans be developed to assist current staff with obtaining skill sets to support future technologies.

LIBRARY ACQUISITION & RETENTION POLICIES

Overview of The Environment:

Over the last decade the revolution in information methodologies and technologies has greatly impacted information acquisition, access and retention procedures and policies. In fact, the digital order is itself modifying behavior and permanently changing cultural paradigms. Alongside this Information Revolution there has been a radical shift in approaches to management away from hierarchical towards devolved and networked models, which better mirror modes of academic discourse. [17] The development of new technologies with their powerful networking capabilities and opportunity for lateral communication has accelerated the pace of change.

Many universities recognize that the resource gap cannot be solved simply by transferring information to computers; but that it involves a close examination of the way in which information is discovered, received, collected, processed and disseminated. They also recognize the even greater need to exchange information and to collaborate with outside bodies, including other higher education institutions, funding agencies, and national bodies.

To ensure that information reaches everyone who needs it within a particular organizational structure such as a department, planning unit or faculty, whilst at the same time encouraging networking in more informal groupings, university libraries often establish a principle that access to all information is allowed and encouraged unless there is a need for privacy to protect an individual, to protect the University interest, to comply with licensing and compliance regulations, or to satisfy contractual obligations. To help close this gap and to make the best use of their resources, they often develop a comprehensive and effective Information Strategy which is often viewed as an integral part of the University Strategic Plan.

In developing such an Information Strategy, university libraries are working with other university administration to develop an "Information Culture" whereby the whole university community will understand more clearly the issues and opportunities involved in the creation and discovery, processing and analysis, and retention and disposal of information. Among the issues being addressed by libraries are:

- **Information-Access** - Information Services staff continue to integrate paper and electronic information resources, providing a gateway to teaching, learning, research and management resources for staff and students, whether they are on campus, at associated colleges or at home.
- **Creative use of Information in Teaching and Learning** - Open and flexible learning environments need to be facilitated, thereby enabling the University to cater for a more diverse range of learning and learners. Structures to resource and support Distance and Mixed-mode education are being developed.
- **Effective use of current information systems** – Emphasis needs to be placed on learning to use information more effectively, rather than installing increasingly complex systems.
- **Bureaucracy** - Greater efficiency and less frustration result when paper work is reduced and information for regularly recurring reports is made much easier to gather.

The Loyola Environment

Loyola Libraries recognize that the paper and digital information content will coexist indefinitely and that they will increasingly interconnect as one provides a gateway to the other. Librarians know the scholar is not interested in the media or the location of the information, simply the information itself and the critical apparatus that supports it.

Changes in the academic culture and the technologies for accessing information are already having a significant impact on how scholarly material is delivered and there is a growing need for information in a range of formats, both paper and electronic, and from a variety of sources held locally and, increasingly, externally. This information is required at differing levels of aggregation and is not confined to traditional disciplinary boundaries. Ownership and intellectual property rights of information created in the University have been identified as important issues and are likely to require the development of more specific policies.

While University Libraries recognize the multi-disciplinary and cross-disciplinary nature of much University research, current policies could include greater recognition of the distinct approaches to research information provision in different faculties. For example, in Humanities and some Social Sciences research monographs are currently a priority but there is an increasing demand for journals and the requirement for electronic access to information; whereas in the Sciences, journals, current awareness and document delivery are the critical factors.

Library acquisition and retention policy statements need to embrace the multi-disciplinary nature of research, and interpret the collection in the widest possible sense by including access to remote information sources as well as local holdings. Collection development statements need to identify key strengths to be maintained and developed in the light of the University research strategy and an overall University information strategy.

Over the last few years there has been an increasing demand for non-traditional methods of access to information with high expectations of desktop delivery. The rapid increase in demand for a wide range of information delivery services reflects the rise in information availability and the increase in the numbers of graduate students.

The "tipping point" for many disciplines in the move from print to online content has passed and the University Libraries need to be campus leaders in the move to digital content since it has the expertise in this area. Since no library can afford funding to retain both print and online collections, a strongly worded collection development policy with well-thought out criteria, backed by Library Administration will go a long way in helping make the transition from print to online. Such policies also need to pay closer attention to shifts in student enrollment and faculty research interests and be more nimble in the way it proposes to administer collection funds across the disciplines.

Unfortunately, the University Libraries have not taken a comprehensive approach to developing written acquisition and retention policies. Rather, their policies tend to emphasize departmental issues and procedures rather than a broad theoretical approach to

collection development. University Departments have changed drastically in recent years and guidelines for purchases are not uniformly updated from department to department. In reality, collection policies seem to be functionally developed by the subject bibliographer and acquisition policies appear to be based more on procedures than on a clearly defined theoretical vision for collection intensity and scope. Both acquisition and retention policies are not well communicated across library departments or libraries or to library users. If the University Libraries are not purchasing important monographs in areas of strength, as is currently reported by faculty and students in the Humanities, their acquisitions policies are failing. Clearly, the University Libraries need to revisit their information acquisition and access policies.

Recommendations:

The changing needs of information custodians and users need to be clearly identified in the University Libraries' acquisition and retention policies, particularly those related to changes in the curriculum. Additionally, processes need to be developed to ensure the correct balance between control and access and to guarantee that changed information is correctly handled. Existing acquisition and retention structures should be reviewed and may need to be modified to reflect future patterns of the acquisition and delivery of information. The resource base needs to be reviewed regularly. Thus, it is recommended that:

- The University Libraries undertake a review of its collection acquisition and retention policies to develop a strongly worded, theoretically based, collection development policy with well-thought out criteria that identify key strengths to be maintained and developed in the light of the University research strategy and an overall University information strategy.
- The University Libraries administration should work closely with other University administration to develop an "Information Culture" whereby the whole University community will understand more clearly the issues and opportunities involved in the creation and discovery, processing and analysis, and retention and disposal of information at all levels of the University.

SPACE: Cudahy, Lewis, Law Library and LSC Library Annex

Overview

Because libraries today are in transition, there is no agreed-on paradigm for the library of the future so every library that embarks on a building program is in a sense on its own. Two factors in particular drive the need for a new paradigm. The more obvious of the two is the revolution in information technology that has been gathering speed since the 1960s and that took off in 1993 with the debut of the World Wide Web. The second factor, somewhat quieter but no less profound, is the move in higher education away from a culture of teaching and toward a culture of learning. Once we understand the potential of the library, its role, and the value it adds to the educational experience, we can develop a detailed program to explore alternatives for spatial organization as a means to fulfill an educational vision. In developing such a program, it will be wise to consider the strengths and weaknesses of the current facilities:

Cudahy Library

The consolidation of the Cudahy and Science libraries and the opening of an on-campus storage facility have helped the space issue at Cudahy, but growth space is limited for the future. With the consolidation, users have a much higher success rate of going to the shelf and finding the materials in question. Although much improved, the stacks need a total inventory/shelf reading project to get catalog holdings in sync with what's actually on the shelves.

As the campus student population has increased and as the collection has grown Cudahy has cannibalized study space for book storage. This has resulted in too few study seats at the library and very few truly quiet study spaces. The main reading room, (nicknamed the "Echo Chamber"), designed for quiet study, is packed most days and well into the night. It is located too close to the general reference area, which has a noise level that during the morning hours sounds like a quiet café and gradually builds to "cocktail party" levels by 7 pm and can rival Hamilton's by 11 pm on a good night.

The library has too few group study rooms. These are popular with students, but all are unwired and some lack electrical outlets for laptops. The graduate and faculty study carrels are also popular, but they are also unwired and there are too few of them.

It is unknown if an environmental study of the facility has been completed, but environmental problems include a roof that leaks far too frequently, an HVAC that is difficult to regulate, and a basement that floods after every big rain. The interior furnishings at Cudahy are a hodge-podge, crazy quilt of cast-offs. There are 4 or 5 different carpet patterns on the first floor alone. The bathrooms in general are inadequate and unpleasant and need considerable renovation. Additionally, lighting in the library presents continuing challenges.

Lewis Library

The Lewis Library is perhaps the best physically designed library for functionality of all the Loyola Libraries. It is attractive and appears to be well maintained. It has a variety of seating areas and appears to be well used by students and faculty. Collection space is adequate but the collections could use a bit of weeding. Implementing the recommendations regarding acquisition and retention policies noted elsewhere in this report would do much to address the collection space issues in this library.

There is also ample space for staffing in the Lewis Library although some original staff and meeting room space has been taken over by other units of the University. One concern with staff space for public services is that the librarian's offices are not located for ready access to the users; instead, users must make appointments or have staff call the librarians to the public service areas if there is a problem or urgent need.

The large, open reading room is a plus but as noted elsewhere the need for collaborative space is evident. Existing rooms are seldom available. Only power, not network connections, is available in these rooms. Further, there is a pressing need for numerous technology-infused group study rooms and project-development spaces.

For both the Lewis Library and the Law Library, the addition of a nearby student housing facility will have an impact on library space and place increasing demands on library services at these libraries.

Law Library

The Law Library has attractive space with lots of natural light and a variety of seating areas that are appreciated by students. There is adequate space for the current print collection with room to grow. The Technical Services area has ample space for the current staff and materials influx. The library's workstations are well designed but consideration should be given to replacing the task chairs. With regard to services and staffing, the library liaison program with faculty and student groups is appreciated and the library's webpage appears highly functional and useful. Students find librarians and staff helpful and they appear to be collegial and work well together. With regard to technology, students are always looking for more computing options; the planned improved wireless network and completion of interfaces to PeopleSoft, Lawson and Voyager will reduce duplication of some staff functions.

On the other hand, there is no large, open reading room and an additional larger classroom would be useful as would an AV viewing room and a lounge area where students can drink, chat, etc. without leaving the library. User seating is inadequate and, in fact, the library ranks badly compared to peer and aspirational schools. Additionally, the study carrels were not designed for using laptops and books and generally there are insufficient computer terminals. More, bigger and better soundproofed study rooms are required. The Circulation Desk is too large and too awkwardly placed relative to the new gates; relocating the Reference Desk closer to this area or as part of it might improve user access and help librarians more easily communicate with one another. The location of staff offices on separate floors also hampers communications among staff. The Reserves

area also needs to be reconfigured. General maintenance (carpeting & cleanliness) should be improved. A restroom facility should be located within the library, not outside it, and an improved signage system would help users locate personnel and services.

LSC Library Annex

There are three key questions that must be answered for the proposed Library Annex: How much of the traditional library program must remain in a centralized facility? Do we bring together library staff in a central information commons, or should they remain with specific collections or services? What configuration of services is most flexible? These are questions primarily for library administration and the library architects to ponder; however, if the facility is to capitalize on the “information commons” concept implemented at many academic libraries, public services will need to be reorganized and a number of service points will need to be consolidated to simplify user access.

Typically, information commons contain high-end multimedia development workstations, networked electronic classrooms, a case-based learning/conference room and general use computers for database searching, email and word processing. [18, 19] Information commons tend to produce a student productivity center in proximity to an information and technology service point, often collaboratively staffed by library and information technology staff, and are imbued with resources and services to sustain learning outside the classroom. Information commons generally include:

- **An Information Desk** provides general information for all library services and it is the first service point for library users.
- **Instructional Services** provides user instruction for use of library informational resources for academic research purposes.
- **Presentation Support Services** provides user support for public computer hardware and software, including scanning and multimedia labs.
- **Reference Services** provides information resource assistance with all levels of research for all formats (paper, electronic, microforms, etc.)
- **Group Study Space** provides collaborative space for multiple uses and quiet work practices.

AFTERWORD

It is the belief of the Task Force that library facilities and services are most successful when they are conceived to be an integral part of the institution as a whole. It is no longer acceptable to consider libraries as stand-alone facilities or departments. Achieving this goal requires a collaborative planning process; the development of this white paper is only the beginning of this process - a process that must include the library dean (s), members of the administration, trustees, students, and faculty, and it must begin *before a detailed program for space needs* is developed. Questions that should be addressed include the following: How should the “library,” and its services and its collections, serve the institution? What programs not in the library at present should be in the facility in the future? How does the library add value to the academic experience of the students and faculty? How is the library presently perceived, and how can it function as an interdependent facility with other learning and teaching opportunities on a campus in the future? How does the library reflect the vision of the institution of which it is part? Why

do students enter the library? What is the sequence of use of the services or technology students require? How should service points be configured with respect to anticipated types of inquiry and use patterns? Hopefully, this document and its accompanying appendices will provide overall direction that will lead to more detailed planning for future library facilities and services.

REFERENCES

1. AKEROYD, J. "The future of academic libraries," *Aslib Proceedings*, March 2001; 53 (3): 79-8.
2. LUDWIG, L. STARR, S. Library as Place: Results of a National Delphi Study. *J Med Libr Assoc* 2005 July; 93(23): 315-326.
3. CARLSON, S. "The Deserted Library," *Chronicle of Higher Education* 48 (November 16, 2001): A35.
4. CLIR Report: Library as Place: Rethinking Roles, Rethinking Space. Available at www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub129/pub129.pdf
5. OSBURN, CB. *Academic Research and Library Resources: Changing Patterns in America*. Westport, Conn. and London: Greenwood Press, 1979.
6. Panel on the Future of Libraries, *Educause Review*, January/February 2000: 69- 71.
7. SHILL, H. TONER, S. Does the building really matter? Facilities improvements and library usage. Available at: www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlvents/shill.PDF
8. VAN ORSDEL, L. BORN, K. "Choosing Sides: 2005 Journal Price Survey" <http://www.libraryjournal.com/article/CA516819.html>
9. PROJECT KALEIDOSCOPE ROUNDTABLE ON THE FUTURE. Characteristics of the Ideal Spaces for Sciences. Crankbrook, MI. March 21-23, 2003. Document available at http://www.pkal.org/template2.cfm?c_id=598.
10. BORGMAN, C. "Now that we have digital collections, why do we need libraries?" *Proceedings of the ASIS annual meeting*. 1997, 34: 27-33.
11. LOYOLA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES. 2005 Annual Report.
12. BASILLION, R. BRAUN, CL. *Academic Libraries as High-Tech Gateways :A Guide to Design and Space Decisions* (2nd ed.; Chicago and London: American Library Association, 2001).
13. ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGE AND RESEARCH LIBRARIES. 2004 Statistical Summaries.

<http://www.ala.org/ala/acrlbucket/statisticssummaries/2004abcde/04statssummaries.htm>

14. ALCTS/CMDs/Chief Collection Development Officers of Large Research Libraries. Available at <http://www.arl.org/scomm/lmbs/lmbs2001.html>.
15. INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SCIENCE (IMLS). The Future of Librarians in the Workforce. Available at: <http://libraryworkforce.org/tiki-index.php>
16. BUCHSON-ARBIB, S. "A View to the Future of the Library and Information Science Profession: A Delphi Study", *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 2002,53(5):397-408.
17. WORPOLE, K. 21st Century Libraries: Changing Forms, Changing Futures. Commissioned by Building Futures, a joint initiative of CABA and RIBA. Available at www.buildingfutures.org.uk/pdfs/pdf/31.pdf
18. BEAGLE, D. Conceptualizing an Information Commons. *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 1999, 25: 82–89.
19. MURRAY, D. Information Commons: a directory of innovative services and resources in academic libraries. nd. A Web site available at http://www.brookdale.cc.nj.us/library/infocommons/ic_home.html.