Overview and Introduction

The reviewers visited the Gustavus campus for two days in early April. Using the library self study as a launching point, we met with a variety of students, teaching faculty, and administrators. The library group designed an excellent set of engagement questions that sparked high quality discussions on emerging needs-- such as digital scholarship--as well as critical topics such as considering the library as place on a residential campus. We are grateful to the "Gustie" community for their time and thoughtful engagement: the library is clearly a valued and valuable campus resource.

The following report is organized into a discussion of strengths, challenges, and recommendations for organization (staffing), budget, student learning, the library building (physical and virtual environments), and observations. We hope that this document proves useful as the Gustavus Adolphus community, led by the library, works to ensure high quality services, spaces, and collections in a rapidly changing environment.

Organization (staffing)

Strengths:

The library faculty and staff at Gustavus Adolphus are highly energetic, dedicated, and passionate about their work. The faculty includes a group of librarians hired since 2000, and two senior librarians with many years of experience and history at the college. As a faculty department, the librarians are highly regarded by their teaching faculty colleagues.

The longevity of the two senior-most librarians has created a high level of trust in their judgment, expertise, knowledge, institutional memory and comprehension of the campus culture. [The newer members of the library faculty are heavily engaged with teaching and learning, and also have the respect of the teaching faculty and their students.] The library faculty have a history of strong, student-centered programming, fine reference and instruction services, and responsive collection development on tight budgets. They have earned the respect and support of the campus--and the profession. They deserve administrative recognition for their successes.

The support staff at Folke Bernadotte Library are smart, committed individuals with years of experience and longevity. Many of them, while educated and compensated at the clerical level, perform the work that would be done by degreed librarians at many institutions. They have forged strong ties with student workers, and are clearly dedicated to their role--and to student success--on campus. They are one of the library's many strengths.

The student workers at the library also are an asset; many of them are considering careers in professional librarianship, thanks to the positive role models and learning experiences they have had while working there.

Challenges:

The library faculty were described by one member as "rugged individualists." While this is a trait most of us admire, it is possible that librarians have aligned too strongly with the highly individualistic teaching faculty model, in that they are not fully committed to working toward the same group of goals as a unit or team. The library is leanly staffed; it is critical to leverage time effectively and efficiently. They report that their promotion and tenure criteria mimic those of the teaching faculty. Consider: does that serve well the best interests of the institution as a whole? Does it support the institutional needs and strengths?[1]

For example, the rotating chair model discourages continued leadership, with concomitant rewards for effecting strategic change. (Dickinson College had a similar model for years, and ultimately abandoned it. It might be useful to learn from Dickinson's experience and the decision-making process the used to make a change.)   While a rotating chair model has value in that a broader group develops budgeting and decision making skills, and can bring those to bear in moving the library forward, it also has significant disadvantages. Most significant is that it makes sustained, strategic change difficult. Even in small libraries, substantial benefits can be realized from a structure that clearly vests in one person the long term responsibility and appropriate status to ensure that vision and strategy are developed and that they are translated into annual goals and daily operations. Perhaps as a compromise, the college might consider assigning a longer-term period for each chair.

Without adequate support for professional development funds for refreshing and revitalizing the library faculty group, longevity can become a liability. And without rewards systems in place that recognize the importance of flexibility and change (particularly in a field that is changing constantly), entrenchment, loss of creativity, and loss of inspiration are obvious outcomes.

The current campus model for staff assignments creates a lack of motivation to pursue significant new approaches. Our understanding is that the administration makes all decisions on how open positions will be used and filled. As a result, there are no incentives to think creatively about new needs, best practices, position reallocation or reassignment, or collaboration with other departments. Instead, the rewards go to those who cling successfully to the status quo. (At least that way, no positions are lost).

---

[1] For a different perspective on how P&T documents can change to reflect institutional needs and reward specific traits, see: June, A. W. (2013, April 12). Colleges begin to reward professors for doing work that actually matters to them. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A25-A26.

An example of this situation is the half-time position in audio-visual services. Our understanding is that the position has been full-time, at a higher rate of pay. In the new fiscal year, once the incumbent retires, the position will become half-time and the pay rate reduced. In 2013, when multimedia is an increasingly important aspect of communication, scholarship, and critical study, cutting those hours and downgrading the pay grade are actions far from strategic. It would be interesting to see what the library faculty could propose if given the opportunity to rethink staffing and services around that position.

We recommend that, when staff openings occur, the library prepares, and the administration reviews, a document that re-envisions the position and places it within the context of library and campus strategy and goals, including where appropriate goals of other campus partners. For example, we see an opportunity, with the opening of the audio-visual position and a currently open instructional technologist position in the Gustavus Technology Services unit (GTS), for the campus to ensure that rapidly changing technology-based support needs, current and anticipated, will be met in high quality and efficient ways. We encourage creative thinking across departments to assess college staffing needs and the courage to collaborate and think institutionally.

In a tight budget situation, it is hard to hire and retain higher-level staff. One approach can be to support continuing education and travel. Gustavus Adolphus librarians need to attend meetings and conferences to broaden their horizons, and see how other institutions have had success with different approaches and models. Support for professional growth and its results can help create a different atmosphere—one that is more experimental and enterprising.

Budget

Strengths:

The library faculty have accomplished much with very little, particularly in the use of collections money. The former availability of restricted funds --which could be saved up and rolled over from one fiscal year to the next--had enabled the purchase of high-value big-ticket resources (the library equivalent of capital investments) that strengthen the libraries' resource offerings and support of learning and research. The teaching faculty report that "the librarians have performed miracles on a shoe string."

Tight budgets offer opportunities to rethink the status quo. Questions to engage might include: Could resources be used more effectively if some work were outsourced? For example, it might be possible to create a core liberal arts approval plan for monographs, gaining deeper discounts with coverage of core

content. Adding in vendor-provided copy cataloging and shelf-ready processing could relieve staff hours to be assigned to work that cannot be outsourced to vendors.   Could a pay-per-view model for expensive journals relieve pressure on the journals side, allowing the library to reallocate funds for content that would have greater value to the entire campus community? How can shared collection management agreements offer flexibility and greater access?

Challenges:

The deep distrust of the administration pervades the faculty and the library. The change in budget model remains puzzling. We still struggle to grasp how unused restricted funds can be assigned to the general operating budget, if they are, indeed restricted? We recommend that Gustavus Adolphus consider rethinking that model, at least in the case of the Folke Bernadotte Library. The librarians' record of careful fund management and saving for important resources should be rewarded, not penalized.

The library faculty have relied on the operations budget to cover overages in collections expenditures, which is arguably a dangerous practice and precedent. The collections budget is voracious (owing to the high rate of inflation in library materials) and it can ultimately consume the operations budget, to the detriment of library programs and facilities. Among other risks, the practice of relying on the supplies and expenses budget for resource acquisitions guts professional development funds--an investment source that can lead to more creative solutions to current budget problems through exposure to new practices, services, and opportunities.

Assuming that peer comparison information is useful, the review team consulted the Oberlin Group data for the 2010-11 year, which is the most recent compiled and edited version of the shared data set.

Some key findings of that comparison:

With an endowment of $96 million, the Gustavus Adolphus is in the middle of the 25th (lowest) quartile of the group. Most of the college's numbers fall near—either slightly above or below—that quartile for most of the survey data.

Population is one exception: Gustavus Adolphus FTE enrollment is close to the mean for the group, as is the size of the faculty.

Total acquisitions expenditures for 2010-11 were above the 25th percentile by several thousand dollars. Acquisitions expenditures *per student*, however, were well below the 25th percentile line. At $262/student, Gustavus Adolphus is well below the $516 median for the group, or the $808 average. Granted, many Oberlin Group institutions have a smaller student population than Gustavus, but this

shortfall may merit additional scrutiny. Similarly, the collection is one of the smallest in the group; though that could change in future years as discussions about significant weeding projects continue to appear on Oberlin Group listservs. Expenditures per student will likely become an increasingly important quality indicator. The driver will be the shift to providing access to--rather than ownership of—scholarly content. Access usually involves annual subscriptions or some other yearly commitment. They also tend to inflate over time. Thus, expenditure/student becomes a good comparison point across peer institutions.

A challenge facing *all* academic libraries in 2013 is the desire to meet the needs and expectations of faculty patrons. The risk is creating expectations that exceed what is realistic. An honest discussion on library resources, needs, and potential can lead to a consideration of alternatives, redirecting the conversation to a more positive outcome across the campus.

Faculty members seem to be surprised that Gustavus Adolphus cannot provide them with the level of ready access to research materials that they enjoyed in their PhD programs, or even before materials inflation outstripped all but health care in its rate of inflation. Teaching faculty at Gustavus need some kind of orientation to the size and type of library they will have at their disposal when they start work there— as well as an introduction to the capacity of Interlibrary Loan. Most faculty objections to the library centered on the absence of research-level material—which is never appropriate for a undergraduate liberal arts college—or assumptions about past support for materials that cannot realistically continue. Constant, repeated communication to faculty to set expectations about what is possible—both through acquisitions and through access—could address misperceptions.

Along with those communications is the need for transparent conversation among teaching faculty and the administration about funding library acquisitions as the academic program expands. The college cannot continue to add programs and not fund them; if new programs are proposed and accepted, the provost's office must be willing to fund library resource acquisitions—both retrospective and future. Perhaps there is an administrative way for the library and the teaching faculty, who do presumably have a say in adding programs, to work together to help figure out how to allocate library funding. We understood that there is a subcommittee of the curriculum review body that scrutinizes programs. A librarian should be on that committee—with the power to slow or halt a program proposal when resources are insufficient and will be cost-prohibitive to acquire.

Beware the trap of allowing overly tight budgets to restrict creativity. Perhaps it is less expensive to have low-wage hourly workers identify books, order, catalog and process them than it is to outsource that work. On the other hand what is the cost in lost opportunities if those same staff hours could be reassigned to work that currently is NOT being done and that is best done by college staff, because Gustavus-Adolphus is unable to hire new staff?

Student Learning

High priority programs
The library faculty, in their self-study, listed the following as their primary program focus:
- Course related instruction
- Faculty development
- The Reference Desk

And the following as important, but less deserving of high priority status:
- Credit-bearing courses (First Term Seminar, the Reading workshop)
- Internships (for students seeking graduate library education after college, and those interested in marketing)
- The Patricia Lindell Scholarship.

Strengths:
Gustavus Adolphus library faculty have long been associated with high-quality information literacy instruction offered across the curriculum, throughout a student's college career. Barbara Fister is a respected writer on academic library information literacy and library instruction; with her colleague Dan Mollner she has built a respected following among the Gustavus Adolphus teaching faculty.
In recent years, library faculty have tacked in new directions. Julie Gilbert teaches as an embedded librarian in a Political Science Methods course that is required of all majors. Both students and faculty rave about her contributions--and the department has the assessment data to prove that students benefit academically. Similarly, Jeff Jenson models both use of primary resources, undergrad research in history, and digital humanities opportunities in his collaborations with the History department faculty.

Gustavus Adolphus librarians have a strong and deep tradition of providing reference service from a physical desk. Several library faculty expressed pride in and commitment to this most central of traditional library services, citing the benefits of the one-on-one consultation with a student, who in turn benefits from learning at the point of need.

In their self-study document, the library faculty make a strong case for contributing to and participating in conversations on teaching excellence at Gustavus Adolphus. Through the relationships and conversations developed in the John S. Kendall Center for Engaged Learning, the librarians hope to build on their information literacy program—possibly expanding the embedded librarian model currently used in Political Science. The opportunity to partner as peers with teaching faculty cannot be understated as a strength.

Library faculty at Gustavus Adolphus have participated as teaching faculty, as time permits, in the First Term Seminar program. This contribution is important and valuable, as it develops a level of empathy and affinity with the day to day

experiences of teaching faculty, and exposes the librarians to the strengths, weaknesses and challenges of incoming students. It also exposes first-semester students to librarians in a new way. Given that many public schools no longer hire librarians or offer any form of exposure to the research process in a library setting, the involvement in the FTS by librarians has significant value and should continue.

Challenges

Survey data reported in the self-study show that "90 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the library faculty support student learning through their instruction program, with most of them strongly agreeing. About 11 percent were neutral or unsure." (Self-study, 11). Nevertheless, in conversations with teaching faculty and students, the reviewers heard several comments suggesting that the "one-shot" library instruction sessions had little impact on student learning or research behavior.

Most of the librarians expressed the view that the reference desk service is the place where the most meaningful teaching and learning about information needs, search strategies and sources take place. They point to the deep gratitude expressed by students who have experienced professional assistance there.

Conversely, members of the Political Science faculty—and at least one of their majors—point to the deeper learning that has happened in their department, using Julie Gilbert as an embedded librarian in the methods course. Survey comments—presumably from faculty in departments other than Political Sciences--seem to support this, acknowledging, "…This is an area where [we] could improve. We are not intentional about this." (Self-study, 11)

We recommend that the librarians consider critically the return on time investment—comparing the relative impact of the individual reference interview against that of the embedded librarian model in the major. The number of students reached through the Political Science program far exceeds the number who actually seek out reference help. Further, through the embedded model, teaching faculty also have the chance to (re)learn library-based research techniques, often using sources and tools that are far different from those they used in graduate school.

Gustavus Adolphus' talented instructional librarians, together with their track record of teaching excellence and faculty outreach, have an opportunity to create a signature program. A cross-curricular embedded librarian program could be a point of distinction—and one that touches every student who completes a degree at the college.   The challenge will be achieving consensus on what services to eliminate to make time for a new program. The 2012 assessment planning retreat suggests there is interest in pursuing a more robust embedded information literacy program (Self-study, 10) which points to the potential for success.

Library Building: Physical and Virtual Environments

Strengths

The Folke Bernadotte Library, while clocking in at over 40 years, is a well-maintained building with a flexible, open design. It is positioned near the center of campus.

The current layout is open, inviting, intuitive and coherent. Student study areas—both for individuals and groups working together collaboratively—is plentiful and heavily used.

Regular, thoughtful collection weeding has allowed the library to achieve a steady state, and the current building has answered the need for collection storage, library services, staff and teaching. The library also houses a Special Collections and Archives facility, which has adequate storage but insufficient public service space—and no teaching space or room for new ventures, such as a digital scholarship area.

For a building of its years, the library is in fantastic condition. Students use it heavily—during our visit in early April, the building was bustling with students working alone or in groups. All areas were in use: study rooms, classrooms, the writing center, carrels throughout the building, and the beautiful Hasselquist Room. Both reviewers were envious of the wide array of student study areas, as well as teaching areas, and the open feel of the building—lots of natural light, and a sense of calm space. Staff areas are housed together, and all workers have natural light and easy access to other employees. It is truly a showcase facility, with lots of potential.

The library website (its most visible virtual presence) is clean, uncluttered, and easy to navigate.

Challenges

A recent trip involving a classics professor, one librarian, and the provost to a program on library buildings and the learning commons model has started a series of (often contentious) conversations on campus about space needs and the role of the library building. It was evident to the reviewers that communication around possible reassignment of library building space has become emotional and dominated by miscommunication. Faculty, librarians and some students feel that there has been enormous insensitivity to the role of the library as a space on campus; librarians also report that they are not opposed to other mission-relevant uses of the library space, but that they understood that the proposal involved taking study spaces on the perimeter of the ground floor and turning them into "offices." Students expressed a strong sense ownership of the building and a desire to

maintain student-focused study and work spaces. Administrators appear to have a different vision. It is imperative that there be some mediation and resolution before anything can happen.

Rather than coming down on one side or the other in this difficult conversation, we recommend that Gustavus Adolphus retain an academic space planner, such as Art Lidsky (AICP) of Dober, Lidsky, Mathey in Boston. Mr. Lidsky can help guide a conversation about the library building—and possibly other campus spaces—that would offer a more student-centered dynamic result than the campus-wide status quo.[2]

We also recommend that conversations about "the library" make careful and thoughtful distinctions between the library as a building, the library as a group of resources (many of them available virtually worldwide—from any computer or mobile device with internet access), and the library as a group of individuals who teach, collect and provide information services.   Similarly, it might be helpful to disaggregate services from locations, such as distinguishing between "reference service" (i.e. helping students and faculty locate information) and the physical Reference Desk.

Concluding observations:

There is deep and palpable distrust of the administration by the faculty. This is a serious threat to the long-term success and health of Gustavus Adolphus. Much of the concern appears to be centered on the library: what it has been, and what it might become.

There is a widely held faculty perception that there is no transparency, that the management style of senior administrators is top-down, the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) will not stand up to a dictatorial president, and that the Board of Trustees (BoT) cannot or will not see the deep rift dividing the campus. There is the belief that President Ohle was brought to Gustavus-Adolphus to "fix" the college, but there is no comparable sense of what was wrong in the first place. There was no mention of outside work with organizations such as the Association of Governing Boards to determine best practices to heal the divide, and address communications challenges. We mention this, not because it is directly germane to the library, but because it was a persistent theme, shared over and over, throughout our visit to St. Peter.

Faculty members are not ignorant, but they do occupy the insular world of their professions. How can they (including the library faculty) be invited to join the

---

[2] For information on this particular planner, see: http://www.dlmplanners.com.

conversation about viable future economic models for residential liberal arts education in the coming decade and beyond?

We respectfully suggest that the administration might begin to form a strategy to help faculty and staff understand what is happening financially at Gustavus Adolphus; specifically, the use of financial aid instruments and discounting to attract top students, preserve class size, retain and graduate students. All new and "excess" money is going to student financial aid, resulting in a significant loss of financial flexibility. The discount rate has climbed significantly, to over 50%, over the past several years. Do Gustavus Adolphus faculty fully understand what that means? Have they been invited to participate in solving the financial sustainability problem presented by that strategy? What are options, and potential solutions? What would happen to the college if that trend continued?[3]

Recommendations:

Trust needs to be re-established between the library and the administration. At present, it appears that both are in a pattern of rejecting the other side's suggestions with a knee-jerk "no." Try saying "yes" to each other--both the library faculty and staff to the administration, and the administration to the library faculty. Give the librarians a chance to make a case for innovation and change.
Consider revising librarian promotion and tenure (P&T) criteria, making them look like liberal arts college librarians. They are responsible for budget and personnel management, a building, collections and resources, and a host of services on top of teaching, research and service. They oversee a rapidly-shifting element of higher education, and they function in a global economy. They are not exactly like teaching faculty. Create criteria that reward the best practices and behaviors that will gain Gustavus Adolphus the best library.

As a campus, look at the campus leave policy, and align it with that of peer institutions. Understand that there is a goal to "right size" staff. Make sure that Gustavus Adolphus compares apples to apples, here: compare your staff to institutions with comparable student FTE numbers, and count the exceptions (i.e. in-house food service). Then, look at the funding model for leaves. Find out what the standard is. Two-thirds pay for a full-year leave is most likely outside of the norm. Consider ways to cover without using (and paying) adjuncts. This effort should not be limited to the library. While controversial, these efforts could save money and provide flexibility in other staffing areas (i.e. the need for instructional technologists, and related staff to support teaching, learning, and creation of student and faculty knowledge products.

Add Instructional Technologists to the library staff. Begin to build bridges between the library (its content), discovery, and creation of new works. This is an essential

---

[3] For a useful perspective on financial challenges facing higher education, see: Selingo, J. (2013, April 12). Colleges must prepare for a buyer's market. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A60.

step to take before a Digital Humanities project can be realized. Gustavus Adolphus and other Oberlin Group member institutions in the area might also investigate the ITAP program in place in upstate New York, in which six liberal arts colleges share a program to train, in house, students to become Instructional Technologists. Students gain the skills and the hands-on experience, and have marketable skills once they finish. DePauw University has a similar program, also named ITAP.

Continue the discussions on intellectual property, copyrights, Open Access, and Open Textbooks. Educate the campus on opportunities for leadership in this space. The library can be a change-agent here; Gustavus Adolphus can become a leader in the state!

Investigate cooperative collection management opportunities between the Oberlin Group and other small liberal arts college libraries in Minnesota. Share responsibility for shared collections, and share your space gains!

Envision your library building as a space to "celebrate the student as a growing and developing learner." How does *every* service and expenditure support deep student learning and the acquisition of the traits of a liberally educated person?

Rethink, at least in terms of the library, the current policy of reclaiming unused restricted funds for the general operating budget. The library has been thoughtful and creative with those monies, over the years, and has used them to acquire expensive materials essential to the support of teaching and learning at the college. That approach should be rewarded and recognized, not penalized.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the reviewers wish to emphasize that the strengths of the Folke Bernadotte Library are greater than its challenges. The highly dedicated library faculty and staff, their strong relationships with the teaching faculty, the innovation they have demonstrated in their use of funds for acquisitions, and the beautiful, centrally-located building all combine to make it possible for the Gustavus Adolphus library to retain and build on its central role in the academic life of the college.

We hope that our comments and criticisms will assist the college in developing a vision for the library that will suit the needs of current and future students and faculty.

Diane Graves
Trinity University   Megan Fitch
                                                                              Beloit College

May 2013

The library asked the reviewers to address in more depth two questions discussed during the review visit:

1. What could we do to advance department-integrated instruction efforts? What specific strategies have you found useful?

Advancing department-integrated instruction efforts is a goal many small liberal arts college libraries have been working on for a very long time. Success can be very institutional culture-specific; that said, good foundations are in place at Gustavus for the library to build upon.

We recommend a multi-pronged approach that takes advantage of opportunities, including faculty interest, at several "levels". Good presence at these various levels (or in these spaces, if you prefer) will help library faculty participate in pedagogical and curricular discussions with a higher degree of comfort and a better knowledge of the departmental and campus contexts.

Of course, excellent relationships with individual teaching faculty in departments are critical to success in this regard. Positive outcomes with integrated course-specific instruction can demonstrate to other faculty in the department what is possible with a more departmental/major-focused approach. Library faculty clearly have good working relationships with many teaching faculty: it is critical to maintain them. These relationships can--and ideally will--inform curriculum proposals at both the course and major level: they are the base. Leverage the successes with the political science department: faculty love hearing from other faculty about what is working well.

Another approach to this question might be to use the Political Science example as a model, and identify one department in the Sciences and one in Humanities that might be willing to "pilot" a similar model. That can be less threatening that a change to the entire curriculum, and success in those departments can ease adoption in others.

Regular librarian participation in departmental meetings (at least when the curriculum is discussed) can be enormously helpful. The librarian can talk to faculty in a more informed way, and simply being in the room can be a powerful reminder that information fluency/research skills are important to student learning. Librarian participation in departmental meetings at Kenyon assisted with helping the history department integrate a developmentally-based set of information fluency goals into their major curriculum. Similar strategies have been employed successfully at Trinity University and Hollins University.

Consider deepening relationships with the Kendall Center for Engaged Learning. Faculty working with the center are engaged directly with questions of teaching and learning goals and whether their students are meeting them: this is a natural place to work with faculty and help them understand how library instruction can further student learning, and then integrate instruction into pedagogical goals at several levels. Trinity has had success with this approach. The Kendall Center

may also provide another connection point for partnering with Information Technology to further student learning and skills.

At a more macro level, placing a librarian on the sub-committee that approves courses, combined with librarian presence on the larger campus curriculum committee, puts the library in the room when curricular issues are formally discussed and action taken. Ideally, proposals that come to this committee will have been influenced already by contact with librarians; however, this is the structure through which larger departmental and college wide curricular goals pass. Library faculty appear to be respected enough within the faculty at large to represent information fluency here in departmental and college curriculum discussions. Consider having the curriculum committee read Information Literacy as a Liberal Art, by Jeremy Shapiro and Shelley Hughes.

Larger curricular reform efforts, presumably coordinated by the committee, present ideal opportunities to place information fluency formally into the Gustavus curriculum in ways that are locally appropriate. Courses could be designated as meeting an information fluency requirement, much the same as courses are often designated as meeting writing or quantitative literacy requirements. Diane experienced success with this at Hollins University. While we were not successful in getting information fluency into Beloit's new curriculum formally (only writing, quantitative literacy, and intercultural literacy made it), it was seriously considered, which increased interest on the part of some faculty. At Trinity, a new curriculum proposal that will be voted on in fall 2013 includes Information Fluency in two sections: one as a basic skill, and another at the outcomes level of the major.

Finally, consider carefully demands on time, as developmental major-based instruction efforts, while very worthy, are time-intensive and for a variety of reasons likely cannot be implemented across the curriculum. What role can the credit-based instruction course play? Are there departments/majors where it might be more efficient to integrate the course as a requirement, or it may be more advantageous to expose students to interdisciplinary research methods? We heard praise during our visit from students who enjoyed learning how different disciplines approach research.

If the library could lay a consistent foundation in the first term experience classes, and then work with departments across campus to have students take the credit course their sophomore year (if it looks like they will be majoring in a department that does not have a major-integrated progression) that might help cut down on the dreaded 200-level course problem where students essentially receive the same one shot instruction session over and over as they move across departmental offerings. Even if they did receive several instruction sessions under this model they either would be more discipline specific or, perhaps, students could test out of a more general skills class.

Any of these approaches may prove too time-intensive; however, there may be ways to develop online quizzes, tutorials and learning experiences that might allow larger numbers of students to move through a class, or serve as a substitute for the one-shot session. The library faces a challenge

in terms of the number of librarians per student when it comes to instruction efforts, so creative and flexible solutions to scheduling and time use will be important. Some options might be: peer teaching/tutoring, using more students and high-level staff at the reference desk, and using students as peer tutors during instruction itself. Trinity University created a group of "Information Literacy peer tutors" who function in much the same way as peer tutors offer services within the Writing Center.

---

2. Are we taking an appropriate approach to licensing digital content, given our resources? What advice do you have for us about promoting and supporting the shift toward open access? Can you recommend particular strategies that you have found effective?

Licensing digital content is a huge challenge facing libraries today. As mentioned in the main report, the conversation may need to be framed on campus in terms of access, not ownership. Gustavus has specific, though not unique, challenges in supporting expanding academic programs. Without substantive increases in budgets for journals, in particular, or corresponding reductions in academic programs that free up library resources to be spent elsewhere (we're not sure that's ever really been accomplished!), licensing digital content, as mentioned in the main report, can eat a library budget alive. Consider whether language used when discussing digital content should be around access, which could be accomplished in several ways and may or may not be permanent, or licensing, which is fairly well defined.

As mentioned elsewhere, one approach (among many) to managing this stressor is to have meaningful representation on the campus curriculum committee. That body needs to require and evaluate cost estimates for all resources needed, including library-supplied content, to properly support new courses and programs. The library representative must be able to share objective information; the library's role would not be to kill off good proposals, but rather, to share information that will inform other faculty members and administrators about the real costs and trade-offs required by new programs.

Joint or consortial licensing deals wherever possible are also critical for cost management. We are unsure what opportunities exist within Minitex, the Minnesota-based Oberlin Group or private college libraries, or even Lutheran Church affiliated institutions in the region.

We strongly recommend that the Gustavus library undertake a review to see whether moving to pay per article for some journals may save money or, at least, provide a relatively cost-neutral way to provide access to a broader range of content than is possible through subscription. Many publishers have pay per article packages available. The Copyright Clearance Center has a program called Get It Now, which charges $26 per article and which provides access to a number of publishers, including Elsevier, Cambridge University Press, Emerald, IEEE, and more. Access can be mediated by library staff, much the way they currently manage interlibrary loan. While this was mentioned in the main report as a way to free up staff time, it can, also be a way to provide

expanded access for the same or less money. This represents a major shift in collection philosophy, but in many ways this is the next logical step beyond the rental model represented by most digital access agreements.

At Beloit budget restrictions force us to be fairly ruthless about making departments who want new digital resources eliminate other resources to free up money. This approach is fraught, however, when it comes to interdisciplinary resources. We also have had some success in asking departments to partially or fully fund resources that are relatively specialized; they frequently decide to allocate department-specific endowed funding. Asking departments to "put some skin in the game" helps them understand long term costs and think carefully about what resources their students need licensed access to, in ways that unfortunately don't always happen when it's not "their" money that is spent. This kind of approach cannot succeed without a crack Interlibrary Loan department, which Gustavus has.

Making the case for Open Access can closely be related to/tied into explaining strategies for managing licensing of or access to content. Making faculty aware of costs and increases is a perfect entry point for a discussion of what really is going on in scholarly publishing (faculty doing all the work, giving away their intellectual property rights, library buying research back, etc.) Campus conversations about access choices that involve costs and/or making tradeoffs are a perfect entry point into a discussion about Open Access. Those conversations could be groundwork for a workshop or colloquium on scholarly publishing. Heather Joseph and some of her staff (including SPARC Steering Committee members) are fairly willing to foot the bill to make a trip to visit a campus to help folks "get" this. Enough Oberlin Group members have passed OA that it might be possible to put together a faculty/librarian panel discussion from Oberlin Group member institutions that have passed resolutions and have the members spend some time with departments discussing in a breakout or workshop format. Such an event could then be leveraged into an ad hoc or standing committee that would take up and move forward the idea of a campus OA resolution.

Both of us encourage the administration and library faculty at Gustavus Adolphus to contact us with further questions—or to use us as a sounding board.

Megan Fitch
Diane Graves