

STRATEGIC PLAN 2000-2010

J. ROBERT VAN PELT LIBRARY

I. VISION

The Michigan Tech Library will be a recognized leader in integrating information technologies, services and competencies into the teaching/learning and research/scholarship of the university; in promoting the innovative synthesis, creation, application and diffusion of knowledge; and in furthering both the educational and research missions of the university and the economic and cultural goals of the state and broader society.

II. SWOT

Strengths

- Highly competent and motivated staff
- Broad range of user-centered services
- Advanced technological infrastructure in terms of library management system
- Global access to resources beyond the library's walls
- Instruction program that integrates information competencies
- Faculty involvement in library resource selection
- Archives and Copper Country Historical collections recognized as nationally significant
- Government depository program that provides a broad collection of current and historically significant state and federal documents
- Active Friends of the Library organization
- Participation in state, national and international collaborative and consortial initiatives

Weaknesses

- Staff: insufficient number, inadequate ratio of support staff to professional staff, demand for rapidly evolving skills
- Inappropriate instruction facility that impedes active learning
- Collection: size, currency, depth, and format
- Inadequate bibliographic control and intellectual access to collections in all formats
- Inadequate and inappropriate physical facility and infrastructure
- Inconsistent level of financial support to sustain new and ongoing library resources that support curricular and research needs

Opportunities

- Digital information environment
- Developing standards for formatting and accessing electronic data
- Evolving nature of scholarly research and communication
- Environmental conditions that encourage collaboration and consortia

- NCA (North Central Association), other advisory organizations, reports and surveys that recommend strengthening library resources
- Global economy requiring information competency
- Governor Engler's MITC (Michigan Information Technology Commission) Report calling for leadership by higher education and libraries in training Michigan citizens for life-long learning and information technology skills
- Trends toward distance education and life-long learning
- Need for information services provided to the University's technology partners
- Increase in philanthropic activity nationwide

Threats

- Ambiguity of intellectual property and copyright laws for digital environment
- Rapidly increasing costs and proliferation of information
- Information viewed as a commodity
- Costs of, and rapid rate of, technological change
- Preservation issues in digital environments
- Popular myths of electronic future
- Reduction in pool size of librarians; availability of more professional opportunities outside libraries
- Low levels of state support, and controlled tuition increases
- New Carnegie ranking criteria

III. SNAPSHOT

Current Status

Ranking

One comprehensive measure of the effectiveness and sustainability of a library program is the trade-offs each library makes in allocating its general fund budget in the pursuit of its mission. Appendix 1 shows specific variables illustrating these trade-offs for the 15 state-supported institutions. The data was reported in the 1998 IPEDS (Integrated Post Secondary Education Data System: Academic libraries.) Additional rankings of low, medium and high are relative to expenditure levels at libraries in the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). All ARL libraries are classified as Carnegie Research I.

It is particularly important to note that the percentage of budget spent by Michigan Tech's library for journals is the highest in the state and ranks with the highest percentage spent by ARL libraries. Michigan Tech's emphasis on engineering and science mandates as comprehensive a journal collection as possible. The current journal collection falls short of documented user expectations for subject coverage, even though journals are our single largest budget expenditure. Few dollars remain to support disciplines that rely heavily on books for their research and curricula. As a result, the Michigan Tech library ranks last in the state, and below the ARL low, for book expenditures as percent of total library expenditures.

Over 53% of our budget supports materials: journals, books and electronic information. This is the highest in the state, and near the high (58%), for ARL libraries. The trade off is less money for the support of technology, value-added services and other operating costs. In addition, Michigan Tech's library places dead last in the state, and lower than the ARL low in the percentage of total library expenditures for salaries and wages.

At this time it is not possible to use the IPEDS statistics to compare Michigan Tech's library with the libraries at our peer institutions. Appendix 2 shows statistics compiled primarily from the American Library Directory 1900-2000 which gives a general idea of the staff, collection, and budget size of the libraries at our peer institutions. These statistics were not necessarily reported in the same way by each of the institutions.

The IPEDS figures document an imbalance in our resources based on our fundamental mission to provide timely, accurate information with an emphasis in engineering and sciences. Reallocation of the existing budget only endangers that mission further. As a result, bringing the library to Research I status and supporting Michigan Tech's move toward recognition as a national university will require a substantial increase in institutional support for the library. Specific needs, such as additional collections, space, and staff are documented in the NCA Library Self Study as well as in the library's Program Statement (available online at www.lib.mtu.edu).

Money to fund these costs needs to come from sources other than regular library funding. The percentage of the university's budget spent to support the library needs to be increased to a level more consistent with that of other state-supported institutions in Michigan. Most of these libraries are actively engaged in fund-raising activities. We have proposed a half-time advancement position in the library and will need to have that position grow to full-time if we are to meet our endowment goals. The university's capital campaign plus the need to raise money for the Center for Integrated Learning and Information Technology (the Center) makes it very difficult over the next few years to build the endowments necessary to support the collections at a research level. This is truly a challenge.

There are currently three small fund-raising activities that provide fiscal support outside the general fund budget: (1) the Student Honorees program in which parents or friends of seniors are asked to purchase a book for the library as a graduation present; (2) the annual Telethon carried out on our behalf by Advancement; and (3) the Friends of the Van Pelt Library Annual Book Sale. These activities will need to bring in more money in the future.

Collections

The Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) is the primary professional body responsible for codifying, reviewing and maintaining standards for college and research libraries. The standards address areas of library operation necessary to effectively support academic programs: mission, collections, organization of materials, staff, services, facilities, administration and budget. Several portions of the Standards are used in the following sections as the basis for quantitative evaluation of the Michigan Tech Library.

Formula A from the Standards measures collection size. The underlying premise is that it is not possible to have a quality collection without adequate quantity in relation to the academic characteristics of the parent institution. The Michigan Tech Library's grade is "D" based on the size of our main collection.

The Library holds about 808,000 volumes including the government documents depository collection. The non-government documents volumes number 358,910. These volumes represent roughly 130,000 unique titles. Using numbers from IPEDS, this number is only slightly above the title holdings at Lake Superior State (107,429), which is the lowest in the state.

A report submitted to the Provost in December 1995, outlined one-time and ongoing costs to bring the Michigan Tech library collection to Research II level (new Research I). In current market dollars, the one-time cost to upgrade the collection would be over \$3,100,000. The library base budget would require an increase of \$970,000 for acquisitions and staff, adjusted annually to accommodate the rapid inflation in information costs regardless of format. The Standards recommend a 5% growth rate until an institution reaches an "A" level. Achieving this rate of growth requires budget increases in addition to keeping pace with inflation.

The Michigan Tech Library has set a course to leapfrog over rectifying collection deficiencies in paper to build comprehensive digital resources. However, electronic formats have not generated budget relief as early predictions suggested. It is also recognized that print collections continue to be important for specific disciplines and specific types of users, and that electronic formats are in development and will remain developmental for many years to come. Thus, collection format is based on several factors including user needs, availability, and budget considerations.

The Michigan Tech Archives and Copper Country Historical Collections is recognized as nationally significant for manuscript records documenting copper mining in the Upper Great Lakes region. Archival holdings include heavily-used industrial technology, regional history, and genealogy collections and are linked to the State Archives of Michigan through a formal manuscript depository agreement. Archival holdings are not included in Formula A calculations, since the mission of an archives is not necessarily the same as that of a university library.

The Michigan Tech Library houses the second oldest federal government documents depository in the state and includes a wide array of historical documents that predate the University. The highlights of this collection include hundreds of 19th century serials set volumes, a far-reaching series of census materials, and broad coverage of the publications of the departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, and Interior. The library also holds a collection of state government documents that predate Michigan's statehood. The government depository has a mandate to serve the First Congressional District of Michigan, giving this collection a featured role in our service to the surrounding community.

Services

According to the ACRL Standards, libraries offer services that support the academic programs of the institution and encourage optimal library use. The needs of the users become the driving force when designing services for a specific academic institution. In 1999, the Library staff employed a

UF-VA (user framed-value added) process to identify the major user groups existing within the Michigan Tech community. By extensively interviewing faculty, students and staff, broad patterns of information seeking, format preferences and work styles were identified. Development of new services and refinements of existing services will be based on the patterns that emerged during this process.

Instruction: In the academic years 1996/97 to 1998/99, the number of individuals served by the library's instruction program in one year ranged from 4,270 to 4,990. In the same time period, the number of groups ranged from 229 to 295, and the number of hours of delivered instruction ranged from a low of 310 to a high of 340. Instruction is delivered primarily by four librarians, who also provide reference service and perform various administrative functions.

The majority of the instruction sessions are course-integrated. However, the library also provides the following value-added services: two one-credit courses, large-group general orientations to the library and its services, one-on-one orientations to the resources of a particular discipline, and individualized instruction. Workshops and seminars are offered in both the drop-in and pre-registration formats. The participants in the library's instruction program are primarily undergraduates, but graduate students, faculty, and staff also benefit from instructional offerings tailored to their specific needs. Due to the regular increase in library staff workloads, the number of instructional sessions delivered to area schools and local community groups has been reduced.

During these same academic years, the total number of general and government document reference interactions ranged from a low of 10,317 to a high of 12,369. These were either in-person or telephone interactions. While the number of reference questions received via the library web site and its reflib-l has increased recently, the number remains minimal in comparison to the number of on-site interactions. As we purchase more and more electronic resources the need for educating users for the information age increases.

The increase in the number of hits to the library web site is not known at this time but there is much anecdotal evidence that shows this value-added site now minimizes the impact of time and location constraints on the library's delivery not only of library-generated, proprietary, and Internet resources, but also of services such as course reserve, and interlibrary loan. In addition, it has poised the library to deliver resources and services in support of distance teaching and learning. These new services have not replaced the need for the traditional services.

Document Delivery: Through document delivery and ILL, our users have access to information from libraries around the world. The Library has evolved beyond the basic service of just pointing our users to appropriate resources. By employing cutting edge information technology like Ariel, we are moving information delivery to the user's desktop. We continue to add new technologies, upgrade staff positions and expand our services. As the volume and format of information proliferate, we are developing consortial agreements and shifting our services from ownership to providing information at the time of need.

Our staff at all levels serves on statewide committees that deal with interlibrary loan and document delivery. The staff also serves on the boards of organizations engaged in cooperative

purchasing and delivery of electronic information. Given our remote location there is not much more that can be done to share services with other libraries without a statewide ground document delivery service funded by the state. We are also active in working with the library organization that is trying to bring this about.

Usage figures for all services can be found in the library's Annual Report, 1998/99, which can be found on the library's web page.

Assessment

The J. R. Van Pelt Library employs both quantitative and qualitative assessment methods. We rely on the analysis of standard quantitative statistics to track usage as a means of assessing value to the institution. Statistical data is gathered for gate counts; for user head counts; and for reference, instruction, circulation, reserve, and interlibrary loan transactions. It is also used to document use of the library's web-based and digital resources, such as its online catalog and digital indexes. Statistics such as these are available in the library's annual report and NCA self-study.

In addition to quantitative measures, many of the library's service areas, such as instruction and circulation, are evaluated qualitatively using formal and informal feedback mechanisms, including the distribution of survey forms. These and larger dimensions of the library's infrastructure and service mission have also been assessed through focus groups and user surveys. Most significantly, the user-framed, value-added (UF-VA) survey of library constituents conducted in 1999 assessed the impact of library programs and identified areas of user need. Outcomes from the UF-VA survey are captured in the library's current program statement, which in turn informed the program statement for the Center.

Assessment remains a central issue for the library profession, not only as it pertains to the evaluation of services, but also as it pertains to the measurement of information competencies/literacies associated with the delivery of library instruction programs. As at many institutions, at Michigan Tech no official university-wide guidelines have been established regarding the attainment of specific information competencies/literacies, although some have been targeted by departments, instructors, and librarians within the context of specific instruction sessions.

In its long-range plan, the Van Pelt library has included strategic initiatives targeted at establishing more aggressive methods 1) of evaluating library infrastructures and services, and 2) of measuring learning outcomes associated with students' attainment of specific information competencies/literacies. These initiatives to identify and determine appropriate measurement mechanism, especially to assess information competencies and other qualitative areas, will be based on cross-disciplinary cooperation and intellectual exchange, and will require consensus building.

Staff

High quality staff is an essential prerequisite for all successful programs. To keep pace with growing demands of the information age, it is important that we develop and support a state-of-the-art information infrastructure. The key asset in an information services organization is its staff. It is essential to develop a staff whose skills and knowledge are continually being enhanced and to invest in that staff by providing training opportunities to keep pace with growing demands.

Formula B from the ACRL Standards determines the number of librarians required based on enrollment and collection size. Commentary accompanies the Standards emphasizing that additional services, programs, and auxiliary programs beyond the examples given, require additional staff. Formula B indicates that Michigan Tech's library should employ 16.359 librarians to support the number of students enrolled and the size of the collection. Support staff shall be no less than 65% of the total library staff, excluding student assistants. According to the formula the library staff ought to total 46.74. Additional staff necessary to maintain and provide access to the Government Documents collection, the Archives, and for library systems administration is not included in this formula. The current library staff, including the out-of-formula positions, numbers 34, equivalent to a grade of "C." Removing the current out-of-formula positions, results in a staff size of 25, which equates to a "D" for library staff maintaining basic services.

Diversity: Over the past ten years the library has worked very hard to make its collections support diverse user populations. In addition, staff at all levels participated in programs such as the NCBI (National Coalition Building Institute) leadership workshops. With 4S grant funding the library conducted a pilot program of Peer Information Navigators. The three students employed in this program included two African-American males and a Caucasian female with strong ties to the international student body. The goal of the program was to provide peer outreach to campus minority populations.

Our staff is as diverse as we can make it given our location: we are 78% female and currently have two staff members from the former Soviet Republic. Two staff are bilingual. We will continue to add to our collection materials that reflect diversity and will add diversity to our staff whenever we can make the opportunity.

Scholarly Activities: Although not currently a requirement of their employment, the librarians and professional staff of the library pursue a variety of scholarly activities. In addition to membership in state, regional, national, and international professional organizations, several of the staff hold leadership positions in these organizations. In the recent five years, Michigan Tech librarians and other staff have made presentations at national conferences, leveraged beta-testing work on the Voyager automation system for national attention, and pursued a variety of publication opportunities.

As of 1981, receiving academic appointment has no longer been an option for Michigan Tech librarians. The withdrawal of this option removed all formal expectations and reward systems based on research and scholarship without putting an alternative structure in place. One requirement for Michigan Tech and its library to be nationally recognized is the creation of a

replacement structure that states performance expectations; defines options for promotion and continuing appointment; and provides a system of supports, compensations and rewards. Such structures already exist among our peer institutions; one could be phased in at Michigan Tech over a period of years. When established, it would have a positive impact on librarian recruitment, retention, and professional achievement.

As with other departments on campus, the library staff have an excellent relationship with the Information Technology Department and have participated in many cooperative programs with IT staff including the implementation of the Voyager system. This relationship is important to us because it helps us to achieve our goals of providing value-added services and digital information resources so that the students and faculty can succeed in their academic and professional lives.

Space

In the 34 years since the current library building opened, it has had no significant renovations or enlargements. Currently this building must accommodate over 730,000 volumes as well as the staff and the technology hardware necessary to serve the University's 6,200 students and 400 faculty. The benchmark statistics compiled using the ACRL Standards provide an objective measure of the library's current status. Formula C measures the spaces necessary for users and for staff. According to this formula, the Michigan Tech library should have 148,160 ft² of assignable space and 1,571 seats. The current library building is 81,000 ft² with only 49,340 ft² of assignable space, leaving a shortfall of 98,820 ft². The library's 640 seats bring us in 931 seats short. Our grade for space using the ACRL Standards is "F".

These quantitative deficiencies are compounded by qualitative concerns. The current facility provides an inadequate preservation environment for the library's collections. Inconsistent control of the building's temperature and humidity has an adverse impact on print and archival materials. Inadequate air circulation and ventilation endanger the well-being of the library's computer equipment and its staff. The building's third floor, home of the Archive's manuscript stacks, has suffered repeated ceiling leaks. These preservation issues pose a significant threat to the University's investment in its library's collections.

Our aging facility also hinders an efficient institutional incorporation of evolving digital technologies. While the digital revolution offers opportunities to limit the growth of the library's print collections, this transformation also has its own physical space requirements. Space is needed not only for behind-the-scenes technologies (servers, routers, etc. and the staff to maintain them), but also for the public terminals and the wiring to link these public and technical components. Furthermore, evolving digital technologies have increased the need for formal, hands-on instruction programs to improve the information competencies of our users. The library's current classroom space is inadequate for this purpose, and funding is being sought to reallocate a portion of the library's ground floor for the creation of a new wired classroom. The library has repeatedly reconfigured unsuitable spaces to its best advantage, unfortunately we are now regularly confronted with the building's design limitations and are encountering serious limitations for any further improvements.

To move our vision forward, the library needs new or renovated physical spaces to house our staff and to facilitate our services. One possible avenue toward these goals would be the development of the Center. This project would renovate the existing library facility and provide an additional 56,235 ft² of space, bringing the total assignable space to 105,575 ft². Although the Center was not funded in the state's 2000 capital outlay, the project remains Michigan Tech's primary capital initiative. The delay of new library space will continue to impact the library's ability to improve services and implement the vision outlined in this document. The library will continue to reevaluate and reallocate available spaces if possible, but will be unable to simply create large amounts of new space. These shortcomings are likely to impact undergraduate students most, particularly the inadequate study and collaborative workspaces. Securing external grant money or corporate sponsors for larger projects seems a temporary fix to significant space and infrastructure challenges. One would question, as well, whether such funding would be better spent towards a new building which could address the level of change required in the both of the quality and quantity of spaces.

Off-site storage: The library currently houses 70,000 volumes in unsuitable off-site storage. This space is currently filled to capacity. We have searched for other spaces on and off campus but have found no existing spaces that could accommodate either the floor load brought by a large collection of books or the environmental needs of our collection. The construction costs of a new suitable off-site storage area would not be significantly less than the costs of a new on-site facility and would pose significant disadvantages for the library's users. An off-site facility would need to be capable of housing at least 100,000 volumes. Such a facility would require approximately 4,800 ft² of high capacity compact shelving and would cost between \$432,000 to \$840,000 just for the collection space. The necessary support spaces would be additional. Our users have told us time after time in library surveys that the thing they dislike the most about the library is having to wait for materials from our current off-site storage unit.

Program/Activities

1. Must do/have to have:
 - Collections of information
 - Instruction program
 - Circulation / document delivery services / interlibrary loan
 - Cataloging / organization services
 - Reference and research services

2. Good base that can be expanded:
 - Archives & historical collections
 - Federal & Michigan depository programs
 - Access to global information
 - Consortial information licensing and purchasing
 - Information technology infrastructure
 - Staff commitment to innovation
 - Customized and personalized service
 - Assessment program

3. No-base programs that need to be started:
 - Scholarly electronic publishing program
 - Electronic reserves
 - Fee-based information services to local businesses
 - Advanced information technology campus facility for repurposing and reformatting information
4. Areas to be de-emphasized:
 - Certain types of paper collections
 - Paper based course reserve activities

Prioritized Goals

1. Library facilities: Provide and maintain appropriate physical space (including network connectivity, equipment, etc.) for library users, collections, value-added services, and staff.

Note: As students and faculty work from a variety of locations to which information can be delivered, the library remains the university's most essential provider of information content and its primary crossroads for intellectual exchange.
2. Collection and information access: Acquire or make accessible, via the most usable and cost-effective formats and user-centered strategies, the materials, services, and information necessary to support both the undergraduate teaching/learning and the advanced research/scholarship of the university.

Note: Unless funds for acquisitions and access keep pace with rising costs, the quality, usability and relevance of the collection will further decline.
3. Special Collections: Acquire, organize, or otherwise make accessible in appropriate formats, to campus and non-campus users, the distinct holdings of the Michigan Tech Archives and Copper Country Historical Collections, and the collections of the university's federal and state of Michigan government documents depository.

Note: It is critical to preserve unique collections, and to provide the detailed content descriptions that facilitate effective digital access and retrieval.
4. User education: Create and adequately staff instructional environments, resources, and programs that support the acquisition of information competencies (identify, access, evaluate, use accurately and creatively, communicate, etc.) necessary for user independence, academic achievement, life long learning, and professional accomplishment.

Note: Attaining information literacy is an expected outcome of both undergraduate and graduate education in the information age. Assuring that MTU graduates attain these competencies requires campus-wide commitment, collaboration, and support.

5. Services: Demonstrate leadership by providing a tailored mix of traditional and progressive services delivered by friendly, knowledgeable staff and supported by intuitive, seamless technology interfaces.
Note: Whether in the library or off-site, whether in person or via electronic communication, users must have ready access to user-friendly, service-oriented staff, resources, and technologies.
6. Organization: Employ, develop, fairly compensate, and sustain a well-trained, highly competent, ethnically diverse, dedicated, and service-oriented staff, organized for maximum flexibility and efficiency.
Note: A diverse, competent staff is the key advantage of a user-centered library committed to providing multicultural users with value-added services. Staffing levels should meet recognized standards.
7. Access: provide state-of-the-art integrated library systems that offer students and faculty with user-friendly, seamless, value-added, comprehensive, and reliable access to information resources at any place or time. .
Note: Assuring all members of the university community have reliable 24x7 information access requires continuously upgrading communication and information infrastructures and technologies.
8. Assessment: Develop a systematic assessment program aimed at measuring the quality, impact, and effectiveness of library programs, services, interfaces, and technologies.
Note: Ongoing assessment is central to the provision of effective, progressive UF-VA services.
9. Funding: Achieve adequate funding through university and external resources to sustain library collections, staffing requirements, and services, and to permit capital investment for new technologies and facilities.
Note: To effectively fulfill its role as central information provider and intellectual crossroads of the university, the library must be provided with a sustained budgetary environment consistent with achieving established goals and objectives.

III. Plan 2000-2010

Strategies:

1. Secure new physical space
2. Address short term space needs
3. Collect and maintain appropriate and adequate information resources
4. Balance ownership and access of information resources
5. Continually renew instructional program
6. Implement UF-VA enhanced services
7. Expand recruitment and professional development efforts
8. Adopt innovative information technologies

9. Integrate assessment program into library decision making
10. Obtain external funding

Time line:

2000/01

1. Plan transition to new models of service
2. Continue to plan for the Center
3. Implement temporary space allocations
4. Continue planning for shift from mainly print to mainly electronic
5. Plan improvements to access and delivery
6. Seek outside funding for Archives special projects
7. Continue to improve staff and public equipment
8. Revamp program to support
9. Continue and expand fund raising activities
10. Survey manuscripts collections
11. Investigate potential digital initiatives
12. Implement collection review
13. Assess usage of map collection
14. Monitor new information technologies for potential implementation
15. Initiate an internal dialog about professional advancement and compensation resulting in a report
16. Inventory of off-site storage
17. Plan electronic reserves
18. Continue to work with Friends of Library

2001/02

1. Plan move to Center
2. Initiate knowledge management initiatives
3. Hire additional staff for new services
4. Implement and evaluate electronic reserves
5. Develop collection management plan
6. Develop Archives Collection Guide
7. Implement Archives special projects
8. Continue refining and assessing instruction program to include outreach to graduate students and faculty
9. Pilot selective digital initiatives
10. Establish policy for treatment of rare items
11. Initiate external dialog about professional advancement and compensation
12. Encourage and support staff development and professional activities
13. Hire half time Advancement Officer
14. Assess current automated library management system

2002/03

1. Move to Center with minimal inconvenience to users
2. Assess new service initiatives

3. Continue staff retooling/training
4. Plan GIS (Geographic Information System) initiatives
5. Plan participation in cooperative digitizing initiatives
6. Develop processing plan to improve access to manuscript collections
7. Hire additional Librarian with science and engineering expertise
8. Upgrade or replace all or part of automated library management system

2003/04

1. Assess Center in terms of space, access, service capabilities, user/staff satisfaction
2. Implement any needed changes in service based on assessment
3. Continue transformation from print to electronic
4. Implement GIS initiatives
5. Implement cooperative digitizing initiatives
6. Conduct UF-VA surveys to update our understanding of how students, faculty, and staff use and manage information, and generate and communicate new knowledge.
Phase one: on-campus populations
7. Continue to plan for and implement changes due to newly developed technologies

2004/05

1. Implement any possible/necessary changes in Center based on assessment
2. Continue GIS initiatives
3. Continue digitizing initiatives
4. Analyze results of UF-VA and consider implications for services
5. Expand duties of Advancement Officer to fulltime

2005/06

1. Conduct UF-VA surveys Phase two: off-campus student/faculty populations
2. Continue transition from all print to mostly electronic
3. Plan for phase two of library
4. Hire second archivist for processing backlog manuscript collections

2006/07

1. Analyze Phase two of UF-VA survey. Use results to shape services to off-campus populations
2. Evaluate options for library management system

2007/08

1. Implement recommendations for library management software

2008/09

1. Repeat UF-VA surveys, Phase one: on-campus populations

2009/10

1. Begin transforming services based on results of UF-VA analysis and availability of technologies

IV. BENCHMARKING

1. Library Peers

- a. Rensselaer – allows us to stretch to meet collection size and quality, space, services, and staff but is close enough that we can hope to reach those goals
- b. Lehigh – a bigger stretch than Rensselaer but still possible to reach quality and service goals
- c. Colorado School of Mines – makes us work to stay ahead
- d. Georgia Tech – Except for services we cannot come close to meeting quality goals
- e. University of Missouri, Rolla – in terms of collection size and quality, services, and staff they offer nothing we look at for qualitative measure

2. “Best Practices” Institutions

- a. Carnegie Mellon – for ways they are shaping the collection in the electronic world and balancing ownership vs. delivery
- b. Case Western – for “user-framed – value-added” process
- c. State University of New York, Plattsburgh – for campus-wide focus on information literacy and innovative use of the web, course management software, and other technologies to bring information and instruction services to their users
- d. Georgia Tech – for ways they provide access to both print and electronic government documents; Library of Michigan for access to Michigan documents
- e. Rice – e-reserves and other access service
- f. Western Michigan University – for bibliographic control of manuscript holdings; The Clarke Historical Library at Central Michigan University serves as a model for web-based access to archival information

American Library Directory, 1999-2000

Appendix 2

	Colorado School of Mines	Georgia Institute of Technology	University of Missouri - Rolla	Lehigh University	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	Michigan Technological University
Staff						
Professional	8	52	10	65		17
Clerical	12	62	17	65		17
Student Assisant	70	6		35		98
Enrollment	2,808	13,036	4,720	5,500		6,302
Faculty	176	1,829	400	410		393
Holdings						
Book Titles	150,000		158,875			
Bound Volumes	281,232	2,002,141	372,804	1,148,000	474,611	352,238
Periodicals Subscription	2,000	14,407	1,301	4,000	3,112	5,138
Government Documents				617,000	185,000	447,257
Budget	\$2,003,840	\$9,107,104	\$2,262,724	\$10,542,637	\$3,249,689	
Expenditures						
Books	\$156,000	\$992,662	\$207,023	\$521,524	\$292,498	\$3,387,021
Periodicals Subscription	\$490,000	\$2,944,733	\$661,248	\$1,701,105	\$888,575	
Electronic		\$220,000	\$137,990	\$243,578	\$233,527	
Salaries	\$686,272		\$751,753	\$4,794,420	\$1,096,367	\$1,360,677

* Number groups books, periodicals, and electronic together for a materials expenditure total.

Added Analysis Using Selected Variables

The high, median and low percentages and ratios enclosed in parentheses below each question are taken from the "Analysis of Selected Variables of University Libraries," in the ARL STATISTICS 1996-97, p. 46. The high, median and low figures indicate the range as well as the midpoint for ARL's 110 university library members.

	CMU	EMU	FSU	GVSU	LSSU	MSU	MTU	NMU	OU	SVSU	UM-AA	UM-D	UM-F	WMU	WSU	AVERAGE	Average without MSU, WSU, UM-AA
1. Professional Staff as Percent of Total Staff (High-43 Median-26 Low-18)	47%	42%	40%	70%	33%	21%	37%	35%	38%	39%	24%	58%	48%	22%	32%	39%	42%
2. Support Staff (line 5) as Percent of Total Staff (High-75 Median-48 Low18)	48%	40%	34%	2%	30%	41%	36%	28%	41%	25%	51%	15%	28%	40%	39%	33%	31%
3. Student Assistant Staff as Percent of Total Staff (High-49 Median-24 Low-0.4)	5%	18%	26%	28%	37%	38%	27%	37%	20%	36%	24%	27%	24%	38%	29%	28%	27%
4. Ratio of Professional to Support Staff (Excluding Students) (High-1.9:1 Median-0.6:1 Low-0.2:1)	1:1	1:1	1.2:1	37:1	1.1:1	0.5:1	1:1	1.3:1	0.9:1	1.6:1	0.5:1	3.9:1	1.7:1	0.6:1	0.8:1	3.6:1	4.4:1
5. Ratio of ILL Items Loaned to Items Borrowed (High-13.4:1 Median-1.6:1 Low-0.5:1)	0.9:1	0.6:1	2.6:1	1:1	0.8:1	1.7:1	0.5:1	0.5:1	0.5:1	0.7:1	2.3:1	0.6:1	0.7:1	1.1:1	3.3:1	1.2:1	0.9:1
6. Serials Expenditures as Percent of Materials Expenditures (High-83 Median-63 Low-38)	20%	66%	80%	69%	78%	67%	83%	69%		70%	56%	63%	63%	65%	59%	65%	66%
7. Monograph Expenditures as Percent of total Library Expenditures (High-54 Median-28 Low-12)	70%	29%	18%	25%	17%	23%	11%	23%	90%	24%	31%	36%	30%	30%	28%	32%	34%
8. Materials Expenditures as Percent of Total Library Expenditures (High-58 Median-38 Low-25)	41%	29%	34%	29%	28%	37%	53%	32%	39%	29%	43%	29%	41%	40%	34%	36%	35%
9. Salaries and Wages as Percent of Total Library Expenditures (High-61 Median-48 Low-35)	42%	59%	57%	36%	58%	47%	32%	54%	45%	56%	46%	60%	53%	48%	48%	49%	50%
10. Expenditures for Electronic Information Resources (Including Serials) as Percent of Materials Expenditures	8%	12%	12%	6%	6%	9%	8%	9%			10%	18%	17%	9%		10%	10%