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University Futures, Library Futures: re-examining academic library relevance

CONSTANCE MALPAS, OCLC RESEARCH
Library Excellence … to What End?

• Academic library excellence: collection size, spend, use
• Measuring the means vs. effecting the ends
• Universities compete: students, resources, prestige
• University differentiation ➔ differentiated library services
• Managing collections ➔ supporting new user workflows
University Futures, Library Futures

- **Collaborative project** with Ithaka S+R, with support from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation
- **Population**: 1506 US higher education institutions (HEI) comprising four-year public and private non-profit degree-granting colleges and universities
- **Institutional profiles** derived from 2015 IPEDS survey data:
  - *What* colleges and universities do (research, liberal education, career-focused education)
  - *How* they do it (residential vs. convenience modes of provision)
- **Mapping library service models** to institution types
Most four-year institutions exhibit multiple tendencies; they have several ‘lines of business’.

- **Research**: primary focus on doctoral research and scholarship
- **Career**: primary focus on preparation for career professions
- **Liberal Education**: primary focus on interdisciplinary baccalaureate education
Model can be used to examine groups of institutions for conformance to type (isomorphism).

Pronounced skew toward supporting research + broad baccalaureate education.
Broad baccalaureate education with some career orientation
Model can be used to examine range of institutional activity within different geographies.

Maryland HEI (n=23)

- **Research focus:** Johns Hopkins
- **Liberal education focus:** Goucher College
- **Career focus:** University of Baltimore
Our premise

• Academic library service bundle should support **primary institutional business objective(s)** of college / university

• I.e., institutions with a greater focus on research will require **different library services** than institutions focused on baccalaureate education or career preparation

• In an increasingly competitive market, colleges and universities will seek to differentiate their educational offer and value proposition; **library service models will look increasingly different** (less ‘Harvardization’ or ‘Berkeley-itis’)

ARC17 #OCLCARC17
University directions
shape library directions
Effective data management can increase the pace of the research process, contribute to the soundness of research results, and meet funding agency requirements by making research data easy to share.

Supporting data management at every point in your research

From collections to engagement, workflow support
Supporting workflows throughout the research lifecycle

Support for researchers

We can support you through each stage of the research lifecycle. We also have tools, training, and expertise to help you throughout the process.

Get support at any stage

- Find funding & partnerships
  - funding opportunities, researcher networks
- Write a research proposal
  - literature reviews, data management plans
- Manage information & data
  - citation management, large data sets
- Publish your research
  - author rights, copyright, open access
- Measure impact & digital identity
  - citation tools, researcher profiles, ORCID, altmetrics
- Preserve & archive
  - repositories, metadata, identifiers, long-term preservation, file formats
The Library | About the Library | Library Prizes & Awards | Goucher Library Student International Purchasing Program

GOUCHER LIBRARY STUDENT INTERNATIONAL PURCHASING PROGRAM

PROGRAM INFORMATION

As part of this program, the Library will award $50 to students who are studying abroad to purchase books, CDs of local music, DVDs, etc. from their host country to become part of the Goucher College Library. Awards can be given prior to leaving for study abroad or upon return. Every item that a student purchases will be cataloged and placed in the Library stacks, including a book plate with the student’s name and country.
THE BURKE-AUSTEN SCHOLAR-IN-RESIDENCE

In 1975, at the death of Alberta Hirshheimer Burke, a Goucher alumna of the Class of 1928, Goucher College received the extraordinary Jane Austen collection that she and her husband, prominent Baltimorean Henry Burke, had acquired over a period of forty years. This nationally-recognized collection consists of Austen first editions, rare period publications related to the life and landscape of rural England, and Alberta Burke’s own notebooks of Austen-related memorabilia and correspondence with Austen collectors and scholars.

In celebration of the 25th anniversary of the collection, Goucher College established the competitive Jane Austen Scholar-in-Residence program in 2000. The residency offers the selected scholar a week to research Goucher’s Austen collection, work with related undergraduate classes, and present a public lecture on an Austen-related topic. The grant also provides a $1,000 stipend, travel expenses and accommodations.

For an overview of the Burke Austen collection, see The Jane Austen Collection Finding Aid. For additional information or to request an electronic copy of the finding aid to the collection, please contact the Curator of Special Collections and Archives Tara Olivero at tara.olivero@goucher.edu.
Embracing student success as a central focus of library activity and attention.
Customized support for “new traditional” students, clear alignment with career-ready educational model
Key message

• Library relevance to the academic mission is not measured by collection size or expenditures, but by alignment and fit of services to distinctive institutional purpose(s)

• As colleges and universities seek to differentiate their offer, models of library excellence look increasingly different

• Be the smarter library: think beyond basic institutional categories (Carnegie type, size, control) when considering the business you are in: enrollment profile, competitive horizon (regional, national, international), revenue model are important indicators of institutional direction and the library’s future
Watch for our upcoming survey with Ithaka S+R in late October
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Proving Library Relevance in Higher Ed: A Study of Provosts

ADAM MURRAY, JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY
ASHLEY IRELAND, MURRAY STATE UNIVERSITY
Provosts’ Perceptions of Academic Library Value & Preferences for Communication: A National Study
Introduction & Literature Review

• Disruptions in Higher Education

• Value of Academic Libraries
## Demographics for Provosts’ Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Control</th>
<th>Total Study Population</th>
<th>Study Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>448 (47.81%)</td>
<td>99 (50.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>489 (52.19%)</td>
<td>98 (49.75%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Demographics for Provosts’ Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation</th>
<th>Total Study Population</th>
<th>Study Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle States</td>
<td>210 (22.41%)</td>
<td>35 (17.77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>210 (8.0%)</td>
<td>11 (5.58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>278 (29.67%)</td>
<td>70 (35.53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>47 (5.02%)</td>
<td>6 (3.05%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>236 (25.19%)</td>
<td>62 (31.47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>73 (7.79%)</td>
<td>13 (6.60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Unknown, National/Specialized, or State)</td>
<td>18 (1.91%)</td>
<td>No Data (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provosts’ Study Questions

• Demographic questions;
• Perceived involvement with student retention, enrollment, success, or faculty productivity and accreditation;
• Libraries’ involvement with HIPs, such as FYE, common intellectual experiences, learning communities, writing intensive courses, etc.
Provosts’ Study Questions Cont’d

• The level of influence certain types of library impact data on funding requests, such as basic use data, satisfaction data, endorsements from administrators, demonstrated correlations between library use and retention, etc.;
• Preferred format for this data, such as the formal annual report, annual budget presentations, emails, presentations, etc.
“In your view, does your institution’s academic library have an impact on students’ decisions to continue enrollment?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer \ Size of Institution</th>
<th>2,500 or less</th>
<th>2,500-6,000</th>
<th>6,000-12,000</th>
<th>12,000-18,000</th>
<th>More than 18,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, based on demonstrated evidence</td>
<td>4 (8.7%)</td>
<td>12 (24.49%)</td>
<td>9 (27.27%)</td>
<td>1 (5.88%)</td>
<td>4 (18.18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, based on anecdotal or suspected evidence</td>
<td>18 (39.13%)</td>
<td>14 (28.57%)</td>
<td>9 (27.27%)</td>
<td>10 (58.82%)</td>
<td>10 (45.45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>19 (41.30%)</td>
<td>18 (26.73%)</td>
<td>10 (30.30%)</td>
<td>5 (29.41%)</td>
<td>6 (27.27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7 (15.22%)</td>
<td>7 (14.20%)</td>
<td>5 (15.15%)</td>
<td>1 (5.88%)</td>
<td>3 (13.64%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Responses:

“**In your view, does your institution’s academic library have an impact on students’ decisions to continue enrollment?**”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer \ Size of Institution</th>
<th>2,500 or less</th>
<th>2,500-6,000</th>
<th>6,000-12,000</th>
<th>12,000-18,000</th>
<th>More than 18,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, based on demonstrated evidence</td>
<td>4 (8.7%)</td>
<td>12 (24.49%)</td>
<td>9 (27.27%)</td>
<td>1 (5.88%)</td>
<td>4 (18.18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, based on anecdotal or suspected evidence</td>
<td>18 (39.13%)</td>
<td>14 (28.57%)</td>
<td>9 (27.27%)</td>
<td>10 (58.82%)</td>
<td>10 (45.45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>19 (41.30%)</td>
<td>18 (26.73%)</td>
<td>10 (30.30%)</td>
<td>5 (29.41%)</td>
<td>6 (27.27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7 (15.22%)</td>
<td>7 (14.20%)</td>
<td>5 (15.15%)</td>
<td>1 (5.88%)</td>
<td>3 (13.64%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• 59% of respondents indicated that their institution’s library was marginally involved or not involved with enrollment initiatives. Librarians at these institutions tended to be classified as staff.

• Only 10% of respondents indicated that their institution’s library was not involved with retention. This cohort tended to have the least favorable perception of the overall impact of the academic library.
Responses: Provosts Perceive that their Library is Very/Somewhat involved with 6 of HIPs:

- Undergraduate Research (84.43%)
- First-year seminars/experiences (78.39%)
- Collaborative assignments/projects (77.38%)
- Writing-intensive courses (75.76%)
- Common intellectual experiences (71.34%)
- Capstone courses/projects (69.65%)
Responses: Provosts Perceive that Library is less involved with these HIPs:

• Diversity and Global Learning
• Learning Communities
• Service-Learning
• Internships
Responses:

“Level of impact an endorsement of a Lib Budget Request by other Deans, Directors or Administrators would have, by format & institution size”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format \ Size of Institution</th>
<th>Master’s Small</th>
<th>Master’s Medium</th>
<th>Master’s Large</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
<th>Research High</th>
<th>Research Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal Annual Report</td>
<td>6 (13.33%)</td>
<td>5 (10.00%)</td>
<td>7 (21.88%)</td>
<td>3 (17.65%)</td>
<td>6 (27.27%)</td>
<td>27 (16.27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Budget Presentation</td>
<td>10 (22.22%)</td>
<td>8 (16.00%)</td>
<td>9 (28.13%)</td>
<td>3 (17.65%)</td>
<td>7 (31.82%)</td>
<td>37 (22.29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>8 (17.78%)</td>
<td>18 (36.00%)</td>
<td>6 (18.75%)</td>
<td>6 (35.29%)</td>
<td>4 (18.18%)</td>
<td>42 (25.30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation or Meeting</td>
<td>19 (42.22%)</td>
<td>15 (30.00%)</td>
<td>10 (31.25%)</td>
<td>5 (29.41%)</td>
<td>5 (22.73%)</td>
<td>54 (32.53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data has little influence on improving lib funding</td>
<td>2 (4.44%)</td>
<td>4 (8.00%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (3.61%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Responses: Summary of Lib Value Data’s Influence on Funding Requests & Preferred Method of Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Influence on Budget Request</th>
<th>Provosts Selecting Influence Level</th>
<th>Notable Differences</th>
<th>Public Institution Comm Preference</th>
<th>Private Institution Comm Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Academic Success</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>72.02%</td>
<td>DRU: higher influence</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td>Presentation/Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Retention</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>66.07%</td>
<td>DRU: Higher influence</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td>Presentation/Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>56.55%</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td>Presentation/Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Research Productivity</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>47.62%</td>
<td>DRU &amp; Research: higher influence</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td>Presentation/Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s small: lower influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses: Summary of Lib Value Data’s Influence on Funding Requests &amp; Preferred Method of Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Influence on Budget Request</strong></td>
<td><strong>Provosts Selecting Influence Level</strong></td>
<td><strong>Notable Differences</strong></td>
<td><strong>Public Institution Comm Preference</strong></td>
<td><strong>Private Institution Comm Preference</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsement by other Admins</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>47.62%</td>
<td>DRU &amp; Research: higher influence</td>
<td>Presentation/ Meeting or Email</td>
<td>Presentation/ Meeting or Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Utilization Data</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Satisfaction</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>55.36%</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>DRU: higher influence</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s small: lower influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Responses: Summary of Lib Value Data’s Influence on Funding Requests & Preferred Method of Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Influence on Budget Request</th>
<th>Provosts Selecting Influence Level</th>
<th>Notable Differences</th>
<th>Public Institution Comm Preference</th>
<th>Private Institution Comm Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy SLO Data</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>48.21%</td>
<td>Master’s Medium: higher influence</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Feedback</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>45.24%</td>
<td>DRU: Higher Influence</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anecdotal Evidence</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>60.12%</td>
<td>27.38% indicated this had no influence</td>
<td>Presentation or meeting</td>
<td>Presentation or meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Lib Value Data’s Influence on Funding Requests & Preferred Method of Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Literacy SLO Data</th>
<th>Influence on Budget Request</th>
<th>Provosts Selecting Influence Level</th>
<th>Notable Differences</th>
<th>Public Institution Comm Preference</th>
<th>Private Institution Comm Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Feedback</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>45.24%</td>
<td>DRU: Higher Influence</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anecdotal Evidence</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>60.12%</td>
<td>27.38% indicated this had no influence</td>
<td>Presentation or meeting</td>
<td>Presentation or meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion:

The larger the institution, the more likely provosts were to perceive the library as having an influence on faculty productivity.
Discussion:

Provosts indicate that academic libraries are involved with important campus initiatives such as student retention and success, faculty research productivity, and accreditation.
Discussion:

They note that the biggest barrier for academic libraries to be involved with these initiatives is that the campus overall doesn’t recognize that potential.
Discussion:

“…Provosts at all types of institutions perceive use data and user satisfaction data to have only moderate impact on a funding decision…”
Discussion:

This work by Robert Baxter is licensed under a Creative Commons License.
Discussion:

For full study results, tabulated by Carnegie classification, institution size, institutional control, and accreditation body, please see the full article.
Library Relevance in Higher Ed: Reciprocal Value Propositions
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Communicating Library Impact on Retention: A Framework for Developing Reciprocal Value Propositions
Introduction & Literature Review

• Value of Academic Libraries

• Value propositions, a concept from the field of communication studies

• This and other studies show that our communication of library impact is unidirectional.
Value Propositions

This work by Ruud Janssen is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License.
The message sent by the company about a good’s benefits, both tangible and intangible.
Value Propositions – Service-Dominant

The marketing offer or value promise formulated and communicated by a seller.

This work by Ruud Janssen is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License.
Value Propositions – Reciprocal Value

The idea that the customer and the creator create value together.
Reciprocal Value Statements take the form of:

“If we...Will you?”

Statements
Ballantyne et al.’s Six Markets

- Customer Markets
- Internal Markets
- Referral Markets
- Supplier/Alliance Markets
- Recruitment Markets
- Influence Markets
The Academic Library’s Six Markets

- Customer Markets
- Internal Markets
- Referral Markets
- Supplier/Alliance Markets
- Influence Markets
- Recruitment Markets
The Academic Library’s Six Markets

Customer Markets = Students

Different populations deserve unique attention.

RVPs should target students’ academic integration, social integration, and environmental factors.
The Academic Library’s Six Markets

Internal Markets = employees

Different populations deserve unique attention.

RVPs should target professional development/achieving goals.
The Academic Library’s Six Markets

Referral Markets =
1) Faculty
2) Parents & Other Support

RVPs should target learning outcomes/achievement outcomes.
The Academic Library’s Six Markets

Supplier/Alliance Markets =
1) Provost/CAO/Administration
2) Library Vendors

RVPs should target
1) university initiatives and
2) Future market opportunities.
The Academic Library’s Six Markets

Influence Markets = student government, other deans, VP/dean of students, CFO, associations

As these are influencers and competitors, RVPs should target mutual goals.
The Academic Library’s Six Markets

Recruitment Markets = Potential employees/those who prepare potential employees

RVPs should target professional/future market goals.
The Academic Library's Six Markets
And Reciprocal Value Statements
Thank you!