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THE MULTI-YEAR PLAN: BACKGROUND & PROCESS

The Library’s self-study (http://library.brooklyn.cuny.edu/about/self_study/2006/) was completed in June 2006 and updated in January 2007. All members of the full-time faculty and staff participated in the study. The faculty and staff were organized into three Primary Groups which analyzed the Library’s programs, collections, and facilities in terms of how well we serve our three major constituencies: undergraduates, graduate students and faculty, and non-affiliated users.

In 2007, the Library underwent an external review. Our external reviewers were Lance Query (Dean of Libraries, Tulane University), Michael Gorman (Dean of Library Services, California State University at Fresno, and past president of the American Library Association); and John Zenelis (University Librarian & Associate Vice President, Information Technology, George Mason University). As library and academic IT leaders with extensive experience, they were well qualified for their task. They visited the campus from March 21-22, 2007. The self-study and several other Library documents (annual reports, the 1996 self-study and external review report, etc.) had been supplied to them in advance. During their time on campus, they met with the President (Dr. Christoph Kimmich), the Provost (Dr. Roberta Matthews), the Associate Provost (Dr. Jerrold Mirotznik), the Assistant Vice-President for Information Technology Services and Chief Technology Officer (Mark Gold), Faculty Council’s Committee on the Library, the Advisory Committee on Academic Computing, classroom faculty from all disciplines, many students (undergraduate and graduate) and, of course, Library faculty and staff.

The external reviewers submitted their report on April 27, 2007; it appears on the Library Web site at http://library.brooklyn.cuny.edu/about/self_study/library_external_review_2.pdf. The report was shared with all Library faculty and staff, and on May 10 a chart inventorying all recommendations (self-study and external reviewers’ report) was created and posted to the Library site at http://library.brooklyn.cuny.edu/about/self_study/library_external_recommendations.doc.

During May and June, the Primary Group leaders met with the members of their groups to discuss the self-study, the external reviewers’ report, and the combined list of recommendations, and to formulate priorities for a Library multi-year plan. On July 12, 2007, the Chief Librarian and Executive Director of Academic Information Technologies (Dr. Barbra Higginbotham) debriefed with the Primary Group leaders and the members of the Library Cabinet. An initial multi-year plan, covering the years 2007-2012 was developed, based upon the findings of the self-study, the external reviewers’ report, the summary of recommendations, and the outcome of the consultations with library faculty, staff, and management.

On January 31, 2008, the Chief Librarian retired, and an Acting Chief Librarian, Professor Stephanie Walker, was appointed on February 1, 2008. In the year since her appointment, a number of changes have taken place in the Library and at Brooklyn College. This updated multi-year plan details changes in the environment and progress on a number of initiatives.
THE BROOKLYN COLLEGE LIBRARY TODAY

President Christoph M. Kimmich has called the Library an article of faith. It is a satisfying experience to deliver an information program in a setting where the Library’s centrality is seen with such clarity. Indeed, the Brooklyn College Library is much more than a beautiful building, or even a very good academic library: believing that student success and the educational experience incorporate experiences that occur beyond the classroom, we also deliver a robust series of cultural programs and provide spaces for many College events. Our art collection, with its catalog and audio tour, further distinguishes the Library as the cultural and intellectual hub of the campus.

The external reviewers gave the Brooklyn College Library an excellent assessment:

Overall, we conclude that the Library succeeds in its mission to support the students and faculty of the College. This is based not only upon the widely recognized standard of academic library assessment--the LIBQual + survey--but also on our meetings with students, faculty members, and administrators. Library collections--in both print and electronic formats--are adequate for a liberal arts college. A talented and manifestly dedicated staff provides always responsive and often innovative user services. Facilities both in the Library and the Information Commons [Library Café] would be the envy of most academic institutions. We believe that the morale of the library faculty and staff is high and that the teaching faculty and student body hold the Library in high regard. (We should note that, having conducted a number of evaluation visits we have learned to spot and therefore are not overly swayed by cheerleading ringers). One theme we experienced throughout our visit was the uniform satisfaction with the leadership of Barbara Higginbotham over library and academic information technology services of the College. A comparison of the Library's situation as described in the 1994 external report with the Library of 2007 makes it apparent what the leadership advocacy of her administration and the concomitant support from central administrators have meant to the Library and the College. With some important qualifiers, we think the Library is well positioned to satisfy the increasing demands of an ambitious strategic plan by the college. It is also ready to respond creatively to an increasingly technology-savvy student body whose needs and expectations occasionally exceed the resources of any individual institution. (p. 1)

In other sections of the report the Library is praised for its strong service orientation (p. 2), innovation (p. 2), effective use of staff (p. 3), atmosphere of mutual respect and appreciation (p. 3), and attractive/inviting/functional space (p. 4). The external reviewers conclude:

We are pleased to report that the state of the Brooklyn College Library/AIT is both strong and progressive. It is effectively led, well managed, well housed, service oriented, and efficient and creative in its use of information technology. It has a dedicated and productive faculty and staff and earned respect from the College community. We believe that it is poised to achieve even more, given targeted funding increases in support of agreed priorities and recognition of the central importance of the Library/AIT to the academic enterprise.
At the same time, the external reviewers made a number of recommendations. Progress has been made on several of these. Some have been set aside, either because they were handled in an alternative manner or were simply not things we were able to do, for one reason or another. However, others have budgetary implications, and would require investment by the College in the areas of personnel, collections, and facilities. Given the current economic environment, the Library understands that progress in many areas may be at a slower pace than originally envisioned. However, over the long term, a number of these goals remain highly desirable. It is important to sustain a certain level of investment even to remain at the level of excellence we presently enjoy, for while the Brooklyn College Library is an excellent academic library and a strong technology hub, it would be all too easy to slip behind the curve. Subscriptions must be maintained; resources must be purchased to support changes to existing programs and new (often interdisciplinary) programs; technology must be upgraded and enhanced; staffing must be equal to the needs of students and of classroom faculty. Demand in all of these areas outstrips our ability to meet it, and current gaps in staffing threaten our ability to continue to provide services to which faculty and students have become accustomed.

The updated multi-year plan that follows details the continuing themes which will govern the coming years. After the broad themes dealt with in the plan, we include, in the Appendix, details of the recommendations by the external reviewers, including those which have been completed, those which are in progress, those which have been set aside or handled in an alternative manner, and those which remain desirable but which have not yet been achieved. Should the Library be able to achieve all of its objectives, including carrying out the specific details of those recommendations still considered desirable, the Library’s ability to serve the students, faculty, and staff of Brooklyn College, CUNY, and the community at large will be significantly strengthened and enhanced, and we will be able to make even greater contributions to faculty research and student success.
THE LIBRARY’S PREFERRED FUTURE

In 2007, the Brooklyn College Library’s preferred future included several major themes, as detailed below.

Library fund-raising will be intensified and institutionalized. Spending for collections will be strengthened and regularized; it will also accommodate inflation in materials’ prices. Library hours will be expanded in an economical, targeted fashion, and greater emphasis and resources will be applied to the delivery of online services and content. New human resources will strengthen online teaching and learning, an area in which both the College and the University wish to excel. Quality, sustained attention to Library issues by Information Technology Services will strengthen technology-dependent services. A new roof, heightened custodial presence, and maintenance plan will contribute to a healthier, safer building.

An update to this is given below.

The Brooklyn College Library’s priorities and objectives over the next five years are as follows:

1) Library fundraising will be expanded and institutionalized, in collaboration with Office of Advancement. Grant writing will also increase, in collaboration with the Grants Office.

2) Spending for collections will be regularized and strengthened over the long term, including accommodations for inflation in materials’ prices, expansion in College programs, and increased interdisciplinary offerings.

3) Increased emphasis will be placed on delivery of online services and content, including expansions of special services such as a digital repository and the Assignments That Work database. Newly added services such as the 24/7 chat reference and e-reserves through Blackboard will be maintained and promoted.

4) New human resources will strengthen and support online teaching and learning, and existing/anticipated faculty line openings will be filled.

5) Our new, successful collaborations with Information Technology Services and with individual academic departments will continue to be a high priority. Opportunities for faculty collaborations with AIT will be promoted, additional staff with expertise in these areas will be added to address the growing needs in these areas, and continuing attention to training and communications will ensure that technology-related services operate smoothly.

6) A new roof, heightened custodial presence, and maintenance plan will contribute to a healthier, safer building.

Details for each of these sections are provided below.

1) Fund-raising & Grants:
Many of the themes in the Library’s multi-year plan are intertwined, and certainly the need for a more robust fund-raising effort is one such thread. The Library’s budget has been cut—or, in “good years,” has remained static—for a decade and a half: we have struggled with sharply decreasing purchasing power. At the same time as we have received CUNY Compact funds, our regular tax-levy budget has been reduced. Today, much of what we need to do in order to move to the next level requires new dollars, and fund-raising is one way to generate them. In terms of institutionalizing and promoting a series of opportunities for Library giving, the external reviewers made several recommendations, including making the Library a check-off on every fund-raising mailing and assigning a development officer to the Library. The former was deemed not desirable by the College, but we would like to explore the latter and other potential fundraising opportunities and collaborations with the Office of Advancement.

We will also increase grant writing in the Library. The Archives has received grants in the past, and has submitted two proposals to NEH this year. The Chief Librarian & Executive Director of Academic Information Technology will encourage grant writing by faculty and staff, and will also seek grants and write grant proposals herself, in an effort to fund projects that would be beneficial, but for which no current funding exists. This will be done in collaboration with the Grants Office.

2) Collections:

Strong Library collections are mainstays of student success, faculty advancement, research, and excellent teaching. Certainly they are key aspects of the University’s Decade of Science initiative and the central office’s emphasis on globalism. Yet funding for our most expensive, most valuable resources is threatened: we remain short of funds to pay the bill for our major science journal package (ScienceDirect) and we are deeply concerned that Scopus will soon be out of our reach, as STF funding for this resource has been discontinued. If we hope to be a player in many University initiatives, including those associated with the Decade of Science, change is essential.

In the spring 2005 all CUNY libraries participated in a University-wide survey about library collections, services, and facilities. While Brooklyn did very well in terms of services and facilities, we received many negative comments about the book collection: students and faculty in all disciplines complained about the lack of sufficient numbers of up-to-date titles in their fields. Before moving to the new building, the Library inventoried the print collections (a project recommended 12 years ago by the last team of external reviewers); missing volumes were removed from the online catalog and librarians made lists of those titles worth replacing. Though we have requested funds, money to replace these valuable missing titles has never been allocated. Recent student surveys confirm that this remains a problem. It is one shared by some other CUNY libraries, but it is increasingly serious as time goes on, and we continue to lack sufficient funding for both print and electronic collections.
In the three years preceding this year, University hold-backs/give-backs decimated spending for books (with reductions of about $200,000 per year); both last year and the year before last the Library received a $50,000 OTPS cut, one partially offset by Compact funding. This year, there is no new Compact funding and other funds have been held steady at last year’s levels, but price increases have reduced the purchasing power of these dollars. The Central Office of Library Services has had some cuts and anticipates more; we anticipate further cuts as well.

For all these reasons, both the external reviewers’ report and the self-study recommend increased funding for print and electronic collections; from the external reviewers’ report:

In our view, BC should designate CUNY Compact and Graduate Investment Program funds on a basis at least comparable to the other senior comprehensive colleges in the CUNY system. … Further, on the subject of library research materials, at a minimum, we recommend that the College fully fund materials inflation costs on an annual, continuing basis.

While the Library realizes that we are in the midst of a budget crisis, further cuts to our collections budgets will be devastating. Lack of resources not only frustrates students, it is a distinct factor in faculty satisfaction, and can contribute to difficulties with faculty retention. If a faculty member cannot access materials with which to conduct his/her research, will he/she stay? We are already unable to fill new requests for databases and other electronic resources, and we are well aware that cuts loom. In the short term, funds need to be stabilized, and in the long term, increased.

Archival Collections:

The new building has proven to be a phenomenal tool for attracting new archival collections—so much so, that we are now out of space in the archival tiers. Of course, space cannot be allowed to drive or dictate collection building, and for Brooklyn College the Archives is a distinguishing factor in the CUNY pantheon. New collections recently added are valued in the multi-million dollar range as well, and these figures boost our fundraising numbers. Here the self-study and the external reviewers are in agreement: new space must be provided for the Archives. Fortunately, the Library has suitable, undeveloped space, and we are in the final stages of creating and pricing a plan for its use for archival storage.

3) Delivery of Online Services and Content:

We should note at this point that we have greatly expanded services since the external review. Library hours have been increased in the Reserve Reading Room, and staffed hours in the Library Café are expanded for finals. Paging service (whereby materials can be retrieved from the stacks when the Library is closed) has been added during Reserve Reading Room hours, and patrons may now also return regular materials and interlibrary loan items, pay fines, and clear blocks in the Reserve Reading Room. We have added applications and software to all public computers except those that are designated “Express” stations for catalog lookup or printing. We have added dozens of computers
for student usage, and upgraded the Faculty Development and Training Lab, which is
heavily used by adjunct faculty. The addition of 24/7 chat reference, and its widespread
promotion, has expanded student and faculty access to assistance even when the Library
is closed. We have also instituted the usage of the popular Ariel software for interlibrary
loans; this has allowed us to offer desktop delivery of articles. We have also created 3
online tutorials to assist users in learning how to search the catalog, use the CLICS book
delivery service, and search for journal articles; these are available via YouTube, and
have been promoted to students.

Overall, reader surveys show enormous satisfaction with the scope and quality of on-site
Library services, and we have addressed several desired online services. However, we
need to expand in the following areas:

- We wish to expand our available tutorials, in ‘podule’ form, to provide additional
  assistance to distance learners and other remote services users. Podules will also sit
  nicely on instructors’ Blackboard sites. In a basic series we envision: Research Basics
  (narrowing topic, keywords, Boolean logic, etc.); CUNY+ (basic and advanced);
  Locating Articles; Locating Full Text; Proxy for Remote Access; Cite Your Reference;
  Using RefWorks, Evaluating Sources; Ethical Uses of Information (Avoiding
  Plagiarism; Copyright; Privacy and Information). The advanced series will include:
  Research in the Sciences; Research in the Social Sciences; Research in the Humanities;
  and Locating Statistical and Demographic Information. We also wish to offer
  podcasting services, whereby we could offer support to faculty wishing to create lecture
  podcasts; the Library is involved in the iTunesU pilot project, and we have been able to
  create some podcasts, but server space has been an issue. We are collaborating with
  ITS to see what expansions can be instituted. There are also additional services we
  would like to offer via the Library website – an expanded institutional repository where
  faculty research and teaching tools could be showcased is just one example. There are
  many proposed technology projects on our plates. A key resource needed here is a
  second programmer/Web developer: we can do no more until staffing is strengthened.
  And, before this position is posted, we must resolve the issue of the proper job
  title/series of the programmer already on staff, so that both positions will be
  appropriately classified and remunerated.

- There is also a strong need for an additional instructional designer. We have only
  Carlos Cruz to support all faculty efforts with Blackboard; most institutions offering
  such services have one or more teams of three or more instructional designers. If we
  are to offer increased support for online teaching and learning (a key component of the
  College’s Strategic Plan and the University’s Master Plan), additional staffing is an
  absolute necessity.

- As well, we have a need for an e-learning librarian who will develop the content for
  our online instruction modules, as well as build and deliver an online Library
  instruction program. It should be noted that the external reviewers recommend all three
  positions, and the Library faculty and staff give this new direction their highest service
  priority.

- Faculty and students alike frequently request additional electronic resources, and we
  have a substantial wish list. Collections funding restrictions threaten this.
4) Human Resources

The three positions detailed above are absolutely critical to the Library’s ability to support online teaching and learning. In addition, other vacancies and gaps have recently come to light. At the time of the External Review, the Information Services unit had 11 full-time faculty, a full-time CUNY Office Assistant, and a part-time Public Relations and Marketing Assistant. At present, it has only 9 full-time faculty. One faculty member who did not get tenure was not replaced. His line had previously been filled when he was turned down for reappointment, and when he returned after a grievance, we were officially ‘over line’ but the fact remains that the external reviewers saw a need for an additional faculty member and 2 additional professional technical staff in addition to the existing complement that was present during their visit. As well, upon the retirement of Dr. Barbra Higginbotham, Professor Stephanie Walker became Acting Chief Librarian and Professor Mariana Regalado became Acting Associate Librarian for Information Services. No one took over Professor Regalado’s extensive responsibilities as Coordinator of Instruction, Bibliographer for several departments, and Reference Librarian; we have twice been denied a substitute. Professor Regalado is scrambling to fulfill all of these responsibilities, and as we were already short-staffed, this has been a challenge.

In addition, the Library is somewhat concerned about upcoming anticipated turnover. Two faculty members will be leaving in August 2009, and our science librarian is also considering retirement. Though the Library has been informally assured it will not ultimately lose lines, it will be challenging to recruit faculty for these positions, and we are concerned about possible gaps that could have a dire impact on Information Services. We have already cut desk staffing to the bone; further staff reductions would necessarily result in service cuts.

5) Collaborations:

In previous annual reports and multi-year plans as well as the self-study and the report of the external reviewers, much has been made of difficulties between the Library/AIT and ITS. We are exceptionally pleased to report that these difficulties have largely been resolved. The first priority of the Acting Chief Librarian was to improve relations and communications with ITS. We are both departments which have intensive involvement with technology, and we should be able to work together, as opposed to being at loggerheads. Monthly status meetings between VP Mark Gold, Mr. David Best of ITS, Dr. Howard Spivak of AIT, Mr. Alex Rudshteyn of AIT, and Prof. Stephanie Walker of the Library were instituted, and have continued regularly. This has improved our relations and communications immensely, and we have both gained enhanced understanding of each other’s areas. We have been able to avoid countless potential errors and difficulties. For example, in August 2006, when Professor Walker first came to Brooklyn College, she walked right into a problem with new IP addresses; for approximately two months, we struggled to contact every vendor of e-resources and get these addresses added to our licenses. Meanwhile, access to these resources was erratic and unreliable, much to the frustration of our users. In December 2008, a new IP address range was again added, and this time, we had advance notice, Mr. Best was able to
construct a way to allow us time to notify our vendors, and everything went smoothly. Users noticed no interruptions in service. This is entirely due to our improved communications.

We have also established once-a-term meetings with the Department of Computer and Information Sciences, and this has allowed us to enhance and expand our services to this important constituency of intensive technology users.

As well, we are working to expand services to Modern Languages by getting a collection of listening lab resources, so students who wish to listen to foreign language materials can access them outside of Modern Language Lab hours. We are now working to create an area that will also allow for a speaking lab.

Finally, we have been collaborating with the Music department to expand services. We have added computers to the listening area for Music, and we will soon have laptop carts which can be used in the listening and viewing rooms. These carts will be available from New Media.

We hope to continue these valuable collaborations, and expand them as we see opportunities for additional cooperation.

6) The Library Building

The Roof:

The Library’s roof problems (and thus the safety of the collections) are a top issue for the Library faculty and staff: the leaks, spreading and increasing in severity, have been a major source of anxiety. The University has allocated funds for a new roof, and construction has begun, but apparently the entire North portion of the roof is not included in this contract! And this portion of the roof is indeed leaking severely. Facilities are exploring whether repairs would be adequate, or whether they will need to approach CUNY for additional funds for this section. The Library was not permitted to be involved in the initial establishment of the contract, and never saw what was covered; we were dismayed to learn it was not the entire roof. The slate roof portion will also be repaired soon, rather than replaced.

Custodial Services:

There is a great need for a second custodial pass through the building later in the day: Library and Library Café washrooms become dirty and messy in the evenings. Users also continue to eat in the building and leave garbage that attracts rodents and other vermin sitting around on tables and shelves. Weekends present the same problem. A further issue is the heavy use of Library spaces by other campus units. Custodians set up for these meetings, clean up after them, scrub the resulting coffee and food stains from the carpets, and so on. No additional custodial hours have been allocated to the Library, and more are needed.
Building Maintenance:

The new Library is now seven years old. Not only does the building function as a Library and the home of both academic and administrative IT, but its role in the life of the College has evolved into much more than anyone envisioned: the Library is a center for cultural events, an art museum, and a host to registration and countless other meetings, seminars, workshops, receptions, and conferences. This role is an exciting one for us, but it comes at the expense of considerable wear and tear on the facility. As construction continues on campus, demand for Library spaces can only increase. A comprehensive maintenance schedule, preventing the possibility of the building’s gradual slide into disrepair, is essential. If the Library is to remain the exceptional facility and source of pride that it is today, projects like painting and replacing worn carpets/broken furniture must be programmed and carried out systematically. We are in a budget crunch, but letting the Library fall into serious disrepair is not a cost-effective solution.

IN SUM

The process of self-study, external review, and plan updates has been an exhilarating one. We look forward to the many initiatives planned for the coming five-year period.
APPENDIX A: RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SELF-STUDY & THE EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

The recommendations of the Self-Study and of the External Reviewers can be summarized under four broad headings: Resources, Services, Collections, and Public Relations & Outreach. Within each of these headings, issues are further divided into subcategories. These are detailed below, and under each subcategory, the initiatives that were recommended are provided, along with updated information on the progress that has been made in each case.

1. Resources:

   a) Staff:

      i) Create a Public Services Interest Group – This initiative was attempted, and continued for two terms. However, despite substantial promotion and attempts to offer programs and generate discussions that would be of interest to a broad range of staff, turn out remained sparse. The sessions tended to be attended by members of the Information Services faculty, plus the Associate Librarian for Access Services and the Library’s Marketing and Public Relations Assistant. The initiative was scrapped after two terms of declining attendance; it seems to have been one of those things that sounded good in theory, but drew little interest in practice. People reported being unwilling to take time out of their regular work for yet another meeting.

      ii) Implement a Mentoring Program for Untenured Faculty – This initiative is in progress on two fronts. First, a Mentoring Workgroup has been formed by LACUNY (the Library Association of the City University of New York), with the goal of creating a comprehensive CUNY-wide mentoring program for CUNY librarians. This is not limited to untenured faculty; faculty seeking promotion to associate professor or full professor status and wishing to have input from a mentor or mentors are also welcome. It is intended to guide people through the full process of tenure and promotion. The group is relatively new, and has only met twice; it is in the process of developing documentation for a proposed program. Drafts of materials are being placed on a Google group page, and will be presented for discussion to the broader CUNY libraries community by fall 2009. This group is co-chaired by Professors Stephanie Walker of Brooklyn College and Sharon Swacker of City Tech. Secondly, a Junior Faculty Research Group for CUNY library faculty was started in 2008, primarily to provide support in the areas of research and publication. It is co-chaired by Professors Jill Cirasella of Brooklyn College and Maura Smale of City Tech. The Library hopes to use these to facilitate research and publication by new faculty, and to orient them to the CUNY community.
iii) Implement a Post-tenure Review Program for all Faculty (Including Full Professors) – This would likely be a much more controversial program, requiring discussions with the union and agreement across CUNY. The Library also is concerned that this should not be done simply for library faculty, if it is deemed to be desirable. Thus the Library feels that this suggestion goes beyond the scope of what we are able to consider at this time, and we do not plan to proceed in this direction at present.

b) Facilities:

i) Address the Building’s Leaks – A new roof is being constructed on a large portion of the building, and the slate roof will be repaired once this is complete. However, it appears that a large segment of the roof, on the North side, was not included in the original consultants’ quote. The Library was unfortunately not included in this process; meetings with the consultants and the contract negotiation were done at the University level, and the Library did not learn of this omission until construction on the new roof had commenced. Even more unfortunately, this section leaks as well, and we had a serious flood during a recent rainstorm that caused water to flow heavily from the 7th tier of the core stacks right down through the 6th, 5th, and 4th tiers. Archival materials are stored here, and staff worked frantically to save these materials from water damage. Jose Santamaria of Facilities is speaking to CUNY regarding additional repairs to vents; if this does not resolve the problem, he will seek funding to replace the North section of the roof as well.

ii) Address HVAC-related Noise Issues – Repairs have been done, and the problem appears to be resolved.

iii) Reduce Noise Levels and Improve Cleanliness – Library staff and security staff do conduct periodic sweeps to tell patrons that food is not permitted in the Library, and to ask people who are being excessively noisy to keep the noise down or move to group study rooms. However, both noise and cleanliness are ongoing problems, unlikely to be resolved in these budgetary times. We are discussing increased signage, including table top signs, emphasizing library policies re/food and noise.

iv) Increase the Custodial Presence – This is not possible during these budgetary times; custodial presence has actually been reduced across campus.

v) Complete the Expansion of the Conservation Lab – We anticipate completion of this project by mid-February, 2009.

vi) Institute ID Card Swiping at the Library Entrance – This has been reviewed, and while it would be desirable, it would require some outlay of funds. We continue to keep this on a list of desirable changes for the future, but it is not presently a top priority in this budget year.

vii) Conduct a Signage Review – A Signage Committee has been created, and has met once to discuss major signage issues. New building maps have been created on the Library website, and we are close to completing new
directional signage and maps for each floor. We are also planning to implement the aforementioned table top signs to stress Library policies on food and noise. Additional signage regarding the locations of computers in the building, and regarding where to sign up to use a computer, has been created. We have increased the number of mobile sign display units we have, which can be used to advertise all types of events in the Library. We do not presently have the budget to make any changes to the permanent signage in the building, though a few desirable alterations have been noted. For example, people find the signs for the washrooms difficult to see – they are at the very top of each bathroom door, far from eye level. There are other issues, but they will need to wait for a better budget year.

viii) **Explore Alternative Security Solutions to the Guard Stationed at the Rear Door** – We have met with people at BC about our options, and a security consultant has been identified, who will be able to provide cost estimates for possible solutions.

e) **Budget & Fund-raising**

i) **Strengthen Spending for Collections** – This has not been an option in this budget year. In fact, the budget for collections has effectively decreased, due to the freezing of funds from the College, the loss of our ability to receive money from several additional funds (as they are now ‘underwater’ – i.e. the Tanger fund), and the strong possibility that this year we may not receive some state collections grants which most New York libraries had received for many years. This latter grant had been used to cover our annual subscription to Ebrary, an e-book collection that consists of approximately 32,000 books, out of our entire collection of about 45,000 e-books. We also still owe over $60,000 on the bill for ScienceDirect, a journal database of over 2700 journals in the sciences and social sciences that costs over $250,000 annually; $50,000 of this was to be paid from Compact funds, but to date, we have been unsuccessful in our requests to have these funds transferred to the Library. We have lost 2 databases that were paid for centrally, and the further loss of all Sage collections (a half-dozen collections of full-text journals in social sciences, business, and education) is a distinct possibility, as the funding model for these products has changed and the prices have increased substantially. The Sage packages had been centrally supported, but support for this has been cut, and the subscriptions will run out in June 2009. Professor Susan Vaughn continues to work to negotiate improved deals for our Library, but our collections spending is seriously threatened, and the Library is deeply concerned about our ongoing ability to support faculty research and student learning. The external reviewers had characterized our collections as ‘adequate’ for undergraduate programs, and a recent collection analysis did reveal that within CUNY, we have approximately 72% of the recommended resources for undergraduate programs (a good score).
However, it will be all to easy for this rating to slip away. In the past, resources tended to be purchased; nowadays, libraries subscribe to resources and provide access – a much less stable situation.

ii) Institutionalize and Promote a Series of Opportunities for Library Giving
   – We have created a list of desirable fundraising targets and projects, and shared this with VP Sillen’s office, and Professor Vaughn has again approached the graduating class regarding desirable gifts. However, further progress in this area has not been made. We have a limited capacity to solicit funds for the Library, as this would interfere with major fundraising. Professor Walker has indicated to President Kimmich that she would be interested in attending the CUNY Fundraising Academy. One other Chief Librarian within CUNY, Professor Kenneth Schlesinger of Lehman College, will be attending. Apparently the program will be open to people who have an interest in fundraising but do not work directly in the fundraising offices of the Colleges, as soon as all the fundraising staff are fully trained.

iii) Assign the Library to a Fund-raising Officer – Dr. Higginbotham had approached the Office of Advancement regarding this, but no specific progress has been made to date. This is out of the control of the Library.

iv) Provide a Library Check-Off Box on all Fund-raising Mailings – Professor Walker approached VP Sillen about this, and was informed that this was not an option. The College does not wish to restrict donations; it would prefer to have people donate unrestricted funds.

v) Develop a Library ‘Leadership’ Council for Fund-raising – There have been early discussions about this, but considerable further discussion is required.

2. Library & Academic IT Services:

   a) On-Site Services:

   i) Hours

      i. Consider a further expansion of Library hours/Fund one of the models for expanding Library hours recommended by the Library

The hours of the Reserve Reading Room have been extended, and paging service is now provided. Library users can thus have materials retrieved and can check them out when the main Library is closed. They can also now return books and interlibrary loan materials, pay fines, and clear blocks in the Reserve Reading Room; none of this had been possible before the hours were extended and more equipment was added to the room. Reference service is available via the 24/7 chat reference. The Library Café has expanded its staffed hours during finals. These additions appear to meet the needs of Library users.
ii) **Library Instruction & Information Literacy**
   i. *Take Library instruction to the field* - This has not been possible on a large scale, due to staff shortages in Information Services. There are presently 2 fewer library faculty in this unit than there were when the external reviewers visited, and their recommendations at the time included hiring an additional library faculty member and 2 technical staff members. However, we have managed to offer a limited number of classes outside of the Library, on request.

   ii. *Emphasize training in information quality* - This has been incorporated in all library instruction. Early discussions regarding information and computer literacy across the curriculum have been held; Professor Mariana Regalado worked with Professor Aaron Tenenbaum of Computer & Information Sciences to create a list of characteristics of an information literate/computer literate student. However, these were deemed somewhat stringent, and the list has gone to a Faculty Council Committee for further discussion.

   LILAC, the Information Literacy Committee of the CUNY Libraries, is continuing to work on standards for information literacy and strategies for getting information literacy incorporated into other areas of the curriculum.

   iii. *Create the “Assignments That Work!” database* - The database has been created. Promotion has been delayed by a display glitch on the main page of the site which needs to be repaired, but we anticipate being able to launch the service imminently.

iii) **Computer Labs & Services**
   i. *More broadly available computers with applications software should be considered in order for students to have ‘one-stop shopping,’ beginning with the research and ending with the finished assignment* - All public computers in the Library, with the exception of the Express Lookup and Express Print Stations, are now equipped with a full suite of software applications. Also, the number of computers has been increased; computers have been added to the Information Services corridor.

   ii. *Consider a laptop loan program* - This program was rejected by both AIT and ITS, due to security issues. However, we are now able to offer laptop carts which can be used in any of the multimedia listening and viewing rooms; these carts will be available at the New Media Center any day. We are simply waiting for the completion of the construction of a secure cage area to store the carts.

   iii. *Explore the possibility of a new computer log-in procedure* - This has been completed. Students can log into all public computers using their email ID and password. If they forget their email ID, it is easily available in the BC portal.
iv. **Extend teleconferencing to the Woody Tanger Auditorium (WTA)** – This has not yet proved possible. The vendor denies problems with the equipment, and the room is also not properly equipped to permit this, and will be expensive to outfit properly.

iv) **Teaching & Learning with Technology**

i. **Expand the movement of degree and certificate programs to the Web** – This is outside the Library’s control. AIT offers support and assistance to all faculty who wish it. However, we do not control curriculum. We have assisted with the creation of a certificate program in Educational Leadership (led by Professor David Bloomfield) and plan to assist Professor David Balk with his efforts to create courses in Grief Counseling when funding is available to him. We have assisted other faculty in putting their courses online or partially online, and now have over 1000 courses with an active Blackboard presence.

ii. **Hire another course designer and another programmer** – This has not been possible during the personnel freeze. Inquiries had been made just before the freeze, but progress in this area is presently stalled. It is a highly desirable initiative, however. Most campuses that offer support such as we do have a team of 3 or more designers; we have only Carlos Cruz, and he is absolutely swamped.

iii. **Appoint an ITS faculty advisory group** – This is entirely outside the Library’s scope. We also feel it is already covered by CUET.

iv. **Conduct an external review of ITS** – This is entirely outside the Library’s scope.

The Library would also like to note that the communications issues and the tensions between the Library and ITS which were mentioned in the report of the external reviewers have been resolved. This was the first priority of the Acting Chief Librarian when she began her term, and monthly meetings between ITS and AIT have allowed us to solve these issues.

v) **Copying & Printing Services**

i. **Improve photocopier performance** – Our ability to influence this is limited, as the College has a contract with a single vendor – and we have also been told that this was the only vendor to bid on the contract! However, Prof. Paraskeva Dimova-Angelov, our weekend librarian, has been diligent in calling the technicians and ensuring that they do indeed show up every weekend to check and repair machines. At present, this is all that we can do in this area.

ii. **Investigate the feasibility of a campus-wide print management system** – This has been completed. The Library is not at all satisfied with the vendor; we had very much not wanted to go with this particular vendor, as we realized their product would not scale
b) Electronic Services:

i) Reference & Instruction – The QuestionPoint 24/7 Reference service has been up and running for nearly 2 years now, and its popularity is increasing steadily. It went from 288 questions the first year to 1191 questions the second year, and anecdotal evidence suggests that our third year’s statistics will show growth again. The service is regularly and heavily promoted with posters, email announcements, announcements in social networking sites, and announcements on the Library plasma display screens and the Library website. There is also a link to the service from every Blackboard course site, so students can use e-resources and get help with their assignments all in one spot.

ii) Work more closely with the instructional faculty to engage the librarians in the research assignment at the syllabus level of appropriate courses – This has only been done in selected individual courses, at the discretion of individual bibliographers. We would like to increase this involvement, and a Library faculty member frequently serves on the Faculty Council’s Curriculum Committee, but to date, staff shortages have prevented a systematic approach to this issue. There is no requirement that a Library faculty member be included on the Curriculum Committee – this has been the case due to the dedication of the Library faculty, rather than due to any Faculty Council requirement. But we would like to see a recommendation that a Library faculty member be included each year on the Curriculum Committee, to ensure that the Library is aware of upcoming changes and that we are able to alert faculty members when and if we lack the resources to support particular courses. This is especially important as interdisciplinary courses proliferate, and as we continue to hire new faculty with different research interests.

iii) Library liaisons to the academic departments should identify ‘champions’ with whom they can team up to develop coursework and assignments that require and promote information literacy – Again, this is not yet being done systematically. Some efforts have been made – a recent pilot project with 3 sections of English 2 involved evaluation of information literacy skills. But due to short-staffing in Information Services, we have only been able to run this as a pilot.
iv) *Develop more effective ways of communicating Library instruction offerings to students* – The Brooklyn College Library MySpace and Facebook sites have proven popular with students; we have about 3000 ‘friends’ on each (though this includes some faculty and other libraries as well as students). We do post information about offerings to these sites. We have also expanded the number of College sites where the information is posted for software classes and for RefWorks instruction. We do not run any other workshops unless they are affiliated with a class. We do send messages to students via the all-student listserv as well, and we advertise services and resources on the plasma screen and via posters and the Library website.

v) *Seek student feedback about Library instruction* – The Brooklyn College Library has, for the past 2 years, run a Library Experience Survey which includes several questions about instruction.

vi) *Rethink e-reference* – This was completed, with the launch of the 24/7 Question Point chat reference service. Its popularity testifies to the success of the service.

vii) *Better exploit Blackboard* – We now use Blackboard for e-reserves and we also have a link to the 24/7 chat reference service on every Blackboard page, so students can access resources and assistance right from within their courses.

viii) *Continue to examine and implement non-traditional reference services* – This has been done via the creation of the BC Library MySpace and Facebook pages and the implementation of the 24/7 chat reference. We have not gone forward with Instant Messaging for reference, as there has been no demand for this service.

ix) *Create online tutorials and ‘podules’* – Three online tutorials were developed and posted on YouTube. A walking ‘art tour’ is available as well; interested persons may borrow an MP3 player at the Circulation Desk. We have had some discussions with ITS about creation of additional tutorials; this is somewhat slowed by the staffing crunch, but we hope to continue to provide new tutorials regularly.

x) *Hire an e-learning librarian to provide online instruction* – This is out of the Library’s control. We requested a faculty line for this last year, but the request was not granted. The Library Cabinet is currently discussing our anticipated future staffing needs, in preparation for the Provost’s next call for requests for faculty lines.

c) **Access to Electronic Information:**

i) *Adopt a simpler proxy system* – Completed with the implementation of EZProxy.

ii) *Offer a federated search tool* – Two CUNY libraries have purchased and implemented the Serials Solutions 360 tool, and both have
reported serious problems and disappointing/inaccurate results. Funding has been granted centrally to purchase a federated search tool, but no recommendation has yet been made. Brooklyn College Library does not plan to go ahead with this on its own; it would prefer to await the centrally provided solution, or to await the working out of the many bugs reported by the libraries currently using Serials Solutions 360. Waiting seems wise in this instance.

iii) Reconsider electronic reserves – Completed, with the launch of e-reserves in Blackboard.

iv) Open up access to on-campus WiFi – Completed – access is available everywhere except in a few areas where thick concrete prohibits it.

d) Access to Other Collections:

i) Implement Ariel for inter-library lending; provide desktop delivery for articles – Completed, much to the delight of our patrons!

ii) Publicize OCLC’s WorldCat direct ILL option – Completed.

3. Library Collections:

a) General:

i) Compare the finding that 72% of the faculty are satisfied with the collections to findings at peer and aspirant institutions – We have yet to undertake this endeavor. However, this is planned for Summer 2009.

ii) Increase spending for collections, targeting Compact and GIP funds – This is out of the Library’s control, and recent budgetary pressures make growth in this area unlikely for this year and next. However, we continue to advocate growth in this area as soon as this is fiscally feasible. Meanwhile, the Library continues to support NYSHEI efforts to get funding for statewide database licensing; there is a new state legislative sponsor for this bill, known as ARIA, and we believe that funding will ultimately be granted. If and when this occurs, costs for some resources should decrease substantially. As well, Professor Susan Vaughn continues to negotiate for better deals for our e-resource licenses, and the CUNY Libraries all regularly re-examine their purchases to ensure we purchase the best resources possible with our scarce funds.

iii) Fully fund an annual inflationary factor for Library collections – Again, though this is highly desirable, this is not within the control of the Library. We will continue to request consideration of this in the future, especially as the fiscal situations of the College and the State improve.

iv) In the College’s strategic plan, recognize the centrality of Library collections (including print collections) to promoting research and scholarship – The Library has emailed contributions and thoughts regarding the strategic plan of the College, but requested changes have generally not been incorporated. The sole exception is that a change provided by the Acting Chief Librarian at Brooklyn College and the
University Librarian, to emphasize support for e-resources, did make its way into the CUNY Strategic Plan, after the Acting Chief Librarian at Brooklyn College spoke to the Chancellor of CUNY at his visit to Brooklyn College. The external reviewers noted that the Library was not central in the College’s Strategic Plan, despite the apparent goodwill of the Administration; when resources to support faculty research were mentioned, library resources were not included at all. Rather, mention was made of laboratories and space – but nothing to support other research.

b) Print Materials:

i) *CUNY library systems office should implement software to provide lending load-leveling among the colleges* – Completed.

ii) *Explore the provision of CUNY-wide conservation services/staff expertise* – This has not yet begun. Because of delays even getting our own conservation lab completed, it seemed ludicrous to explore expansion, until this was in place. Further discussion may take place in the future as we begin working in the new lab, after it is completed.

iii) *Strengthen spending for collections* – Again, this is out of the control of the Library, and unlikely to improve until the budget situation improves, despite frequent complaints from students that books are out of date. We have not been able to provide adequate new books to meet faculty or student requests, as our funds for print materials are slim though demand continues.

iv) *Carry out an analysis of our print collections* – Collections CUNY-wide were analyzed using the Bowker Collection Analysis tool. Brooklyn College led the pack in a tie with Hunter College; it had about 36% of the resources recommended for undergraduate libraries. Across CUNY the figure increases to 72%. This is a good score; it means we are generally able to provide something to meet most student information needs. However, the complaints we do get are that materials are often dated, and we have not been able to completely keep up with requests or with faculty needs in new areas of study. For example, when Prof. Swapna Banerjee was hired in History, she was Brooklyn College’s first major specialist in South Asian history. She informed the Library some months after she started at the College that we truly had little or nothing in this research area, and she is quite correct: no one had ever requested such material in the past. New areas of research create new needs for materials.

v) *Encourage faculty and graduate students to make better use of automatic updating* – This has been periodically promoted, and we will continue to do so regularly.

vi) *Display new books or their jackets* – Completed via the New Books List.

c) Electronic Collections:
i) *Increase support for electronic collections* – Again, this is a budgetary matter, over which the Library has little control. We can only advocate and attempt to negotiate improved deals.

d) Archival Collections:

i) *Identify and develop new spaces for archival collections/explore compact shelving to house lesser used archives in Special Collections* – This is in progress. We have identified 2 potential spaces for additional archival storage. Renovations would be required, and a proposal has been submitted to use funding from the Everett fund to accomplish this. If the project is approved, we will move forward. As well, Professor Vaughn visited with a number of vendors of compact shelving at the January conference of the American Library Association, and one vendor has come to provide estimates. A meeting is set with Steve Little to discuss potential projects.

ii) *Implement a comprehensive digitization program* – This is an extremely costly proposition, and as such, cannot proceed at present. We have applied for funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities to digitize some collections, and have periodically received funding from METRO, an association of New York libraries to digitize some collections. However, at present, a massive digitization program is not feasible. Further research into available grants will be conducted in Summer 2009.

4. Public Relations & Outreach

a) Public Relations:

i) *Continue outreach efforts at fall and spring student orientations* – This is done each year as a matter of course.

ii) *Extend our current ‘take new faculty to lunch’ initiative to include veteran faculty members who may not be au courant re: new services and collections* – This is done periodically. Recently, Professor Beth Evans took the entire department of Puerto Rican and Latino Studies to lunch to discuss their library needs.

iii) *Plan small group meetings/lunches with faculty* – This was done through 3 focus groups, for faculty in Social Sciences & Education, Arts & Humanities, and Sciences. We had good turnout and got useful feedback, which we utilized to enhance marketing and to guide some purchases.

iv) *Increase the Library’s use of the College’s all-student email list* – This is done regularly by Janet Finello, our part-time Public Relations & Marketing Co-ordinator.

v) *Create a handout with answers to basic College FAQs* – This was completed, and then we went one better – we actually created a database
vi) Add a ‘New in the Library’ link to the Library website – Completed.

vii) Reach out to adjunct faculty – We now have a list of all contacts from all departments who can reach the adjunct faculty, and Ms. Finello emails them regularly with updates about collections and services. Some adjuncts have attended RefWorks training as a result, so we know we are reaching them! We also publicize the availability of the Faculty Development & Training Lab, and it is well utilized by adjuncts.

viii) Get our pages on their pages – So far, only Education has provided a link to the Library on their department website. We have promoted and offered a Library Link button, but without success.

b) Outreach:

i) Design a system for determining who uses the Library – Completed. A summary of major common categories of users is available on the Library website; a complete access chart is available in paper at Reference and at Circulation.

ii) Expand Library services for non-affiliates – A committee did look into whether it was feasible to get alumni access to the subsets of electronic resources which are available from vendors specifically for alumni users. The packages were not attractive, and the library literature indicates that in a number of institutions where such access was offered, it was discontinued for lack of use. Alumni would like access to everything, and this is not possible under the licenses we have to sign with vendors. The minimal packages designed for alumni don’t have a great variety or amount of content. We do offer on-site access to resources for anyone who has access to the Library itself. We also open many events to non-affiliates, and these have proven popular. Additionally, the Library has for the past 2 years had a table at the Brooklyn Book Fair, and this has proven to be an effective means of outreach; our booth is always very popular, and Recruitment staff have attended to recruit prospective students. However, there is a limit to what can be offered at no cost to non-affiliates; we have only so many staff members and so many resources, and we must meet the needs of our primary users first.

iii) Form connections between local officials and the Library – Some progress has been made by the Archives in this area; Brooklyn Borough officials do come to speak at events and exhibitions with some regularity. Also, CUNY libraries have supported ARIA, a statewide database licensing initiative, and University Librarian Curtis Kendrick has testified before the State Legislature in Albany in support of this bill. We await word on its fate.

iv) Develop new connections with the corporate and business community – This has not been attempted at present. We have worked with the Magner
Center to offer workshops to students on researching prospective corporate and business employers, but we have not done any outreach to specific constituencies. The Library is unsure how this could be accomplished, other than via the fundraising offices, and we do already liaise with this office. We do not wish to step on toes. We also cannot offer for profit search services or research services, under our present licenses; this is sometimes an attractive service to various businesses.

v) Consider the implications and benefits of broadening alumni access to include graduates of other CUNY colleges – This has not been attempted at present, though it could be brought forward at a CUNY Libraries Access Services or Public Services or Circulation Committee meeting.

vi) Recruit and hire a community outreach librarian – Again, this item is not within the control of the Library. There is also a sense among many in the Library that other priorities are higher in terms of desirable faculty positions to be filled. This initiative should likely be shelved for the present time, to be reconsidered perhaps in the future.