

Friday, February 13, 2009, 9:30-11:00, Killian Hall

## Forces

### User Demands and Expectations

- Need to get ahead of expectation curve in service models
- More important seems to be anticipating expectations before users. For example, being a few steps ahead of the curve
- Be able to access a robust and rich digital information system
- We also need to obtain resources (print as well as electronic) that users don't yet realize they need
- Libraries will quickly become irrelevant if we do not address these
- If they can't get something good enough, they won't use the library – physical or virtual
- We exist to support the users, so their demands & expectations are of obvious importance. The only reason this isn't a "10" is that it's not possible to give them the world, immediately, 24x7, which is what some expect
- Better electronic access; website is not easy to use
- If we're going to appropriately serve our users, we need to be fully aware of and guided by their needs
- Users expect to see purchased materials and services be made available in the least amount of time, i.e. backlog problems of inaccessible items/materials
- If we can't help our users, they won't use us – we'll disappear
- Pay attention! Having the surveys on a 3-year schedule is great
- Important to consider and plan for future users as well as present users and expectations
- Some user demands may be better met by collaborative partnerships, (not only with other academic libraries but with public libraries) rather than pursuing fully, an in-house approach
- Have to be realistic about demands and where we can provide, i.e. can't have everything digital – just doesn't all exist
- Difficult to distinguish useful ideas from fads
- Sometimes users don't fully understand or know best
- Consider this a constraint. User demands and expectations change over time as true in past as in future
- Meeting expectations are important but we alone know what we can do and more so than what our users know
- Access to determine what is already being met and when to publicize (being done with recent survey) – periodic surveys to determine changes
- Interdisciplinary needs will create the demand for more eclectic knowledge in order to meet those expectations
- Communication of services and collaboration in all aspects of the Institute

### Search and Discovery

- Big changes ahead between subscription-free tools and resources
- Another 9. What good is having a world-class collection if the average user is unable to find anything? An alternative would be to not compete with organizations that do this well (Google & Amazon & WorldCat) and instead cooperate with them, using their search expertise and focusing our energy elsewhere
- Forget about playing catch-ups. We should adopt Amagoogle!
- Really difficult to do this well
- This has to be easy for users or they won't use our work
- Research assistance to individual students and teams will continue to be critical. Helping users find, navigate, use our own resources (and helping them find outside resources when necessary) continues to be important and much appreciated by our users
- MIT Google should point to library resources
- If we are going to hold MIT data, it needs to be extremely easy to access it all
- Very important. The most frustration I see from users is when the new Vera M-S fails to deliver content in a seamless or accurate way
- People think Google will find everything they need – need to provide more focused alternatives
- Will become more important when we have less collections

### Content Management

- This is increasing greatly and MIT needs to have an overall strategy – the Libraries can facilitate
- Our success and survival depends on how this works
- If we don't make it accessible in a format people can use, they won't use it
- The more we digitize, the more people will find what we have
- Non-print will increase in importance
- Again, this goes hand-in-hand with a user's ability to search and discover content. Librarians need trained managers of digital information to resolve problems and constantly keep system working
- Need to maintain quality meta-data and authority – control
- If we don't manage the content we can't guarantee access and use; need collaboration in Libraries as we proceed with DOME; decisions need to be made to insure consistent collection of information across projects and that fields are used for same information
- Get more people involved on decisions to use their skills or find new, willing person to achieve this force

### Content Provisioning

- An on-demand model may make it more efficient for us to meet user demands
- Some materials are not suited to digital only (at least right away)
- This gets our content in front of people; shift to digitize

- Electronic kiosks

### **Collaboration**

- Key to leveraging our resources
- Need to be responsive to these widespread needs
- Collaboration outside MIT – with academic and public libraries, not just through ILB and VirtCat and BLC) would be beneficial
- Necessary! It's efficient
- Collaborate with food services to set up café, Copytech for printing, A/V to approach technology and pedagogy, and researchers regarding their data needs
- MIT students in all fields do study together; this relates strongly to space
- Collaboration can provide more yield than working on our own, but I think we need to be very cautious about pairing with for-profits; the open-source community would provide us with much more flexibility
- Throughout all MIT and outside corporation and other libraries

### **Interdisciplinarity**

- Relationships with faculty and students are essential. We must be aware of their interdisciplinary work, but we also need groups with whom we can form close relationships. Should we reassign subject liaisons across to Centers/Labs instead of departments? I'm not sure. It's been fairly easy for me to become part of my department, but it has taken a few years
- We are already very much in “interdisciplinary” mode. This will continue
- Popular request with faculty
- Combining Libraries/collections would improve ease of access to materials as MIT becomes more interdisciplinary – including combining branches with their divisional library, but also combining divisional libraries
- Ongoing trend
- Make sure we don't lose staff subject expertise in your efforts to become more interdisciplinary
- It's going to happen with or without us
- Collaboration of management

### **Pedagogy**

- The library needs to play a central role in education and should build relationships with faculty to help foster that role, perhaps from the top down
- Changing needs in the classroom will affect collections and materials
- Management
- Clearly important to value MIT Libraries to the best of the Institute
- Collaboration is important here. Many companies have technology that can be used here instead of rebuilding
- Especially on the type of software available for accessing the materials
- We have made enormous strides in this area and will continue this direction
- Opportunity to provide interactive teaching and research materials

- I have little experience in this area, so really can't comment

**Space**

- We can survive without changing the space. This seems like a want, rather than a need
- Users are more interested in virtual “stacks”
- Comfortable, multi-use space with access to people who can help with information management
- If we provide more electronic access to our collections the need for space decreases. It is important but not crucial yet
- Changing space is expensive. How does this fit with priorities?
- Large in near-term; will diminish over time
- Becoming less important
- I do not want to see one, big, central library. I do not think that would best serve our diverse users
- Important as alternative
- We should really heed our users' demands when considering how to handle space
- Needs to be flexible to changing needs
- We must fill a very important need for learning spaces on campus
- Monumental for users
- The libraries' spaces don't feel like a central part of the university community in the way that it does on many college campuses
- This seems to be a huge priority for users
- I'd also like to add that we need to think about space for staff. It is unequal across different units and in some cases inadequate to get the job done
- Both user and staff space cannot expect staff to do their best work in space that is cramped, hot and badly laid out
- Make available fresh look and friendly space

Wednesday, February 18, 2009, 9:30-11:00, 66-144

## **Forces**

### **User Demands and Expectations**

- We need to communicate more effectively with our users. I hear “I didn’t know you offered that…” far too often
- Users are what really count! Do everything we can to meet their expectations!
- If users don’t perceive us as useful, pretty much nothing else will matter
- Provide more accessible and 24-hour services, learn more about how users do their work uniquely at MIT
- We have allocated very little money or staff to focus on this area – need to increase our investment here
- There needs to be a balance between what users (some users) want and what libraries can provide, given constraints on budget and staff shortages
- This obviously drives (or should) what the Libraries do. We still operate in a vacuum with a lot of our services
- The single most important factor
- Ask and keep asking
- Important not to ignore resources where content is needed because they are only available in print format (also applies to content provisioning)
- Collect more data

### **Search and Discovery**

- The Libraries need a “next generation” website and catalog – it is worth the cost to improve discovery and user impressions
- Need to identify and work toward a strategy for the next 1-5 years as longer-term solutions mature
- A lot of these forces are interrelated – I think it makes sense to think of them together (user demands and expectations, search and discovery, content management, content provisioning)
- Need to put Libraries search interfaces where users are
- Less places for users to learn
- Do we need to work on our own discovery tools or just piggyback on others?
- Better search tools
- I see this as a place for us to do less – let’s not put energy where we don’t have the ability to compete. Let’s instead do things that focus on what we offer that is unique
- The experience we provide with discovery services is our tangible product. Users are asking us to do better
- I agree with the concept completely, but I think that the examples are very weak. Amazon? YouTube?
- Text and MP3 media content to text and video audio-track to text

### **Content Management**

- Note: As you say, the need, to make born-digital material is an issue on its own, not necessarily stemming from the digitization of analog materials
- Make this a priority
- Develop a structure to digitize and manage content
- This is where we are farthest behind and will only hinder us more going into the future unless we make it a priority
- I rate this highly because I've heard it's an issue, more than that it's affected me
- Get DOME projects moving, involve community in choosing the content that gets digitized and collected
- Clips of course content, chunks of born-digital available to certificate holders
- Need digital preservation/curation strategy to move forward in this area

**Content Provisioning**

- Refocus print-intensive staff and resources towards digital
- More e-resources
- I'm not sure of the difference between this and content management, but again – similar to search and discovery – if someone else can do it, let's focus less on it
- Pay attention to the content – fly on the wall video is no video; look at near perfect, good content. High cost of delivery is not high cost capture driven; save money on post-capture steps

**Collaboration**

- This can provide some opportunities but also takes a lot of effort so may or may not increase our own flexibility
- Without the funds to improve our technologies, we need to make connections to move important projects forward – we are in the right place for these collaborations
- While I think this is very significant, Librarians as a whole are slow to see the need, or more accurately, to take action
- These are all very significant. The only reason I'd rate this slightly lower is that the need for collaboration has always been there
- Not clear on how we would establish useful and mutually beneficial partnerships; all forces are significant
- Put ourselves with others; become more connected to others
- Is this new? We already do this. Need to assess more honestly how these partnerships are working
- Videoconference to save travel

**Scholarly Communication**

- Continue what we're doing
- Continue to build on existing program

**Interdisciplinarity**

- Rethink our rigid lines between libraries and schools. It's less important nowadays

- Find another framework to do collections and selection work to map to MIT course needs
- I think this is consistently overstated

**Pedagogy**

- This is overrated – the category is called “pedagogy,” but the description only talks about technology, not teaching. Students are savvy enough to see through technology for technology’s sake. They want to know how it will improve what/how they learn
- Sage on the stage is not the capture mold to optimize. Synchronous classes over distance is a hard problem

**Space**

- Digital access can be put off to the user
- The Libraries need to upgrade old/dysfunctional spaces – provide more collaborative learning spaces and private study areas
- Make MIT Libraries’ spaces MIT spaces, so we don’t have to pour so many library resources into them when our transaction #s’ are down
- This one worries me – why do we need “libraries” to provide “multipurpose spaces?” IS&T, or the Institute, can do this without us
- Space reservation as part of website to facilitate group work – internal and external outreach
- More space needed for working with digital content, i.e. labs

Wednesday, February 18, 2009, 1:00-2:30, Killian Hall

## Forces

### User Demands and Expectations

- If we don't provide what they need they will go elsewhere...
- I think it's clear that user expectations are probably the most significant, as these are the users...obvious, but true
- Frequently poll users, and quickly respond with how we are working to meet their needs, along with our limitations
- What if we only had 2 locations – physical items and group space, and those were open 24/7?
- Continue to obtain online content – there's already a lot so keep moving in that direction
- Educate users how to find information
- We can't meet all expectations. Select most reasonable
- Concentrate on getting proper access of existing e-resources and reduce print resources
- Why else do we have a library?!
- Also need to be educated on where this is impossible or far-fetched
- More programmers! Better computer/tech. support
- More surveys/respond to students expectations
- Why else are we here?

### Search and Discovery

- Let the general search services go to those who do it well. Concentrate on providing deep access to specialized collections
- Put "blurbs" on YouTube and link to library collection to see full documents (when not bound by copyright)
- I imagine advances in this are tapering off. MIT Libraries should go along with industry
- Incorporate these into MIT Libraries resources and web presence
- If we want users to use our resources, we have to make them easier to find in line with the likes of Google
- Quick results with a few relevant choices matter more than comprehensive results. Could be a generational change
- Make our databases/catalogs more discoverable, syndicated, and harvestable in the big search tools that everyone uses
- Collaborations with these companies. Have we contacted the Cambridge Google office?
- Users have already gravitated to services like Google, Amazon
- Connect the Libraries site to the common search engines
- I actually believe that librarian persuasion around Google and YouTube, etc., is somewhat unfounded...It's about taking from these systems, but improving upon

them, making them more personalized and MIT-specific, not worrying that they will undermine and inevitably destroy our library

- Public services staff need to monitor the available tools and use them to communicate with users while highlighting historical materials that compliment those sources
- Long-term preservation born-digital
- Add “browsing” to force

### **Content Management**

- Get fast digitization process underway
- I do believe that this is significant. This is where we should focus our attention
- As media changes, old formats are unusable but not really old and irrelevant. Micro-cards = example, MIT reports
- Develop DOME
- The Libraries shouldn't be wholly dependant on digital sources – what happens when sites go down? Technology can fail, but print sources are always there. Don't forget about patrons who prefer books to computer screens – they do exist!
- This depends on how much other content holders do it themselves, e.g. societies, Google Books, archives
- Shift staff to more digitization projects, instead of storage/binding, etc.
- The technology exists to put multimedia files (sound recordings, films) online. This is a big future trend, I believe
- Be careful to choose digital versions that will not deprave – don't automatically toss hard copy

### **Content Provisioning**

- We've made great strides towards this in recent times
- There is a lot of competition here from the for-profit sector of the economy
- Use email attachments, download capability

### **Collaboration**

- I agree with the opportunity and benefit, but I'm not seeing the “necessity.” Do you mean our very survival depends on building close allies?
- We need to do more with BLC. Help them move to OhioLink model
- Budget restraint may force MIT to become more insular or force collaborations
- Allow staff the flexibility to collaborate (they already do)
- Perhaps we are already doing this and it is not as important a force moving forward

### **Scholarly Communication**

- I'm not sure I understand or agree with your foundation. I'm not getting the predicate – why does this call for more “data mining and knowledge management?” I think what is called for is an advocacy role for Libraries and experimentation in new forms of scholarly publication

- I'm wondering if a lot of what is under this description also fits or fits better under provisioning

### **Interdisciplinarity**

- Yes – but this doesn't mean we should get rid of subject specialists. They're more important than ever. Collection development can no longer be done in separate and competing domains
- We need to rethink discipline-specific spaces
- More money for staff training
- This may happen naturally as we attend to other forces

### **Pedagogy**

- Where's "information literacy" here? Training of students and researchers?
- I think there's much more to this than using technology to deliver material
- Need to work more closely with AMPS on these issues and make course support seamless
- Let other MIT groups take the lead; be willing to collaborate and implement
- Can be done in collaboration – but an important force

### **Space**

- Again, not just technology, but that is a big part of us
- What if we organized space by function/topics? Tech assistance, data services, journals and print, etc.?
- Let other organizations worry about technology rich spaces
- I think this is least significant because patrons rely on the physical space of the library less and less
- More off-sites storage/decreasing to allow for more space for technology
- Make power outlets more convenient; increase both quiet and group space
- Get money
- Combine collections for ESL!
- Stop being the ones to provide spaces and let other parts of MIT provide study space (since we have to stop something)

Comment on process written by one individual: "This is not data – it's opinion. Who is measuring? In the last week, faculty wax poetic on Harvard's Widner, PhD students complained about loss of ability to browse books and journals, and undergrads searching for hard copy of book when we have only electronically."