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I

n February we featured articles on the many dimensions of reading in a digital age. There were more articles than we could publish at one time; therefore, this month is our second themed issue on this crucial and challenging topic. We continue to explore ways in which reading is being bolstered, reappraised, and reimagined in our communities. Brenda Boshele and Brian P. Hall, in their piece, “Building, Sustaining, and Transitioning the College Reader: Going from a Shared Experience to Sharing the Experience” describe various strategies that the Reading Center at Cuyahoga Community College employs to develop literacy, such as annotation modeling, picture books, and the “Say, Means, Matter” technique to develop better analytical skills. Ultimately, say the authors, “We are not just building a strategy for literacy success for individual students within the confines of the college environment. We are providing the tools and supports to sustain and transition literacy successes beyond our circle of influence and into the circles of influence that our students have within their homes and communities.”

Dede Elrobeh, Cindy Ortega, and Renee Smith, who work in the Glendale Community College GCCReads program, in their piece, “GCCReads: Creating Community Through Reading” describe a collaborative effort between the College Library and the Reading faculty to aid students who are underprepared for college. The overall goal of the program “was to increase academic preparedness and persistence through the fostering of leisure reading and campus engagement among developmental reading students.” The highly collaborative program fostered mentor/mentee relationships, outreach with the community, making reading fun, and promoting literacy. Student success is perennially difficult to define, but comments such as “I read my favorite chapters over and over again when I used to feel gloomy...I have recommended this book to lots of my friends” are clear signs of success of this program.

David M. Durant, in his piece “Resistance is Not Futile: Why Print Collections Still Matter in the Digital Age,” thoughtfully argues that in our era of ubiquitous screen reading we shouldn’t view print as inevitably destined to disappear. He challenges the notion that print is no longer desired or valuable as a form of knowledge and learning, and that different formats are essentially interchangeable with little impact on the user. He argues that viewing “…print’s disappearance as ‘inevitable’ not only flies in the face of much of the evidence, but constitutes nothing more than a reductionist, self-fulfilling prophecy. Inevitability is a choice, one most libraries would be well-advised not to make.”

If Rumors Were Horses

The past few months have been hectic. In the College of Charleston Addlestone Library, we have been dealing with many interviews replacing retiring librarians. Plus it seems like everyone caught some sort of sickness or other. But it’s now spring/summer and we have made all the new hires so things are looking up!

We have been able to secure new meeting space in the Gaillard Center which is about five blocks east on Calhoun Street from Marion Square and the Francis Marion hotel, only a few blocks from downtown Marriott Courtyard on Meeting and Calhoun. The Center was supposed to open in May for Spoleto but the opening was delayed. The grand opening is now scheduled for October 18. The Gaillard Center is a state-of-the-art facility with a performance hall that seats 1800-2000 people and six large breakout rooms. We will still use the continued on page 6
Greetings from Charleston at the cusp of summer! It is hot as the dickens already. Yesterday it was 100 degrees! Still was an exciting weekend. We had the baptism of grandson George Wilton Jacks and a house full of company. Lots of cooking and cleaning! Got a great mandarin passion fruit cake from Saffron’s. Have you ever been there? Not far from the Gaillard Center!

Toni Nix, my fabulous, unequaled editor and layout person, wanted to know why I was a nervous nellie. I told her it was because I was always trying to figure out if the guest edited issues would come together okay. And this time I also had company coming to complicate my nervousness. I should not have been nervous. This issue was no problem whatsoever. Tony Horava has done his usual spectacular job on this one—“Reading in a Digital Age: Issues and Opportunities — Part Two.” There are articles by Brenda Boshela and Brian P. Hall, Dedra Elrobeh, Cindy Ortega and Renee Smith, David Durant, Herman A. Peterson, Anne Burke, Janette Hughes and Renee Sanson, and Tony Horava himself. Our Op Ed by Bob Holley is about small libraries, and we have an IMHBCO about decision-making from Allyson Mower. Interviews are with Mark Sandler, and Rick Lugg and Ruth Fischer. Allen McKiel and Jim Dooley fill us in on the results of the 2014 Credo Survey which addressed student research skills. Tom Gilson has done his wonderful job of reviewing reference books and Deb Vaughn has even taken time out from her four children to do a few book reviews. We have a cases of note about Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and Lolly has done her usual awesome question and answers on copyright. Our digital conversations by Paul Chilsen and Todd Kelley is about the library and books. Myer Kutz talks about editing then and now. We have meeting reports from Lynda Kellam and Don Hawkins as well as Ramune and her team of reporters from the 34th Charleston Conference. Stacy Lewis and Alanye Mundt (aren’t they wonderful additions to the ATG team?) are talking about damaged books, Kim Wallis is closing media service points, Tom Leonhardt (retirement can’t keep him down!) is collecting nautical material, Jesse Koennecke has tips on providing access to streaming video, Anthony Paganelli is wandering makerspaces, and Mark Herring is nervous about libraries. Michael Gruenberg talks about ballpark prices, Jerry Spiller is keeping his eye on Fireside Fiction while @ brunning talks about archiving as well as desktops. And there is more, more, more!

Excuse me! I just learned that my clothes dryer won’t work and I have a house full of dirty laundry to take care of! Oops!

Happy Summer and let’s go swimming ASAP!

Love, Yr. Ed.
2015 Charleston Conference — 35th Annual Issues in Book and Serial Acquisition

Call For Papers, Ideas, Conference Themes, Panels, Debates, Diatribes, Speakers, Poster Sessions, Preconferences, etc. ...

2015 Theme — Where Do We Go From Here?

Wednesday, November 4, 2015 — Preconferences and Vendor Showcase
Thursday-Saturday, November 5-7, 2015 — Main Conference
Francis Marion Hotel, Courtyard Marriott Historic District, Embassy Suites Historic District, Charleston, SC
Addleston Library, and School of Science and Mathematics Building, College of Charleston

If you are interested in leading a discussion, acting as a moderator, coordinating a lively lunch, or would like to make sure we discuss a particular topic, please let us know. The Charleston Conference prides itself on creativity, innovation, flexibility, and informality. If there is something you are interested in doing, please try it out on us. We’ll probably love it...

The Conference Directors for the 2015 Charleston Conference include — Beth Bernhardt, Principal Director (UNC-Greensboro),<mailto:beth.bernhardt@uncg.edu>, Glenda Alvin<mailto:galvin@1tstate.edu>, Adam Chesler (Business Expert Press)<mailto:adam.chesler@cox.net>, Cris Ferguson (Murray State University)<mailto:cferguson13@murraystate.edu>, Rachel Fleming (Appalachian State University)<mailto:flemingrm@appstate.edu>, Joyce Dixon-Fye (DePauw University Libraries)<mailto:joydye@depauw.edu>, Tom Gibson (Against the Grain)<mailto:tgilson@cofc.edu>, Chuck Hamaker<mailto:chahamake@email.uncc.edu>, Tony Horava (University of Ottawa)<mailto:thorava@uwatc.ca>, Albert Joy (Retired)<mailto:albert.joy@uvue.edu>, Ramune Kubilius (Northwestern Health Sciences Library)<mailto:r-kubilius@northwestern.edu>, Erin Luckett (Readex)<mailto:eluckett@newsbank.com>, Jack Montgomery (Western Kentucky University)<mailto:jack.montgomery@WKU.edu>, David Myers (DMedia Associates)<mailto:dave@dmadiaassoc.com>, Ann Okerson (Center for Research Libraries)<mailto:aokerson@gmail.com>, Audrey Powers (UFS Tampa Library)<mailto:apowers@lib.usf.edu>, Anthony Watkinson (Consultant)<mailto:anthony.watkinson@btpenworld.com>, Meg White (Rittenhouse)<mailto:meg.white@rittenhouse.com>, Katina Strauch (College of Charleston)<mailto:kstrauch@comcast.net>, or www.katina.info/conference.

Send ideas by July 17, 2015, to any of the Conference Directors listed above.

Or to: Katina Strauch, MSC 98, The Citadel, Charleston, SC 29409 • 843-723-3536 (voice) • 843-805-7918 (fax)
843-509-2848 (cell) • <kstrauch@comcast.net> • http://www.katina.info/conference

Rumors from page 6

writing his memoirs! (BTW: Will he be in San Francisco at the WT Cox booth 421?)

So sorry I had to miss Susan Zappens retirement party last month. Susan has made a commitment to help plan a New Year’s Eve dinner/dance for the three balcony dance clubs in the capital district, and we all know how Susan loves to dance! The promotional blitz is at the same time as the 2015 Charleston Conference. Oh well! Susan promises to be with us as a Mentor in 2016. Susan actually made a point last year of approaching first-timers. Up until last year Susan has been presenting in Buzzy’s pre-conference session on serials management. So many of the first-timers have been given the task of cutting serials expenses and Susan had advice. But not to worry, Susan will be using her Skidmore email address, <mailto:szappen@skidmore.edu>, and we will see her in Charleston in 2016! Mark your calendars! 2-5 November 2016.

http://www.charlestonlibraryconference.com/about/future-conference-dates/

And speaking of Buzzy! He can outwalk any of us! What a guy! Buzzy is planning a new Seminar this year along with his usual preconferences. This Charleston Seminar: Understanding the Library Market (Tuesday, November 3 from 1-4 pm) will include Buzzy and Mike Gruenberg and others giving insights on targeting the library market. Look at the full description:

http://events.constantcontact.com/event/register/eventId=r43yshdab&oeidk=a07eb4e3b33313629f

And speaking of Charleston Seminars, there are two more excellent ones planned. Legal Issues in Libraries (Tuesday, November 3, 9 am-4 pm), presented in conjunction with UNC Chapel Hill School of Library and Information Science with instructors Will Cross (NC State) and Kevin Smith (Duke) and facilitator Ann Okerson (CRL).

http://events.constantcontact.com/event/register/eventId=r43yshdab&oeidk=a07eb41b9797274dad62

And still more! Charleston Seminar: Acquisitions Bootcamp (Monday, November 2, 9 am to Tuesday, November 3, 12 pm) presented in conjunction with UNC Chapel Hill School of Library and Information Science with instructors Rebecca Varga (UNC-CH) and Megan Kilb (UNC-CH)

http://events.constantcontact.com/event/register/eventId=r43yshdab&oeidk=a07eb40x7decba016e4

You all no doubt know that Registration for the 2015 Charleston Conference is now open and we have a lot of people already registered and it’s the beginning of June. Come on down!

Oh! You’ve probably noticed that we have a new Website and email address for the Charleston Conference — http://www.charlestonlibraryconference.com. Old addresses will still work but will be redirected so no problem!

We are hoping to try something new at this year’s Charleston Conference. Heard from Don Hawkins who attended SSP for ATG (be sure and read his thorough report on the ATG NewsChannel and coming soon in the print ATG) that SSP used a Graphic Recorder to illustrate many of the concepts that were discussed during the meeting. I spent time talking to the awesome Melanie Dolechek (Allen Press) about this and am excited about trying this in Charleston this year. Check out some information about this and graphic recorders! Turns out there is an international forum for visual practitioners. Stay tuned!

http://greggersch.com
http://ifvpcommunity.ning.com

continued on page 10
BTW, SSP and NASIG had some joint sessions this year and the astute Steve Oberg sent a great report from the recent NASIG Conference that is loaded on the ATG NewsChannel. I recently learned that Don Hawkins (Charleston Conference blogger) and his wife Pat who works for the Charleston Conference information desk were friends with Steve’s family and just ran into each other at 2014 Charleston! Small world! Since Don was covering SSP for ATG and SSP and NASIG were held near each other at the same time this year, Don recruited Steve! www.against-the-grain.com/

Speaking of libraries and publishers, it was an excellent Fiesole Retreat in Berlin May 3-10. Very provocative! The theme was Competing in the Digital Space: Evolving Roles for Libraries and Publishers. Probably the most provocative talk was by Anja Smit, Thinking the Unthinkable, A Library Without a Collection. http://www.casalini.it/retreat/2015_docs/smit.pdf


As a related plus to the Retreat, we received a copy of a small book called The SAGE Story, 50 years. It is fun to look back at the beginning of the company we all know and love. A timeline takes us through the company history — first Sage Journal content available online, launch of Sage Reference, Sage acquisition of Adam Matthew Digital and much more. There are several pictures of the awesomely energetic Sara Miller McCune who started the company in a one-room office in New York. She had only 3-1/2 years of experience! It was 1965. Talk about one gutsy woman!

Reminds me of the gutsy Rolf Janke who launched Sage Reference back in 2001. And now he is on to even more with Mission Bell Media. MBM’s very first reference titles are in press and should be on the streets in just a few weeks. The digital versions of MBM titles are exclusively available on Credo and Rolf will be at ALA in San Francisco!

Chuck Hamaker has been in the hospital with a tumor on his right eye. He is better but does not have full vision. But in the meantime he and his long-time partner Marc got married in May. Congrats, Chuck and Marc! And we all know that Chuck never slows down! He is planning on being in Charleston in November!

The death of Martin Gordon was announced recently on liblicense. Here are some of Chuck’s reminiscences from liblicense. ‘Martin Gordon was 82. Probably best known to the Internet era as the man who sued Harry Barschall and the AIP. Martin Gordon founded Gordon & Breach in 1961 and implemented some innovations in the STM field, including if memory serves, speed shipping for STM journals. He may have been the last of the larger STM publishers (300 journals at one point) not to publish journals on a regular schedule, or even with a predictable annual subscription rate. Issues were released in a “flow” system, when there was enough “content” to fill an issue and for however many issues there was content for that year, more or less. That was in a German tradition common during the between-the-war years, when libraries never knew how many issues were coming from a journal, or how much the yearly cost would be. And of course when the Germans did it their physics and chemistry journals were some of the most watched and waited for journals in the world. Most STM journals moved to regularly scheduled issues with predictable pricing by the time I became a librarian, in the early 1970s I suspect Robert Maxwell might have had something to do with that.” For myself, Katina, I remember being on the PVLR ALA’s publisher/vendor/library relations committee where we had a rather heated interview with Mr. Gordon. End of an era in more ways than one. http://linguafranca.mirror.theinfo.org/print/0012/insidepub_suior.html
http://barschall.stanford.edu
https://cap.stanford.edu/profiles/stanford/Michael_Keller/

Exciting! Sarah Hoke will be leaving YBP on July 10 to start a new career. Sara will enroll at McGill University in Montreal to study for her Masters in Information Studies full time. This change will also allow Sara to spend more time with all of her family back North and particularly her grandfather, who lives in New Hampshire and will turn 100 in September. YBP is actively working to hire Sara’s replacement. www.ybp.com

More news! The Library Publishing Coalition, a community-led membership association for library publishers, will expand membership to libraries outside of North America, effective July 1, 2015.

As we all know, the LPC supports an evolving, distributed range of publishing practices and furthers the interests of library publishers. It promotes collaboration, knowledge sharing, and networking among libraries and between libraries and other publishers, especially university presses. LPC’s President is Kevin Hawkins (University of North Texas). And Sara Lippincott is program manager. Academic and research libraries and library consortia anywhere in the world are invited to complete a membership application at http://www.librarypublishing.org/join/membership-application.

By the way, the LPC operates as an affiliated community of the Educropia Institute, a nonprofit organization that advances cultural, scientific, and scholarly institutions by catalyzing networks and collaborative communities to facilitate collective impact. AND — Katherine Skinner of the Educropia Institute is one of our keynote speakers at the 2015 Charleston Conference! www.charlestonlibraryconference.com/
allow his students to use digital technology in the classroom without permission due to its distracting effects. In his words, “The industry has committed itself to an arms race for my students’ attention, and if it’s me against Facebook and Apple, I lose.” Even Facebook founder Mark Zuckerberg has recently extolled the virtues of reading books.

Far from being interchangeable, then, print and digital should be seen as complementary formats for text. Print facilitates deep, linear reading, requiring sustained, extended focus, and fostering analysis, reflection, and the ability to absorb information and integrate it into conceptual knowledge frameworks. Electronic devices, on the other hand, tend to enable what has been called tabular reading, a form of power browsing focused on absorbing small bits of text or finding specific pieces of information. Both forms of reading are necessary, and both need to be supported by libraries. For the foreseeable future, supporting the full spectrum of reading requires both offering access to digital resources and retaining open-stack print collections.

Are Digital Libraries Inevitable?

The final implicit concept underlying the case for the all-digital library is that it is inevitable. Technology marches on, and it has decreed that the print codex should disappear, regardless of the desires of individual users, or the actual merits of print vs. digital as formats for textual reading. One can no more halt this process than buggy owners could have prevented the ascendance of the automobile. Resistance is futile; you will be assimilated.

This sort of crude reductionist deterministic frequently appears in debates regarding the adoption of new technologies. Technology writer Michael Sacasas has aptly described it as the “Borg Complex,” a phenomenon “exhibited by writers and pundits who explicitly assert or implicitly assume that resistance to technology is futile.” Except, of course, that resistance is not futile. There is nothing inevitable about the possibility that libraries might choose to completely divest themselves of open stack areas, and relegate print to either special collections or remote storage facilities. It would be a conscious choice. One that, in light of what we know about the nature of reading and the differences between print and digital as reading formats, would be a fundamentally misguided one. In the words of librarian Jeff Staiger, “as librarians en masse adopt the view that digital versions of books are destined to replace physical ones, the phasing out of print books will indeed be inevitable because it will be self-fulfilling.”

One offshoot of the inevitability argument is the question of relevance: that as society abandons print, libraries will be forced to do the same to remain relevant. As we have seen, society isn’t nearly as ready to abandon print as some believe. It is, of course, true that as digital devices become ever more ubiquitous in the lives of our users, libraries will need to continue to adapt accordingly. Yet will libraries really be “relevant” by offering users the exact same environment they can find in any coffee house or campus computer commons? Or, rather, are libraries most “relevant” when they offer their users an experience different from what is available elsewhere in the broader society? An experience, for example, that facilitates access to the wealth of information in digital format, while also offering the opportunity to escape the non-stop distractions of contemporary life and engage in a deeper, more reflective form of reading and research. Providing access to the world of literacy and learning has been a core mission of American libraries since the 19th century. Sociologist Wendy Griswold has speculated that the digital information environment will result in linear, immersive print reading becoming the exclusive property of “a self-perpetuating minority that I have called the reading class.” If libraries don’t continue to offer a gateway into this reading class, then who will?

Resistance is Not Futile

The advocates of the all-digital library present a stark choice: either libraries relegate their print materials to remote storage facilities, or to special collections used only by a select handful of researchers; or they become institutional dinosaurs. This is a false choice. For one thing, while print reading has declined in popularity, it is not going away anytime soon. Many library users, including so-called “digital natives,” continue to prefer the print codex for deep, immersive, linear reading. At the same time, the popularity of eBooks seems to have levelled off, at least for now.

Second, the print book fosters the ability to read in-depth and at-length in a way that most digital devices do not. If we marginalize print, we risk marginalizing an entire way of reading, writing, and thinking that has proved heretofore indispensable to our society, with potentially serious consequences. Finally, in light of the above, arguing that print’s disappearance in “inevitable” not only flies in the face of much of the evidence, but constitutes nothing more than a reductionist, self-fulfilling prophecy. Inevitability is a choice, one most libraries would be well-advised not to make.

Preserving open-stack print collections does not preclude libraries from adapting to the demands of the digital age, far from it. There is no reason that print collections should remain as large as they are currently, and nothing to prevent libraries from moving many of their print monographs into remote storage. It is entirely appropriate to resize print collections to meet the needs of the electronic information environment. The key is to do so in a way that meets the need of your specific user community, and to understand that retaining an appropriately sized open print collection is essential to meeting the full spectrum of user information needs. For example, general purpose academic libraries need to be aware of the differing reading and research needs of faculty and students in the humanities and social sciences vs. those in STEM fields. Scholars in disciplines such as English, History, and Philosophy remain heavily reliant on print monographs read in deep, immersive fashion to communicate research findings. For their part, public libraries will need to support the continued desire of some of their patrons to engage in what has been termed slow reading, something that for many is most easily done using print. We need to move beyond the simple dichotomy of print vs. digital, and understand that both formats are indispensable going forward.

endnotes on page 30
Paul: That makes sense. Beautifully and articulately laid out — on par with your usual depth and insight! Thank you for the context.

Now, I’d like to steer us back to a course we were on earlier. You mentioned that even though I’m a specialist in film and media — a hedgehog in that respect — I’m really very interested in how all our students can more effectively communicate with the varied forms of digital media that are available today. How do we make them foxes in that way? If we are to imbue our students with the notion that they can and even must reach a global audience with the communication tools within their reach, then as educators, we must of course, ensure their easy access to do so. But we also must train and teach them how to effectively use those tools. It’s not enough to just hand out $1000 pencils, as it were; we must show them how to more effectively use these tools.

Todd: I think the new library is the linchpin — the key. Because — if the new library is imagined and executed correctly — there, freed from the constraints of disciplinary rigor and focus, students can truly explore and create.

Paul: The library truly becomes a place where they can work together to better articulate their points, more deeply and confidently support their research and findings, and more resolutely affirm the ground they are staking.

This leads back to what you were saying about the library being for people, not books. We’ve talked in the past about what that might look like, but can we dream a bit more? Can we talk about some of the current trends out in the world that we might cherry-pick to begin to connect these lofty ideas to students in a more your-backyard kind of way? What’s already being done that we may embrace and even exploit to people’s ultimate benefit?

Todd: I did a little research, and I know you have too, on the idea of makerspaces. It seems this term has been now associated with public libraries and co-op places for people to make things in a very general way — sort of a blend of inventing, tinkering, and crafting — that doesn’t quite encapsulate what we are talking about. There’s nothing wrong with the current makerspace idea of course, it’s just that I think we need something more explicitly related to digital knowledge creation and digital fluency for global communication at our institution. Perhaps we need our own branding.

Paul: I know hacking is a trending term, but it too has downsides — the word “hack” has obvious negative connotations and again, it has become a term that’s more organic: my son mentioned the other day that he hacked someone’s longboard move into his own thing. So, we should come up with a new way to refer to this new kind of makerspace. I came up with this: iCAN — which stands for “Create, Access, Network.”

Todd: I like that name quite a bit Paul. It seems to build out your Rosebud Institute vision statement of “Creating those who can.” That’s what these spaces could do — carve out places for students of all types to use the resources — together.

Paul: Exactly. In these iCAN spaces — in libraries specifically — people could go in and work together. They’d be specifically set up for collaborating on academic and scholarly work. Easy, super-fast cloud access, all apps at your fingertips, high-resolution displays, excellent sound quality, cameras, conferencing capabilities, full text, image and motion editing capability — the whole nine yards. What else? What am I leaving out?

Todd: Food. You’re leaving out food Paul. Everyone knows that students work best when they’re eating pizza! Food is a big part of inspiration. But seriously, the inclusion of iCAN space for knowledge creation is clearly a direction we want to go. I am wondering whether library and information organizations like ours can use it as leverage to create a nexus of collaboration that includes other units and programs that have specific goals for student success. The programs and initiatives that I am focusing on are recognized as high impact practices, such as the first year experience, the senior seminar courses and capstone projects, faculty and student learning communities, undergraduate research, and global and experiential learning. What do you think?

Paul: It seems an excellent vision and those seem appropriately impactful targets. Is there a place Todd that is doing this in any way so far? I’m curious if you know of anywhere that this is happening or where at least parts of it are happening.

Todd: I too am curious about that and wonder if our readers might let us know. It would be helpful to build a list of college libraries that are engaged in integrating support for Bicycle Books in Charleston. BBB is right across the street form the Francis Marion Hotel. Have you visited it? You will remember that Jonathan Sanchez, the owner of Blue Bicycle Books was the roommate of Leah Hinds’ husband Patrick once upon a time!

Exciting to have an article in the ATG NewsChannel on the recent purchase of SIPX by ProQuest by Nancy Herther. And in print an interview with Rick Lugg and Ruth Fischer about the recent purchase of Sustained Collection Services by OCLC in this print issue, p.42.

Speaking of interviews, hope that you are reading the interviews by Richard Poynder on the ATG NewsChannel. We have arranged to co-publish the next four Q&A interviews of Richard Poynder and his Open & Shut blog. As many of you know, Richard is an independent journalist and blogger specializing in information technology, scholarly communication, open access and open science. Thanks to the barn-zowie Matthew Ismail whose idea this was! http://www.against-the-grain.com/2015/04/the-life-and-death-of-an-open-access-journal-qa-with-librarian-marcus-banks-by-richard-poynder/ continued on page 84

Paul: Again, we turn to you — our readers and viewers and listeners — and ask you to join in this Digital Conversation. Let us know where you see this happening. Please share with us, either on email or follow the link or QR.

Todd: We started out this conversation with the hedgehog and the fox, or the productive tension between the specialist and multiple perspectives. We have come back to this idea as we think about the development and future role of the library and the information services organization. Of course, the library is not dead — not by a long shot. It’s very much alive, but it’s alive in many new and vital ways.

Paul: I don’t often play the nostalgist, but I have a brief anecdote. I’m reminded of the time when I was a young boy and my mother would take us to the library. It was always a hotly anticipated event. We were a family of eight kids. A large portion of the brood would pile into the station wagon and make our way down to the beautiful, neoclassical building with huge, important-looking stone steps and stalwart columns. We would enter with awe, knowing we had the next couple hours to do nothing but explore.

It was a special time. There were all those books — rows and rows of books — and so many little nooks and crannies where we could curl up with wonder.

While the emotion may be similar for people today, the specifics of the experience are necessarily changing. In this case, change is inevitable. Change is good. Change is alive.

Todd: Indeed it is. A great note to end our conversation. I hope that we continue to hear from more readers Paul. It has been fun talking with you as always.

Paul: The Library is dead. Long live the Library! 🐻
lack research skills (72%), it is necessary in their discipline (47%), and student requests (29%).

In question 20, faculty were asked, “How big of an impact did the research skills instruction have on the quality of your students’ work?” The responses were moderate (50%), small (27%), major (19%), and none (5%).

Question 15 asked faculty the open ended question, “How does a lack of student skills in this area impact your work as an instructor?” “Time” (112) was the most common word used. The word “more” was used 66 times. Faculty reported using “more time” (26) covering basic “research” (67). One faculty reported, “I have to spend a lot of time helping students and teaching them basic concepts about using research, even when I think they should know the information.”

The word “content” was used 14 times in sentences like, “It takes away from the time that could be spent teaching other topics.”

Question 23 asked faculty the open ended question, “What do you think is the most important thing students should know about doing research?” “Find” (28), “evaluate” (13), and “use” (11) were the most used verbs. “Sources” (45) and “information” (39) were the most common nouns. “Time” (9) was used mostly referring to the time it takes to do research. There were 10 references to citing sources properly.

Question 20 asked students the open ended question, “Since you have started college, do you generally feel prepared to conduct the required research?” Their responses roughly align with student responses in the 2014/15 survey.

Research Skills — Question 14 asked faculty their level of confidence in students’ information literacy skills as one of four levels: not very confident, somewhat confident, confident, and very confident and students were asked to rank their own confidence level. The skills were:

- Narrowing a broad topic
- Writing a thesis statement
- Using scholarly information
- Searching library databases
- Incorporating sources into a paper
- Evaluating the authority of a source
- Properly citing sources
- Understanding the ethics of using information

The responses for faculty and students across all of the skills followed skewed patterns in their average confidence levels. The students’ confidence level overall was considerably higher on average than the faculty’s. The students selected “very confident” on average across the skills 22% of the time to the faculty 4%. Students selected “confident” 41% to the faculty average of 19%. They selected “somewhat confident” on average 29% of the time to the faculty 46%. And finally, students selected “not very confident” 8% to the faculty 31%.

Faculty had the most confidence (“confident”) and “very confident”) in students’ ability to select a topic (41%) and the least confidence in their ability to evaluate the authority of a source (16%). Students had the least confidence in “evaluating the authority of a source” (53%) and the most confidence in “understanding the ethics of using information” (71%). See the Confidence Rankings Table for a comparison of the student and faculty rankings on all nine skills.

Confidence Percentage Rankings Table – “Confident” + “Very Confident”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the ethics of using information</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing a topic</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating sources into your paper</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using scholarly information</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching library databases</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrowing a broad topic</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing a thesis statement</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properly citing your sources</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the authority of a source</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 2012 survey, students were asked, “When writing a typical research paper in a college or university class, do you generally feel prepared to conduct the required research?” Their responses roughly align with student responses in the 2014/15 survey.

Average % of Student and Faculty Confidence Rankings 2014 and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014 Survey</th>
<th>Not very confident</th>
<th>Somewhat confident</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Very Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<th>Not prepared</th>
<th>Somewhat prepared</th>
<th>Adequately prepared</th>
<th>Very prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2012 Credo Student Survey article can be found in Against the Grain, April 2013. (McKiel, A. (2013) Information Literacy and E-resources: The Credo Student Survey. Against the Grain, v.25#2, p. 83.)
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