

[StaffWeb Index](#)

Planning CUL's Digital Future: A Report of the January 10, 2000 Meeting

Presentation by Sarah Thomas, the Carl A. Kroch University Librarian

It's the beginning of a new year, and it's a fine time to take stock and to plan what we want to accomplish over the next two years and beyond. Today, we are going to focus on our digital future. We know that the Digital Library is not the whole library; it represents only a small fraction of how we invest our resources. Most of the people working in the Library spend the lion's share of their time dealing with books: selecting books, acquiring books, cataloging books, shelving books, circulating books, and preserving books. Our physical libraries are designed to accommodate huge stores of books. Over 90% of our materials budget is devoted to the acquisition of paper.

Two years ago, when we were developing the tactical plan, the goals and objectives for the Library from January 1998 through December 1999, we deliberately did not include a goal "Build the digital library" because we considered the essence of the digital library to be incorporated in our overarching goals. It was, and is, but one aspect of our complex organization. Indeed, our very first goal on that tactical plan was to

Provide outstanding service to the University in support of Cornell's information needs by integrating traditional and digital resources and services.

This is still our goal today. Our role as librarians and information professionals is to see that we carry over the best and most relevant aspects of over a thousand years of literary tradition into the new world, which appears to be so different. But today, we want to concentrate primarily on the digital threads that run through our activities. The Cornell University Library has pioneered in what has come to be known as digital library development, and its reputation remains strong in that arena. Partnering with Xerox led to the Mathematics digital books project, in which almost 600 core mathematical texts were digitized. Mann Library worked with Bell Labs to evaluate use of chemical journals in the Bellcore project. The Core Historical Literature of Agriculture is a sweeping project that resulted in the scanning of important agricultural texts. The Digital Access Coalition, now the Cornell Institute for Digital Collections led by Tom Hickerson, has been a leader in ! the digitization of visual images, with Utopia serving as a precursor to the more comprehensive and challenging task of digitizing the contents of the Johnson Museum of Art. The Making of America brought key nineteenth and early twentieth-century American journal literature to a broader public through digitization. Along the way, we learned much about technical standards and best practices, and in more ways than one, we wrote the book for digital imaging specifications: Anne Kenny's workbook has sold more than 2000 copies, and hundreds of people from around the world have participated in the Digital Imaging Workshops Anne and her staff conduct. The

Rare and Manuscripts Collection Division was early to mount online exhibits, to scan in manuscript holdings, and to create encoded finding aids. Cornell was one of the original 12 co-signers of the Digital Library Federation in 1995. The Engineering Library, through John Saylor's participation, showed great prescience in DAISY, its! project to put engineering dissertations online, years before the National Theses and Dissertations initiative. The Library Gateway, which began life as the Mann Gateway, serves our Cornell community in an outstanding fashion, and is often cited as a model by other institutions.

This list is not exhaustive. There have been many, many projects. The Cornell University Library has received millions of dollars of funding to support these forays into the digital arena, with the NSF grant for the Digital Libraries II initiative and the Rockefeller award for the TEEAL undertaking being two notable examples. Our digital achievements are so extensive and numerous that our staff is in constant demand to serve on advisory panels or give presentations. Metadata, digital imaging, archiving, implications of the digital world for archives and libraries in the area of copyright -- these are all areas in which we have outstanding expertise. Dan Greenstein, the new director of the Digital Library Federation, was most impressed with the expertise of the Cornell University Library staff during his visit here recently.

So, we're doing well. We have acknowledged leadership, and we continue to have a strong presence. What's the point, then, of creating a digital plan? There are several reasons:

1. We want to move more decisively from the project stage to programmatic endeavors.

Projects, by their nature, are finite, self-contained. They can be considered experimental. They are often funded by external funds or out of discretionary funds. Programs have a greater stability, but they require ongoing staffing, and ongoing budgets. The Library must undergo a rapid transformation to create sustainable programs and reallocate or secure new funds to scale up these initiatives to mainstream activities.

2. We want to develop a coordinated, cohesive approach that benefits from the creativity of all our staff in its conception.

A coordinated effort enables us to build and maintain programs more efficiently, and sets a model for our partners in the Digital Library Federation. At the same time, we need to recognize that we are creating standards, rather than following them, and in the process, we will need to explore many different routes. In the process of developing the plan, we can draw on your ingenuity and experience.

3. We want to continue to explore and chart the frontiers of digital research.

We want to lead in understanding how information technology affects the communities we serve, how we can adapt it to help us meet our mission better, and how it changes our organization. Leaders shape the future; they influence others. By engaging in this work, we will create programs and products that work well for Cornell.

4. We want to be able to communicate a clear vision of our digital strategy and the benefits of the digital library to all staff of the Library, to the faculty, students, and university administration, and to potential supporters--foundations, corporations, and individual donors.

If we are to raise funds from external sources, we must be able to present them with a coherent plan and evidence of the benefits that arise from their investments.

We are doing so much, but we must do more. There are new challenges for us. Changes in scholarly communications are affecting universities and publishers. Our students have become consumers, and as a consequence, there are heightened expectations for access, availability, and convenience. People want information to be more ubiquitous than ATM's, as timely and as visual as CNN, as free as an 800 number. '.Coms' are seizing the opportunity of the information age to develop commercial services that have a lot in common with libraries, only their service comes with a price tag, and sometimes isn't as good. Although I am certain that all of us in this room would agree that the Web is not a library, many of our students feel they can meet their information needs on the web. Yahoo isn't the same as a catalog but many think it is good enough. We have an obligation to educate users about how to locate accurate, relevant and diverse information in electronic and analog formats.

Other research libraries are aggressively pushing forward in the delivery of new and expanded services to their clients. They are updating their infrastructure to support access to electronic information. Recent renovations at Stanford, Columbia, Emory, NYPL, Dartmouth, and Yale, for example, have created a learning environment that is both congenial (cybercafes with comfortable chairs and 24-hour access) *and* wired. Cornell is now among the few major institutions that have not completed retrospective conversion of their catalogs. Many of our peers are active partners in electronic publishing ventures: Stanford's HighWire Press is high profile, but Johns Hopkins has Project Muse, Columbia has EPIC (Electronic Publishing Initiatives at Columbia); Michigan has a highly visible and energetic digital program. Last year Harvard, which had been relatively inactive, with a few notable exceptions, announced a five year, \$12 million initiative to encode finding aids, dev! elop a repository for faculty projects, provide consultation services for faculty and students, and to expand significantly its range of visual resources and geographic information services. Columbia, Yale, Stanford, Penn, Penn State, Michigan, and Duke all spend considerably more on electronic resources than does Cornell. As pioneer ing as we have been, it does not take long to fall back.

In the Library Management Team, we have had considerable debate about what to do and at what pace we should move ahead. The transformation around us is occurring at such a rate, that incremental change will not suffice to keep us at the fore. Cornell University wants to be an institution that is a leader among its peers, which are the best in the nation and the best in the world. We know the sciences, in which Cornell has top-ranked programs, are relying ever more heavily on computation and digital information. Hunter Rawlings spoke to us in December about the need to balance the emphasis on science with attention to the humanities, traditionally one of Cornell's strengths. Common wisdom has it that the scientist has a laboratory, but the library is the humanist's lab. We must do our utmost to ensure that the arts and humanities, science and engineering, and our professional schools all benefit from the

digital revolution. Likewise, we must offer library services that match the concept of the undergraduate living and learning experience Cornell is striving to embody. The North Campus and West campus initiatives make Cornell the Cornell residential environment more attractive and will be one reason students will choose Cornell when less expensive alternatives are proliferating. Our library services must be integrated into the new models envisioned for campus life.

To be a leader requires boldness, the courage to make mistakes, the agility to change course when a situation demands it, the ability to extract insights from past failures and successes, and the energy and commitment of our entire organization. We have some excellent examples of success: the Gateway implementation demonstrates teamwork, ingenuity, and resilience. The Library Management System Evaluation Team, and now, the Implementation Management Team, is introducing a system of immense complexity. We have numerous initiatives underway, e.g., the Creation Station, the Digital Music Library, MyLibrary, and we can expect to continue these innovations.

Today, we have an ambitious agenda, a way too ambitious agenda, probably impossible to achieve in one day. But, I hope we will be able to gain insight into the direction we should follow and identify some of the milestones along our journey. The Library Management Team spent a day coming up with three topics for discussion: content, service and community. The Council of Librarians has met twice to share their views on these issues. These are big topics and although I am eager to get down to the pragmatic details of how we should be spending our time over the next two years, the sessions we have had in the LMT and the Council have made me very aware of our need to invest time in thinking about the very nature of the library for the 21st century. What is our vision for the Library in the first decade of the 21st century? Who will our users be? (Community) What information will they seek (Content) and how will we provide it (Services)? In the small group discussions that follow, I would like you to think about the big picture and the details we need to be able to achieve our goals. Think about Cornell University and where it is headed in the next decade--a leader in computing and information science, genomics, material science, the humanities, the social sciences, North campus, West campus, distance learning--and how our diverse users will seek and use information. What service innovations and transformations must the Library provide to meet the information needs of this clientele? What are the impediments to realizing our vision of a robust digital library and how can we overcome them? How can we make the most of our investment in our existing physical collections and facilities in a world which is becoming increasingly dominated by digital manifestations and transmissions?

When we meet again at the end of the day, I hope you will be able to provide us with your perspective on how the Library should develop over the next few years, as well as specific goals for us to achieve in the next twenty-four months. I'd particularly welcome a list of creative initiatives in which we should invest time and resources. The Cornell University Library needs to become the "next generation" library, the kind of library that will be as vibrant and vital at the start of the third millennium as it was at the start of the second millennium.

Reports of the Small Group Discussions

GROUP 1

Facilitator: Donald Schnedeker

Recorder: Edward Weissman

Participants: David Banush, Carmen Blankinship, Charlotte Bynum, Lenore Coral, Gale Halpern, Ved Kayastha, Deb Lamb-Deans, Jean Pajerek, Steve Rockey, Leah Solla, Wanda Wawro

Focus: Content

Facilitator's summary

This was a thoughtful group, which raised a number of questions and concerns about the digital library.

- 1) They felt the need for help to deal with the digital library. Examples pointed to a number of areas where staff could use help, digitizing, mounting servers, selecting and processing.
- 2) They felt that we need to change the current economics of digital purchases. Specific suggestions included more consortial purchasing and providing digital publishing service to compete with commercial publishers.
- 3) They discussed the need for more data and analysis to assist with decision making in the digital library. What works with our patrons; what is used by our patrons.
- 4) They felt that we underestimate the amount that we spend on digital resources, noting a couple of items that may not be counted in the current digital library expenditures - music CDs and memberships that include website access.
- 5) This group felt that digital content is interconnected with services and as we add to the digital library we will need to add to the services. They suggested that we need to look for ways to involve more staff in these decisions and actions. The digital infrastructure and services are directly related to the digital library and they are an opportunity for new funds.
- 6) They felt that we need to develop a rational approach to digitization projects considering whether this activity should be based on user needs or on the uniqueness of content.

Recorder's notes

IA. Buying Content

- a. There needs to be balance across the disciplines.
- b. The cost of materials in the sciences is high compared to the other disciplines.
- c. Increase in total materials funding needed. The tradeoff of books for databases is not sufficient at this time.
- d. Must make sure we count digital content accurately, including content we receive for the price of print subscriptions, society memberships. Also, we purchase non-networked digital materials, such as music CD's, that are not counted.
- e. Look at media types and focus on those that are most effective and appropriate to users needs.

- f. Need to track use of digital resources more effectively to make sure we are getting "bang for the buck."

IB. Creating Content

- a. Look at needs of users and work backwards to insure we are providing what's most useful.
- b. Work with faculty to develop pre-print servers.

II. Services

- a. Must help users to "critically evaluate" digital resources. We should be teaching these skills.
- b. Networked access makes it harder to get people into the library. We must provide services across the network, e.g., interactive and e-mail reference. We need better Web-based services (e.g., instruction, guides) than we offer now.
- c. More people from outside the Cornell community will be using our services. We need an "institutional mechanism" for dealing with the broader user community.
- d. We should consider charging fees for services to the broader community.
- e. We will need more staff to provide these services because, in many cases, we can not drop the old services.
- f. Selecting digital resources takes more time. More central support needed.
- g. We need to be nimbler in making resources.
- h. Reconsider Library Gateway: we are privileging networked resources, browsing is no longer effective.
- i. Need to broaden base of discussion about the digital library. Up to now it has been handled by a "narrow range" of the staff.

GROUP 2

Facilitator: Kathy Chiang

Recorder: Ross Atkinson

Participants: Bob Braude, Marty Crowe, Janie Harris, Bill Kehoe, Gordon Law, Brenda Marston, Lori Micho, Michelle Paolillo, John Saylor, Pam Stansbury, Patricia Viele, Martha Walker

Focus: Services

Facilitator's summary

1) Underlying philosophies:

- a) When in doubt, focus on programs that play to our unique Cornell strengths: our particular collections and expertise.
- b) Stay true to our 'brand identity', which we considered the organization and meta-organization of

information, including its delivery and preservation.

2) Major items:

- a) Push and pull technologies: work to develop push technologies for print and electronic resources, e.g., the filtering and redissemination of information, techniques such as employed by commercial information providers (e.g. amazon.com's linking and 'user comments' functions.)
- b) Mainstream proactive partnerships with users, especially faculty.
- c) Plan so as to ensure state-of-the-art equipment for staff. We cannot be experts in state-of-the-art information technologies if we are working with inferior hardware and software.
- d) Remember the prosaic, but widely useful functions, such as e-reserves.
- e) Create a database of staff expertise/consulting skills.
- f) Use selected students (our students, and even high-school students) as a study population to better understand how our users work with information.
- g) Work ourselves into the electronic communication pathways of our users, especially students, e.g. their class listservs, society lists, departmental lists.
- h) In our access systems - incorporate controlled vocabulary lists (such as LCSH) to help patrons retrieve information; incorporate online instruction through tutorials or perhaps 'live' sessions.
- i) Integrate the print information with the digital by widespread network access (through expanded port access, or wireless technology).

Recorder's notes

- Most agreed with the CU Med policy that in general no electronic resources should be purchased that are not network accessible: a primary purpose of electronic resources should be 24/7 anywhere/anytime access.
- For the digital library, collaboration is essential, starting first within the CUL system, and then moving beyond: it is the responsibility of the CUL administration to nurture trusting relationships.
- A key component of digital library service is to ensure that users have access not only to electronic publications and databases but also to library experts to provide users with assistance.
- We need more push (vs. pull) technology and services: we should not design things that users must retrieve, but should rather be giving users what they need. Library staff should be seeking out faculty in their offices. This will require a change in attitude, because librarians are not traditionally "pushy."
- Part of such push technology should be to provide users with opportunities to publish material through the library. The library should provide a server where faculty can decide to post their materials, and on which such materials will be maintained over time. This is especially important for gray literature.
- When users encounter useful electronic resources, the library should have some mechanism or process to inform them of print resources that are also available on the same subject.
- We should hire students, both undergraduate and graduate students, to serve as informants, from whom the library can learn in detail how students pursue information and what kinds of

information students need. We should also aim to get on student listservs and maintain an open and continuous dialog with students online.

- Controlled vocabulary is a major problem. An effective digital library must include an automated index of controlled vocabulary for each major database.
- The library should digitize all Cornell related materials, such as dissertations and as past many writings by faculty as possible. Such digitization and conversion should be an ongoing service.
- More support should be provided to technical services, to ensure that the digital resources we are acquiring will be accessible and used. There is no point in putting up digital resources if users cannot locate them. We should also be creating more electronic archival descriptions.

GROUP 3

Facilitator: Paul Constantine

Recorder: Sarah Thomas

Participants: Christian Boissonnas, Jennifer Conklin, Phil Davis, Tom Gale, Surindar Ghanghas, Erla Heyns, Anne Kenney, Mary Patterson, Patricia Schafer, Patrick Stevens, Tom Weissinger

Focus: Service

Group 3 Recorder's Notes

The Library takes its cues from the University, and should, therefore, align its priorities with the stated objectives and priorities of the University. It should know its users well, employing surveys, focus groups, and other forms of market research to gain a better understanding of their needs. The Library has many categories of users, and they require differentiated treatment. For undergraduates, the Library as place is important, as is the supporting infrastructure that will allow them to take better advantage of digital materials and services. For faculty, the collection is of greater significance.

The collections of the library and digital information content do not exist in isolation, but rather is linked to a suite of services. One service the Library could pursue would be to inventory digital collections/data at Cornell and develop a means of making it more widely known and of preserving it, as appropriate. Indexing and cataloging becomes a more visible public service when applied to these fugitive materials. Other services to pursue are interactive reference and semi-automated routines that reduce the labor-intensive act of responding to questions. This becomes more essential as the Internet opens up the Library resources for people who are not part of our core constituency, and who want services beyond access to digital content.

The Library is in a state of transition, and it may not be organized optimally for its new role. The Library should look outside libraries for new models, but in the interim, it should form teams of staff from throughout the library to facilitate communication and development. We should focus on information and how to help people get the information they need, rather than get hung up on the package which contains the information. The Library should identify the new skills it seeks in staff. A visual picture of

the digital library should be drawn to help convey its essence. There is much to be done, and much that is uncertain. For this reason, the Library should avoid the temptation of being all things to all people and instead focus on doing a limited number of things in a stellar manner.

GROUP 4

Facilitator: Jim LeBlanc

Recorder: Lee Cartmill

Participants: Kris Alpi, Lynn Brown, Michael Cook, Lance Heidig, Peter Hirtle, Lorna Knight, Joy Paulson, Marty Schlabach, Julia Stiles, Elizabeth Teskey, Scott Wicks

Focus: Community

Facilitator's summary. (Recorder's additions in **bold**)

III, A-B

Who is our "core" community? Although we generally agreed that CU faculty, staff, and students seem to form that core, the boundaries between core and non-core have become fluid.

* **Core includes "walk-ins" both physical and electronic, residents of NYS, constituents of our federal congressional district.**

* **Core community is not a physical one but rather a global one.**

Thus, the distinction between core and non-core may be too simplistic. There are several groups of users with different content and service needs and with different technological options.

* **How about alumni, K-12, collaborative researchers at other institutions and distance learners?**

* **What services do we need to provide to distance learners? Would we need to radically change the way we provide services if we had (say) 20,000 distance learners? How would this affect services to others?**

* **The potential difference in computing capabilities between the Library and its users could present problems.**

* **Should we privilege "walk-ins" over electronic access users?**

* **Do we provide differentiated services depending on whether user is core vs. non-core?**

Is technology driving policy or is policy driving technology? It seems like the former is true, but this question bears examination.

* **Are either or both of these (policy or technology) impediments to expanding services?**

* **What is the need for "24/7" service? Consider cooperation with other institutions for reference services. Perhaps an "Ask Jeeves" type service.**

* **Need to look at not only the "big picture", but also specific innovations to be implemented in the next year or two.**

* **We should consider additional document delivery service. If users receive information directly at**

their desk electronically, won't there be expectations for physical delivery as well?

We need to do a better job of letting user groups know what resources and levels of service are available to them ("an ad campaign").

*** User assistance will be key. Information must be as self evident and easy to use as possible.**

*** We must improve communication with faculty. Does this impact services to others and if so, how?**

III, C

We should strive for more organized cooperation with the library community at large, not just with our peer institutions (e.g. with regard to online reference).

We should put more effort into forming consortia to provide for the archiving of electronic resources in an organized way. Among other benefits, this would allow us to be less fearful of discontinuing print subscriptions when electronic versions are available.

We should be more aggressive in seeking corporate partnerships.

*** How would increased demand affect our capacity to deliver services - bandwidth, staff, equipment?**

GROUP 5

Facilitator: Oya Rieger

Recorder: Jean Poland

Participants: David Brumberg, Elaine Engst, Constance Finlay, Nancy Holcomb, Zsuzsa Koltay, Sara Miller, Lynne Personius, Cecilia Sercan, Yoram Szekely, Marijo Wilson

Focus: Service

Facilitator's summary

General Vision Related Comments

1. We need to balance digital and print
2. Would book be replaced? What is the prospect for e-book? The factors include:
 - o it is a generational issue (younger people will embrace electronic)
 - o recreational vs. scholarly use
 - o reliance on print depends on disciplines
 - o monographs vs. serials

3. Library vs. the other information providers. We can compete, but the determinant factors are:
 - uses/disciplines: we have a niche (e.g., archives)
 - economics - "free information"
 - we need to be selective and identify the area we want to compete at

4. Financing hybrid library
 - need for new money - reallocation will not solve the problem
 - need to revise/revamp old services on on-going basis
 - we still need both print and electronic (access vs. preservation)
 - how long can we afford keeping both formats?

5. Retrospective conversion
 - Acquiring new electronic resources
 - Digitizing our traditional collection
 - How selective should we be in digitizing? (TOC?)

6. Digital preservation is a crucial area

Services

1. Re-evaluate electronic reference
 - We now have a wider user group (unique digital CUL resources are attracting others) with a large variety of questions (content, technical support, user help, etc.)
 - We need a reality check: How long can we continue providing comprehensive and free reference and document delivery services? We need to explore fee based services
 - Rights management will be more important as the user population is more diffused than ever.
 - Get to know our users better. Track users and classify them (primary, secondary, etc.)
 - We need to continue actual presence - personalize services (do not become virtual librarians).
 - Our priority should be to cater to the needs of the CUL customers/users (however the question "who is our primary user" is becoming perplexing)

2. Market our services more effectively

3. Revamp our training programs
 - Balance between "too much" and "too little" instruction
 - Maintain visibility – "ask us"
 - We function in a wider information environment -tailor the curriculum accordingly (both CUL and other Web resources)
 - Collaborate with the users in developing these services
 - Continue to develop workshops on information management skills (e.g. digitizing, setting

up web sites)

- o Market "our skills" while we are teaching/offering workshops

4. Evaluate the technical infrastructure

- o Maintain a number of platforms and do not overdo standardization (users with different platforms, machines, etc.)
- o Recognize the difference between public vs. staff need
- o Remember that wireless is the future - need a strong foundation for electronic communication

5. Users

- o Users see library kiosks as "workstations" (No distinction from the other computers) - need/require a variety of software to get their work done (word processing, etc.)
- o Ensure reliability (24/7) - reduce technical problems

6. Consider document delivery for traditional collections

- o Centralize check in/ outs
- o Hire "students on bikes" for document delivery
- o Electronic services are being used heavily because it is convenient. Make the other traditional resources easy to use too.

7. Complete/enhance the online catalog

- o Retrospective cataloging
- o Need for detailed/granular cataloging (TOC, finding aids, etc.)

Content/Services/Community

1. Virtual collection building is important (shared collection development among institutions)

2. Project to program mode

- o Outsourcing vs. in-house digitizing: evaluate/compare them
- o Archiving is "begging for attention"
- o Define roles in supporting the new digital services
- o Represent functional division from the start
- o Production of traditional services component is important. When adding new roles, add new human/computer resources (do not overload)

3. What is the role of the library in electronic publishing?

- o Library will be successful in this role only if the library makes it an attractive option for authors/content creators (reputation/reliability/prestige of the publisher is important)

Impediments

1. the number one issue is money
2. variety of political issues - user/staff "buy in" is essential
3. preservation– both \$ and technical: need "long time organizational commitment"

Recorder's notes

General: The relationship between digital and print has been problematic for a long time. Our research material has more long-term value than many digitized materials. "Amazon.com is a mile wide and an inch deep." It is the top inch that attracts people.

Materials that are published in paper as well as in digital form will require serious decisions. We should not leave these choices up to each selector. Administration may have to nudge them.

There is a market value for our materials, but can we get funding for more esoteric projects?

As librarians we should give voice to those who do not have one – for example, undergraduates.

I. Content

A

We need new money for electronic- otherwise our unique materials will suffer.

B

- Decide whether we do production scanning or outsource the process.
- Digital collection is not physically restricted. Participate in virtual collection building,
- Investigate alliance with Cornell University Press to publish faculty articles. (A ninety percent rejection rate the first year will enhance the reputation of resulting journals.
- Faculty ultimately run the university. If we are digitizing we need to do the materials they need.

II. Services

A

- We need to programmatically develop reference services for our digital collections.
- Our strength has always been individual services. We need to find a way to personalize digital services.
- Market our services better. Publicize what we have
- Train potential users of digital material. Be visible and available in the library as well.
- Include web use in our training.

- Train people in the skills we have- scanning, digital conversion, etc
- Make completion of retrospective catalog conversion a priority
- Commit to producing title level records for digital collections
- Include all library activities (public service, cataloging, IT, etc.)in programs and projects at the beginning

B

- Gateway should connect to a person who can assist.
- Institute/expand fee-based services.
- Distance learning provides revenue-generating opportunities
- Users are thinking of library kiosks as workstations – investigate "ubiquitous computing"
- Expand document delivery services (electronic and physical)
- Ensure Voyager accommodates charge, discharge, and renewal at any unit

C

- Provide library users with choices - wire for laptops, provide connections for personal digital systems
- Improve infrastructure. Should not limit platforms (Mac, PC, Unix)

GROUP 6

Facilitator: Marty Kurth

Recorder: Susan Markowitz

Participants: Ann Ferguson, Mark Funk, John Hoffmann, Angela Horne, Nan Hyland, Rick Lightbody, Jill Powell, Sasha Skenderija, Nancy Skipper, Sarah Young

Focus: Content

Facilitator's summary

1. Bring users in:
 - Assess demand
 - But shape it, too ("Got books?")
2. Remake the physical space
 - Comfort
 - Congeniality
 - Connectivity
3. No content without service

4. Integration is key
 - o Product
 - o People
5. Keep the boat(s) small
 - o Adjust quickly
 - o Don't over commit
 - o Allow model to emerge
 - o Recorder's report

Recorder's notes

We can develop more electronic resources (more content), but people can't find the resources and they aren't coming in to the library to get help. We need better gateway help pages (the pathways to get to resources are complicated).

Questions about the process of acquiring and cataloging electronic resources: why are some major resources not cataloged and smaller ones are? The process to get web resources cataloged is daunting; the collection development process needs to be "opened up" somehow.

Potential barriers to use of electronic resources:

- a. the resources may be here, but how do we help individuals with technological questions (software and computer issues)? People find it difficult to configure their browser, and connect from home. One example: student finds it easier to use another university's INSPEC rather than ours.
- b. internal barrier: CTS is cataloging "free" stuff, but are we cataloging the "right stuff"?
- c. how do patrons find resources? It's crucial to provide a clear pathway to what people need. Important to do user testing so we understand better how people find things
- d. comfort and convenience of libraries. Some students are going to Barnes & Noble to do research. To compete, we need to make people physically comfortable in libraries and provide easy access to food and drink. Uris/Olin need to make a leap forward to be seen as places to come with first-class service. We should provide one-to-one help, easy tech access (plug-in ports or wireless), food/drink areas.

How do we change job content of staff? We need a massive analysis of our jobs and what new skills and services are needed.

Discussion of the issue of *integration*.

- a. We need to look at both drawing users in to the library and also aggressively working with remote users (through email and chat reference). We need hooks to pull people in to show them

the wealth of physical resources.

- b. How can we improve the integration between traditional and electronic services/resources? Univ. of Illinois has very popular service: articles and books are delivered to offices for all patrons after an online request is made. One suggestion was made to focus on "digitization on demand" rather than trying to digitize all physical material -- we can't scan all of our holdings. The user should think of himself as at the "virtual center of the cosmos" when they pose questions to the gateway, as they do on the Internet. In sum, bridging the gap between physical and digital resources should be done using a combination of document delivery services and digitization on demand.

Other issues discussed:

1. Service relates to content dramatically. We can't talk about adding to digital content without adding to service.
2. Content includes data as well as text and graphics.
3. How do we bring more electronic content to users? Are we matching our services to the new ways that users want to get information? We need tolerance for varying user needs and preferences.
4. We should have CUL metadata guidelines for creating web products
5. Don't underestimate the importance of convenience for users. We need libraries that are comfortable (attractive), congenial, and connected.
6. We need to be able to make short-term and mid-term changes of direction since there are so many unanswered questions. We need to be "light on our feet" to be able to make changes and re-direct resources. We should be looking more externally (user needs) than we are now.
7. There should be more communication within the library system so that we know what other library units are doing.
8. How to hire and train for new staff competencies?
9. Need to spend money marketing books (GOT BOOKS? ad campaign). Add technology to old services: patron-mediated document delivery, provide scanners in library same as copiers

GROUP 7

Facilitator: Barbara Berger Recorder: David Corson Participants: Daniel Cleary, Betsy Gamble, Janet Gillespie, Sarah How, Bob Kibbee, Elaine Krikorian, Marty Kurth, James Morris-Knowler, Howard Raskin, Lynn Thitchener

Focus: Content

Facilitator's summary

ACTION ITEMS:

1. BUILD ON OUR STRENGTHS

2. WE NEED TO HAVE A TEAM-BASED APPROACH FOR THE DIGITAL LIBRARY TO SUCCEED AND THIS WILL REQUIRE STRUCTURAL CHANGES IN THE LIBRARY SUCH AS PERSONNNEL AND ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES
3. WE NEED TO EMPHASIZE THE IMPORTANCE OF LIBRARIANS IN LEARNING HOW TO SEARCH THE DIGITAL LIBRARY
4. INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN DIGITAL PRESERVATION IS A ROLE FOR CUL AND IT SHOULD BE INTEGRAL TO WHAT OUR PROGRAM IS
5. WE HAVE A PUBLISHING OPPORTUNITY FOR CONTEMPORARY AREAS OF HUMANITIES RESEARCH
6. THE CONVERSION OF EXISTING COLLECTIONS SHOULD CONTINUE BUT IT NEEDS TO BE A MORE COORDINATED AND THOUGHTFUL EFFORT
7. COURSES AT CORNELL SHOULD USE OUR DIGITAL RESOURCES

AND MOST IMPORTANTLY:

THE DIGITAL LIBRARY MUST MOVE FROM PROJECTS TO PROGRAM

Recorder's Notes

All members reported involvement, of varying kinds, with current CUL digital activities.

Moving from a "individual project approach" to "programmatic immersion" within CUL as a whole seen as essential by all.

- What done to date de facto more "digital projects" than "library projects"

Reorganization required to be successful in the digital world

- Stronger structural links needed between currently disparate functional groups
- Still divided too much into functional groups (including CIT); need more team based approach
- Will require major commitment to personnel and budget reorganization

A better strategy needed for reallocation of human resources.

- Approach has been too disorganized to date; needs to be more "positive", more supportive of

staff

- Human component remains essential to ultimate success of our endeavors
- Despite common perception, there can be job security in all of this, but needs to be a more centralized approach with stronger central administrative support

A consensus existed that we are currently doing significantly more in the "digital realm" than Sarah seemed to imply in her opening remarks.

- A clear need, however, for more than just "digital material"; also need more personnel skills, continuously updated equipment, better communication links, etc.

Need further clarification of CUL goals.

- To what extent do we want to "own" versus "access" information (e.g., tripling access different than tripling content)
- Define more clearly the connection between the digital and the print collections (e.g., different disciplines have different archiving needs)
- Need better management data (e.g., currently have lots for print resources, but relatively little for digital resources)
- Not just more dollars, but also more "time and effort" will be required (How do we accommodate this?)
- Increased education of staff, as well as users, must be emphasized ("Quantity of material is irrelevant if don't know how to access and use it." "A little knowledge can be dangerous in the digital world!")
- Better coordination and integration with Cornell courses is needed
- Equal access for all users must be guaranteed (recognizing that the community of users is vastly expanded in the digital environment)
- Legal "rights", and related issues, should be added to the list

The focus of our digital efforts needs to be refined.

- Make maximum use of what is commercially available
- Emphasize local creation of and access to digital resources in areas of study and research emphasized at Cornell but ignored in the commercial world
- "Publishing" offers more opportunity to develop a unique "CUL identity" than does "conversion"

Be assertive: libraries "will look and feel different" in the future.

- Continue, however, to build on strengths; don't try to be everything to everyone
- In seeking partners for cooperative endeavors, keep existing strengths and resources in mind
-
- Take a more aggressive leadership role re. relationships with traditional partners such as CRL

- But avoid "scanning wars" with "a hundred other ARL institutions"

Infrastructure deficiencies remain a major problem.

- Adequate facilities are as important as the digital resources themselves

GROUP 8

Facilitator: Angi Faiks

Recorder: Tom Hickerson

Participants: Eric Cooper, John Dean, Susan Greaves, Bill Kara, Fred Kotas, Susan LeCette, Linda Miller, Mary Ochs, Carolyn Reid, Allen Riedy, Tom Turner

Focus: Community

Facilitator's summary

A) Expanding the utilization of services to our core

- Group was not particularly satisfied that we are serving our core community to the best of our ability
- Have a lot of anecdotal evidence of this, but think we need more systematic means of tapping into the needs of our core community and then develop programs to meet them
- Need to provide better access and services to help people use our collections. The group felt collections are underutilized.
- This translates into better and new kinds of service, outreach and instruction:
 - add info studies course to curriculum
 - get a research component into classes
 - use new technologies to provide remote reference support
 - integrate services with e-resources, more closely aligning service with needs
 - make electronic info more useful, get away from just printing out all e-info. Do this using pocket-computers, e-books and other similar devices

B) Expand our user community

- Agreed that support of and service to a community larger than our core is important and within our mission, but need to be careful not to do this at the expense of support and service to our core.
- Can we do this and somehow capture costs?
 - with fee-based service
 - with subsidized programs for certain communities
- Need to explore technologies that make this outreach feasible

- Concerns about for-fee service and distance learning are logistical and managerial, not necessarily a challenge to our principles and mission

A and B) For all communities, need to come up with a more systematic plan for deciding how to "be digital":

Start with PROJECTS

1. Identify issues
2. Do user studies showing current systems, practices, etc. and find out really how our community is using them and what we can do to better support their efforts.
3. This leads to:
 - future development
 - adjustment to current products and practices
 - standards, understanding and principles
4. All of this EQUALS PROGRAMS

But, in order to do all of this, need support by way of funds, resources, better infrastructure.

We also need to ask ourselves how to continually reevaluate our tools, practices, standards and principles in order to ensure that they are not getting in the way of user needs. (i.e. does a CUL Collection Development principle get in the way of meeting user needs and is that reasonable?)

C) Also considered our internal CUL community as part of the big picture

We agree that we need to collaborate outside of CUL, but there was also strong feeling that we need to do a better job of collaborating within CUL. We need to examine our community and support structure from the inside.

- Are we too competitive?
- What is the incentive to collaborate?
- Should proof of planned collaboration and sharing be a requirement before projects are approved/funded?
- It seems like project-based work hinders collaboration.

GROUP 9

Facilitator: Nancy Skipper

Recorder: Ross Atkinson

Participants: Kristina Buhrman, Jay Datema, Diane Hillmann, Peter Hoyt, Eileen Keating, Darcie Mersereau, Suzy Palmer, Lydia Pettis, Alison Reissman, Robin Remick, Richard Strassberg, Noni Vidal

Focus: Service

Facilitator's summary

The group started out by articulating the **values of wishing to promote free access to information and providing high quality service for our user community**. Concern was expressed that commercial interests will take over if we don't pursue these goals assertively enough, and that this will be a disservice to our users because the quality of service provided will be poor.

A number of the group participants had experience with working on various aspects of locally produced digital projects so that became the main focus of the discussion. The main point made is that we need to move from project-based work into a more programmatic mode. **Three themes arose out of the discussion reflecting the need for integration, assessment and mainstreaming:**

1) Create and maintain a unified list of all digital projects. Include information on the nature of the project, who is in charge, where questions should be directed about the project, etc. and mount it on the staff web. It will be important to keep this list updated. The goals are to increase staff awareness, accountability and communication. These factors will result in better service.

2) Establish a form and a unified procedure for planning, assessing, approving and tracking digital projects. The goal is not to hinder creative efforts but to ensure more "front end" coordination, planning and possibly even selection. Included should be an assessment of infrastructure needs, such as hardware and software. Preservation plans for the data/images should be included. Personnel requirements for producing, cataloging and maintaining the project as well as the impact on public services staff in responding to queries about the project/site should be taken into consideration. Principles, procedures and committees/groups already in place that deal with print and electronic resources subscribed to by CUL should be utilized to the greatest extent possible. For example, producers of digital resources can use IRPC-L to solicit feedback or inform staff about new projects.

3) Producers of digital resources should collaborate or confer with staff from other functional units such as cataloging or reference to ensure that digital products are as accessible and user-friendly as possible. Products should be designed to be as "self-service" as possible, but staff should also be well prepared to respond to queries about digital resources through all means of communication including in-person, telephone, reference e-mail or "real time" chat-reference. Defining our core user communities and establishing priorities will enable us to design various levels of response. For example, "canned" responses can be used to answer a variety of questions from our non-core community. Developing an FAQ will help with commonly asked questions.

Digital products should also be considered for "weeding" as are all other formats managed by CUL. The criteria may be different and would require discussion but the procedure could be as simple as sending out a cancellation proposal to CU-LIB as we do for serials cancellations.

We also briefly discussed the concern about losing access to important resources if we cancel print counter-part subscriptions, which current budgetary pressures tend to encourage, and then the producer of the electronic version is no longer viable. The group concurred that **CUL could collaborate with consortia such as NERL to ensure long term access to these resources.**

Recorder's notes

- The corporate world has awakened and realized that information will be the primary source of money in future. They will therefore seek to control and limit access to information. This is the single biggest challenge we now face.
- We must integrate and mainstream electronic resources with all of the other information resources the library is responsible for.
- To build a digital library is to take on an ongoing infrastructure challenge. We will not be able to provide adequate digital library services until we are prepared to make the commitments needed to run and maintain the basic infrastructure.
- We have got to articulate anew what our service mission is, and who are core users are. Once we have done that, the rest of our planning for the digital library will fall into place. When we know who our audience is, we can select digital materials to respond to their needs; so far, we have selected digital materials with very little consideration for user needs.
- CUL has concentrated on providing access primarily to digital images, which are not easily used. (You can't search them, problems in downloading, etc.) This is one reason that our digital library projects have resulted in such heavy work for public services. One of our key aims must be to build into our digital library as many self-service features as possible, so that users can answer some questions for themselves without relying always on library staff.
- In the case of the digitization of the "War of the Rebellion," which caused such pressure on Olin Reference, reference staff and LTD made adjustments to the presentation, which substantially reduced the number of questions. This kind of collaboration between the originators of the resource, the public services staff, and LTD should have been done before the resource was made publicly accessible.
- In the same way that we carefully coordinate (through ERC) the acquisition of online resources, we should coordinate digital projects.
- We must be prepared to discard some projects. We must not imagine that all projects must move from experimentation to production. We will need to develop the criteria for deciding what to keep and what to throw away.
- Before we can give up print copies, we must have some assurances that the digital material will remain accessible. We can reduce the risk of losing the digital material by collaborating with other libraries and dividing up responsibilities for archiving.
- MyLibrary is one of the coolest things we've done. It is so clear that it is a good idea, and that it will benefit many of our users. But we are struggling to make it available, because we have not really put enough resources behind it. We are stretched and overloaded. We should choose a few obvious digital winners, and put all of our resources into making those work, rather than putting our energies into so many different digital things. We need priorities.
- The people who decide that CUL will undertake a project often have no idea and greatly

underestimate the amount of work that will be required by CUL staff to make the project successful. There needs to be a formal process whereby all staff who will be involved in or affected by a digital project are consulted as part of the planning for the project. A carefully constructed form of some kind might serve this purpose.

GROUP 10

Facilitator: Marty Schlabach

Recorder: Edward Weissman

Participants: Barbara Berger, Kathy Chiang, Tony Cosgrave, Martha Hsu, Joanne Leary, Jim LeBlanc, Lois Purcell, Oya Rieger, Caroline Spicer,

Focus: Community

Facilitator's summary

Need to:

1) Clearly identify the matrix of the broader user community

- Perhaps it would be easier to id who isn't included!!
- We developed a long list
- Agreed faculty, staff and students are the core
- Alumni and NYS residents a close second level

2) Proactively choose our target communities (both core and additional communities)

- Develop appropriate content and services
- The community is expanding, we have been reactive to it

3) Develop policies that match various diverse user groups

- Consider unit vs. institutional policies
- Consider single point of contact for user assistance
- one email address, with questions then referred
- takes burden off the user of knowing where to direct question

4) Develop filters that match users to resources

- My Library is a good start, need more

5) Push the boundaries of intellectual property rights to support the expanding community

Pursue more collaborative efforts for user assistance and content both intra- and inter-institutional

Recorder's notes

III. Community

- a. In broadest sense, our community includes anyone interested in CUL content.
- b. Electronic publishing and collection building is changing the definition of our user community. We take grant money to make things available to "the world."
- c. Create a matrix of our user community including who's entitles to what services (free, fee-based, unit-based, institutional.)
- d. Develop different interfaces/filters for different groups.
- e. Push the boundaries for intellectual property rights (e.g., include all CU--Arecibo, Medical College--in our licenses.)
- f. Create CUL-wide services (e.g., single CUL e-mail reference megalist) rather than relying on unit-based services.
- g. Collaborate with other institutions to create cross-institutional rather than CUL-only collections (e.g., MOAI, SagaNet) and services (e.g., 24/7 reference services, cataloging, collection development.)
- h. Consider "indirect cost recovery" model to pay for increased service demands from the broader user community.

I. Content

- a. Build digital content to serve the core community. If it serves others, well and good.
- b. Content building should be program driven rather than project driven. Digital conversion should be tied to primary collection responsibility.
- c. We should collaborate with other institutions—perhaps provide access to our level 5 collections in exchange for access to level 5's elsewhere and drop support for level 2 collections.

GROUP 11

Facilitator: Lorna Knight

Recorder: Janet McCue

Participants: Suzanne Cohen, Pat Court, Angi Faiks, Marianne Hansen, Yumin Jiang, John Mamora, Katie Margolis, Barbara Morley, Allen Quirk, David Ruddy, Iris Wolley

Focus: Content

Recorder's notes

The group began the discussion by addressing the statement: "substantially increase the % of materials budget devoted to electronic resources." No one had a problem with the statement but the objective should be to do as much as we can without compromising the print collection. Some in the group had no problem with tripling the increase (from 1-3 cents on the dollar); others suggested 25 cents/\$1. Advantages of digital are 24/7 availability; better access for remote users; need to maintain competitive edge—particularly in areas, such as distance education. Can't just be a blanket statement, though, because it should be dependent on the discipline and what is available, what would be useful. The Library also needs to take into account the University's priorities in determining its selections. Also need to define what is "it." Libraries have traditionally collected very broadly; publishers' aggregations, though, tend to skim off only the cream of the crop. What will! become of the small press and the depth of our collections.

Consortia may also provide some relief—both in buying power and in shared resources. This may involve more trust than the library has traditionally given to consortial arrangements.

The group expressed support for moving from project into production mode. Too often decisions are driven by funding opportunities rather than intellectual integrity or user needs. Also need to recognize that digital collections require service and retooling. For example, selectors will need to make selection decisions, robust access systems need to be designed, and reference staff will be called upon to answer inquiries. Need some of the traditional specialties as well as new skills. Would also be helpful to have better communication of information about projects. Everyone shouldn't have to reinvent the wheel. Acknowledgement that there needs to be a balance between centralized and everyone going their own way. Some suggested a central office that could digitize and deliver a useable project; other stressed the value of involvement from individual units; others suggested a central database of projects. Anyone should be able to say, "hey, this would be great to digitize and have the support/resources to get it done" and each of the participants could list projects that would be valuable for their users.

The group discussed the question of two libraries (i.e. digital and print) vs. one library (i.e. integration of print and digital collections). The consensus was to integrate the "libraries" as much as possible rather than building parallel institutions. The expertise can't be in one particular group, have to broaden involvement, and develop the skills within the organization. We should start with the user and it should not be the technology that drives the development of the "Library." The group discussed the proposition that when something is available in print and electronic form, choose electronic. Group members felt comfortable with this statement for some titles (e.g. Project Muse); others were more dubious about publishers, such as Elsevier, who might not be interested in archival responsibilities.

Strong belief that there is much more that we could be doing to let users know of our services/collections. Need to invest as much in the education and publicity as we do in developing the collections/services. Others expressed the need to allocate more support to support the infrastructure (e.g. cataloging) that makes electronic resources accessible.

Quotes from the session:

"One of the positive things about this day is realizing that we are all digital library participants."

"We always pay a lot of lip service about asking the user what they want, perhaps we should create a "Library Interrogation Unit" to really delve into the question. Or, perhaps an "Electronic Visitation Librarian" who would pop up on your computer screen and offer assistance.

GROUP 12

Facilitator: Christian Boissonnas

Recorder: Susan Markowitz

Participants: Paul Constantine, Philip Herold, Phil Dankert, Greg McClellan, Margaret Nichols, Don Schnedeker, Patrizia Sione, Linda Stewart, Ed Zieba

Focus: Community

Facilitator's summary. (Recorder's additions in **bold**)

The group discussed the definitions of core community and services, proposed three ideas to incorporate in a plan, and defined three issues to be addressed.

Core community and services

The core community includes users on and off campus, people who are other than faculty and students, alumni (but not necessarily all of them), and residents of Tompkins County. As the digital content increases, volume of use increases, and this leads to traditional non-users becoming users.

Insofar as services are concerned, we need to revisit our assumption that we are currently providing the right services. The real problem is to define our role in providing expanded services. We should become partners with the faculty in research and teaching, improve the content of information we have, educate ourselves and others, market ourselves, provide outreach services (even go to people's houses), and expand our services to reach core community members who do not use the library. **We could digitize materials for large introductory courses. The role of "middleman" has no future, so should look for new role, improving content of the Gateway. There is a perception that Gateway resources are inadequate -- students say that they are getting all their research information "on the Web." We need to counteract the student view of "What's the point of libraries?" by marketing our resources and our expertise to students. The ILR Library web site on the Triangle Shirtw! aist Factory Fire (with scanned documents) gets over 5,000 hits per month and spurs interest in the Kheel Center collections ("What else do you have?"). The suggestion was made that we should have a good online exhibit for each important collection in the library. Digitized finding aids will**

serve as effective tools for advertising our collections. We need to do more outreach to convince non-users about the value of our collections and services. It is not easy to use the current information or to configure browsers, telecommunications, etc. We should provide more individual consultations to help users. We should get more input from users about what they want and need. If we don't have what they want, ask them to tell us what they need.

Components of a plan

- Improve content by getting more participation from users, buying materials "just in time" rather than "just in case," design more web pages to highlight collections, negotiate for more content with content providers, digitize more unique resources, negotiate licenses that are less restrictive to allow an expanded core community and to support distance learning, increase the support structure, and develop standards for technology used by users.
- Prioritize the services provided to subsets of the core community across CUL according to a uniform standard. Who gets what services where is confusing now.
- Increase collaboration by identifying what we can give to, or exchange with, corporate partners, identifying discipline-based digitization projects on which other institutions would want to work with us, and expanding programs with existing groups (geospatial data, netBooks).

Issues

- How to serve the non-core community without hurting the core community.
- Why serve the non-core community at all?
- What is our obligation to non-Cornell scholars to make unique materials accessible?

[StaffWeb Index](#)

rev. 3/22/00, mc