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Highlights

A major focus for the Stark Campus Library over the past few years has been library instruction. Although specific highlights will be summarized in a later section of this report, this section will be entirely devoted to a discussion of the library’s instructional efforts.

The First Year Information Literacy Program

Three years ago the library instituted its First Year Information Literacy Program. The program involves teaching students basic library skills as part of the University Orientation course, taught mostly during the fall semester to first semester freshmen. Then more advanced information literacy skills are presented to freshmen during their second semester in the spring as part of the College English II course. The program has evolved over the course of these past three years and has been discussed extensively in previous annual reports. The key to assessing this program is the use of the SAILS (Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills) test. The first set of usable data was available just after the creation of last year’s annual report. So this is the first time the library has had the opportunity to analyze the effectiveness of the first year program.

Originally the plan was to test Orientation students in the fall and then test College English II (ENG 10002) students in the spring. The hope was that the aggregated results would show greater proficiency in the ENG 10002 students. However, due to a sudden change from a paper test to an online test last year, it was difficult to put together the necessary online files and promote the test to Orientation instructors. As a result, only 35 students completed the online SAILS test last year. So instead, the library separated the ENG 10002 students into three groups:

1. classes receiving the full range of information literacy instruction (2 class periods)
2. classes receiving selected information literacy instruction (1 class period)
3. classes not receiving any information literacy instruction from the library

Unfortunately, SAILS analysis tells us that there was no significant difference between the aggregated test scores of the three groups (this information was presented during the Georgia Southern Information Literacy Conference last September). It has been argued by some familiar with SAILS that the assessment tool was not meant for this type of measurement. It has also been suggested that SAILS may not be the appropriate tool for students on the Stark Campus. It is a fairly lengthy test and includes questions that are not directly related to the instruction provided. Still, after digesting the potential impact of this revelation, the library was given the opportunity to evaluate how instruction has been provided locally and how libraries, in general, have traditionally provided instruction.

After some reflective consideration, the SAILS results should not come as such a great surprise. Libraries have structured library instruction the same way for many many years. Typically, when a course includes an assignment requiring library research (term paper, for example), the instructor teaching the course often requests that the library provide one or two sessions of library instruction, in the library. It is probably unrealistic to expect students to learn and retain
life-long information literacy skills after only 45 minutes of condensed instruction on a topic that is not likely to excite the learner. So regardless of the value or appropriateness for the use of SAILS at Stark, the library needs to reinvent how library instruction is provided.

It should also be noted that the First Year Information Literacy Program remains the only active AQIP Action Project for the Stark Campus. Since AQIP is a tool used to ensure continuous improvement, the library is less discouraged by the SAILS results and more determined to find the strategies that prove effective in teaching information literacy skills to college students.

Reinventing Library Instruction

Stark Campus librarians met recently to discuss new approaches to library instruction. The library realizes that whatever changes are attempted this coming year, it will likely take many years and a great deal of trial and error to discover what works and what does not. Rather than attempt to develop its own assessment tool, the library plans (at least for the coming year) to continue to use SAILS as its primary assessment tool. The following is an outline of some of the new ideas that will be tested during the coming year.

Class Instruction

- The library will investigate using an Audience Response System to enhance class instruction. It could be used to pre and post test to see where the students’ skills are and to see if the instruction was immediately valuable. It could also be used as a secondary assessment tool to evaluate the effectiveness of class instruction.
- Students seem more engaged when they are given activities or problems to solve individually or in groups. The library has already developed such activities for skills like developing search strategies and critical thinking. The library will continue to expand this concept and find ways to introduce laptop computers and printed reference materials into the problem-based exercises.
- The library plans to create more online tutorials that could be incorporated into class library instruction or supplement it.

Individual Instruction

- The library will actively encourage teaching faculty to have their students come to the library for individualized assistance. Having students “sign up” for time with a librarian in advance could be a way to make sure as many students needing help with their research get it.
- The library will continue its “office hours” method of delivering reference assistance on demand. This has proven to direct most students to the library’s experts in a more systematic and productive way.
Faculty Collaboration
Each librarian will work directly with at least one teaching faculty during each semester. To build partnerships with faculty in different disciplines, the plan includes the following activities:

• meet with teaching faculty to discuss the library’s role in the course
• consult with teaching faculty on their assignments (may include additional exercises reviewed by librarians)
• include class instruction if appropriate—advocate individual or small group library instruction (have students sign up to meet with a librarian)
• go to the classroom as necessary to maintain presence in course and to discuss information literacy concepts (search strategies, source selection, plagiarism, etc.)
• maintain library presence on online course components (WebCT, Chat Ref)
• develop web-based instructional modules (Infowizard) with teaching faculty for future inclusion in course content

University Orientation
The library will investigate the use of the Audience Response System (discussed above) as part of the Orientation library instruction as well as making laptop use a part of that instruction. In addition, the library will continue to focus on some basic skills like:

• creating a PIN
• requesting a book
• connecting to databases from off-campus
• using chat reference
• web site navigation

College English II
For next year, the library plans to do the following with regards to ENG 10002:

• find out where the new English sequence is going and how we (at Stark) fit in
• in the meantime, continue the current plan of providing a menu of skills
• investigate
  o possible inclusion of an Audience Response System
  o more Problem-based exercises
  o use of laptops

Plagiarism
The initiative started last year for addressing problems with plagiarism (a presentation was given at the fall faculty meeting and faculty council addressed some specific proposals brought forward by Committee II) will continue this coming year. Specific initiatives include:

• teaching a mini course on plagiarism as part of the University Orientation class
• developing a “Plagiarism School” modeled after Traffic School to deal with educating students who violate the university’s policy regarding plagiarism
• put together a Faculty Learning Community Lite (perhaps as a joint effort with the Trumbull Campus) to discuss other methods of dealing with the on-going problem of plagiarism, such as the use of detection software like TurnItIn
The following includes a description of some specific highlights of library activities for the academic year 04/05:

**Kent Campus Allocation ($5,000)**
Since the Kent Campus began allocating money to regional campus in the 01/02 academic year, the Stark Campus Library has assigned the allocation to a specific faculty member to use to develop the library collection in his or her discipline. This has proven to be a worthwhile venture that has both strengthened ties to those departments and faculty members as well as significantly improve those aspects of the library collection. The library allocated the $5,000 to Jarrod Tudor of the Justices Studies program.

**Materials Booking on KentLINK**
This year was the third year using the Materials Booking system of KentLINK. While problems persisted throughout the year last year, this year, while not without problems, the system was a bit more reliable. One change was that faculty were actually assessed fines when they returned AV items (mostly videocassettes) late. However, planning for the coming year, a task force recommendation led to the decision to reverse this practice and stop fining faculty for overdue AV items.

**First Year Information Literacy Program (AQIP)**
As discussed in the beginning of the Highlights sections, The First Year Information Literacy Program was a major focal point for the library this year. With the disappointment of SAILS findings that the program had questionable usefulness, the library will be investigating new methods of instruction (as previously described). The program continues to be a viable AQIP Action Program. The purpose of AQIP is to practice continuous improvement. So it can be argued that the First Year Information Literacy Program and the all of the changes it has experienced over the past years in an effort to improve the way library instruction and information literacy is taught on campus is a good example of the type of project that will likely make AQIP a successful initiative.

**Web-based Information Literacy Modules**
The library has nearly completed the Geology module and anticipates having students enrolled in Geology courses at Stark use the module during the coming year. The other module for Middle Childhood Education is still in development. The key problem with getting these modules completed in a timelier manner has been the production of video clips. The limitations of the Infowizard make converting those large media files into a usable file suitable for transmission over the internet quite a difficult task.
Campus Center

The new Campus Center was constructed to free up additional space for classrooms in other buildings while providing a central location for basic campus operations like the Bookstore, Testing Center and Cafeteria. While it was a concern for the library that a new building designed for use by students who were not scheduled for a class on campus might cause fewer students to come into the library, library attendance statistics (discussed later in this report) showed that more people needing library services came into the library this year than previous years, continuing a four-year trend of increased library usage.

Laptops

In the spring semester the library started checking out laptop computers so that students could use the wireless environment created within the library building by taking the laptop virtually anywhere in the building while maintaining internet access. In addition, the library facilitated the establishment of the Campus Center as a second, non-library, point on campus where KentLINK could be used to checkout and track laptop usage. With the removal of the lower level computer lab (replacing it with a digital video editing lab), the library will be receiving more laptops, which will continue to function as research tools for students as well as replace the need for a fixed location lab for performing non-library activities (like writing papers using a word processor).

Scanning

This year the library agreed to be the place on campus where potential job applicants could go to fill out the university’s online form when applying for a job on campus. A scanner was provided so that applicants with only a printed copy of their resume or cover letter could convert those paper documents to electronic format so that they could be submitted along with the online application. The library also made use of the scanner by converting some print reserve documents to electronic format so that they could be put on the library’s website and accessible by students over the internet from on campus or off campus. These documents had no copyright implications and improved service at the circulation desk by requiring fewer print items to be processed, held, and checked out at the circulation desk.

Library Show

The library developed an interactive, online video that orients users to basic services. The video can be accessed at: http://131.123.120.22/library/Library%20PR3.html by using Shockwave, a free browser plugin for displaying the video. The library plans to use this as a model for developing similar tutorials for providing library instruction.
Staff

The following individuals comprised the library staff for the 04/05 academic year:

- Rob Kairis, Library Director (Associate Professor)
- Judy Kooistra, Collection Development Librarian (Associate Professor)
- Maureen Kilcullen, Reference Librarian (Associate Professor)
- Roger Davis, Serials Librarian (Assistant Professor)
- Mary Birtalan, Cataloging and Interlibrary Loan (Library Associate)
- Mary Lou Hester, Circulation/Student Worker Supervisor (Senior Library Assistant)
- Jeanne Hawley, Acquisitions (Clerical Specialist)

During the fall semester Sara Klink, a student worker, completed her Masters of Library Science Practicum at the Stark Campus Library. Sara worked closely with Maureen Kilcullen primarily on library instruction initiatives. In addition, she conducted a survey and formed focus groups to get student input on the value of library instruction. Sara also split her practicum between Stark and Kent by working 1 day a week in the Kent Campus Main Library Reference Department.
Interlibrary Borrowing and Lending

Last year the library began comparing the relationship between circulation activity and interlibrary loan activity as part of this interlibrary loan report. It was noted that, when excluding reserves circulation, since the turn of the century Stark campus library users started borrowing more materials from other libraries than from their own library. Last year the split was approximately 60% to 40% in favor of interlibrary borrowing. This year the split has widened to nearly 70% to 30%.

This is understandable. Users are getting more accustomed to the process of requesting materials (mostly books) from other libraries, using KentLINK and OhioLINK. As a result, the 70,000 or so volume collection held by the Stark Campus Library is hardly comparable to the 2 million or 30 million combined collections of KentLINK and OhioLINK, respectively. In fact, it is encouraging to discover that the inconvenience of having to request materials online and wait 2-3 days for delivery is not an impediment for students in finding the best resources for their needs (as opposed to simply accepting the resources available in the local library).

It should be noted the increases and changes are largely due to book borrowing and lending. Interlibrary borrowing and lending of articles has remained on a fairly steady decline over the past 10 years. This should come as no surprise, as the development of online resources has marginalized library print periodicals collections. To illustrate this, the Stark Campus Library has a current print periodicals collection of less than 300 titles. However, the library has access electronically to nearly 20,000 current periodicals. With so much information readily available online, it should be expected that users are less likely to utilize information in local print journals or available only by requesting an interlibrary loan that often takes weeks to be delivered.

* These figures exclude course reserve circulation
The Stark Campus Library will always exist as a “net borrower,” which simply means that the library will bring in (borrow) more materials from other libraries than it will send (lend) to other libraries. With books the primary activity, the overall borrowing by Stark Campus users has hit a 10-year high (as demonstrated by the graph below).

It is interesting to note that, since the introduction of online requesting from the KentLINK and OhioLINK online catalogs in 1995, activity went down for a few years. Still, since its lowest point of activity in 98/99 there has been a steady increase, resulting this year in nearly doubling the activity of 98/99.

Although interlibrary lending went up again this year, the 6% increase is overshadowed by the huge increase of 41% last year. There are two factors that seem to have contributed to this increase. First, about the time lending started to go up (around 00/01) Kent State began lending its audiovisual media (mostly videocassettes) collection. So some of this increase is likely attributable to adding those items to the library’s lending (many other OhioLINK libraries still do not lend their audiovisual media). The other, perhaps more influential, factor was the library’s
change in its approach to collection development. The impact of the OhioLINK central catalog has resulted in the library checking to see the availability within OhioLINK before placing a library order. This means that the library’s collection of recent acquisitions is more unique than most other OhioLINK libraries. Since the Stark Campus Library may have one of only a few copies or the sole copy of a certain title, these materials will be in higher demand from within the OhioLINK system than titles that are highly duplicated among many OhioLINK libraries.

Again, it should be emphasized that the increases in both borrowing and lending are attributed to book activity. Article borrowing decreased for the third straight year. Although article lending did increase, the number of these transactions year to year is too insignificant to be noteworthy.

Books

Borrowing

Lending

For many years the lending of books from the library’s collection to other libraries was pretty steady, hovering around 2,000 loans per year. Then starting around 01/02, at the same time that the library changed its collection development practices, lending activity soared. The main changes in how books are selected for addition to the library’s collection included implementing an approval plan that allowed teaching faculty to play a greater role in book selection, and developing specific criteria for deciding what new titles get added to the collection. The main objective of these criteria was to purchase books appropriate for the campus but not duplicated in the KentLINK or OhioLINK
Interlibrary Borrowing and Lending

systems, where Stark users have access to those books. With the continuation of this collection development practice, it will be interesting to see whether or not the lending of books will continue to increase or level off.

Filling systems, where Stark users have access to those books. With the continuation of this collection development practice, it will be interesting to see whether or not the lending of books will continue to increase or level off.

Articles

Borrowing

The overall trend for the past 10 years is clear. The borrowing of articles has decreased to less than half the number of transactions over that span of time. As previously mentioned, the proliferation of online access to periodicals has led to the marginalizing of print collections and the need for interlibrary borrowing of articles. Even if a user cannot find a specific article they have a citation for, it is likely that the user can find other articles of similar content in the online resources available.

Filling systems, where Stark users have access to those books. With the continuation of this collection development practice, it will be interesting to see whether or not the lending of books will continue to increase or level off.

Filling systems, where Stark users have access to those books. With the continuation of this collection development practice, it will be interesting to see whether or not the lending of books will continue to increase or level off.
Lending

The lending of articles has gone up and down over the past 10 years. And while the percentage increases and decreases appear to be substantial at times, it should be noted that the number of these transactions is so small, that even seemingly large fluctuations have minimal impact on the daily operation of the library.

This year the total number of articles loaned was 161. This amounts to an average of 3 articles per week.
Information Literacy

The library’s primary concern for the past few years has been library instruction in general and information literacy in specific. The library completed the third year of its First Year Information Literacy Program. To summarize, this program has attempted to expose as many students as possible to library instruction during the first year of their academic career. All first year students are required to take the 1-credit hour University Orientation course, usually during their first semester. Library instruction has long been a fixed component of this course, so it became a natural part of the First Year program. Basic skills needed to navigate Kent State library services are presented (searching the KentLINK/OhioLINK systems, using the library’s website, creating a PIN—Personal Identification Number—requesting books online, etc.). Specific information literacy competencies (skills any sophisticated library user will need, regardless of the location or type of library) are presented as part of the College English II (ENG 10002) course that most freshmen take during their second semester. Skills taught at this stage include developing search strategies, applying those strategies to searching specific resources, understanding information sources (the differences between books, magazines, scholarly journals, etc.), and critical thinking (evaluating websites, identifying scholarly journal articles, etc.).

So in the fall, the library concentrates on the library instruction taught for Orientation and in the spring the library offers information literacy instruction for ENG 10002. Because the library has only 4 full time librarians, covering all sections of these two important courses is extremely difficult. Although most Orientation instructors do prefer to bring their classes to the library for instruction by a librarian, ENG 10002 instructors are not required to do so. This year the library contacted each ENG 10002 instructor and offered a menu of skills. The instructor could decide to bring their class to the library for two class periods of instruction (the full range of information literacy competencies), for one session of library instruction (with the competencies selected by the instructor based on the needs of the course), or the instructor could decide to provide these skills themselves and not have a librarian instruct their students.

A key element of the program, and one of the aspects that makes the program appropriate as an AQIP Action Project (see http://dept.kent.edu for an explanation of AQIP at Kent State) is the use of SAILS (Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills). This test, developed by librarians on the Kent campus, is used to measure the students’ abilities as an aggregated group. The original intent was to test all Orientation students in the fall and ENG 10002 students in the spring. However, with response rate problems in the fall of 2003 and not being able to cover all sections of ENG 10002, the library decided to group the students as follows:

1. Orientation students taking SAILS in the fall
2. ENG 10002 students receiving 2 sessions of information literacy instruction in the spring
3. ENG 10002 students receiving 1 session of information literacy instruction in the spring
4. ENG 10002 students receiving no information literacy instruction from a librarian in the spring
As reported last year, no usable results were available. Usable results were provided early in the fall semester 2004. With such a low response rate for Orientation students in the fall of 2003 (about 35 students completed SAILS), only groups 2-4 were analyzed. The analysis showed that there was no significant difference in information literacy skills between the groups, or between any group and the aggregated national results. Basically, taking the SAILS results at face value, this means that the library’s instructional efforts are not paying off. A fuller discussion of the impact of this is presented in the Highlights section.

With this information at hand, the library attempted no new efforts to expand library instruction for the year. As a result, the number of library instruction classes and the number of students instructed went down.

Although the number of classes and students reached an all time high last year, this year the number of classes went down by 9% and the number of students taught went down by 11%. The Highlights section describes how the library plans to address library instruction in the coming year.
Collection Development

The library spent significantly more this year than last year on library materials. The overall increase was 38%. However, this is a bit deceptive in that last year the library spent 18% less than the previous year. So although 38% appears to be a big increase, the increase from 2 years ago is only a cumulative 13% (averaging less than 7% per year). Considering the average increase per year for the last nine years, 7% is not unusual. What is a bit unusual is the decrease experienced last year. It is hard to discover the reason for this, but the decrease is nearly equally split between the purchase of books and serials (both went down by about $20,000 that year). With serials, the timing of invoices often means that an invoice is paid after the fiscal year cut off. Since these invoiced amounts tend to be quite large, it often skews the trends from year to year. As far as the book purchases, since the decrease last year was mostly with library (as opposed to faculty) purchases, it is likely that some expensive reference titles, which are not published (or selected for purchase) every year, were not bought within the fiscal year by the library. So it is likely that, just as with serials, the timing of the purchase of certain reference titles was such that the invoices were posted after the start of the new fiscal year. The chart below shows the upward trend of library spending over the past nine years.

![Chart showing library spending trends over the past nine years.]

The more important trend that the library has been tracking is the contributions to the collection by teaching faculty. As explained in past reports, the library implemented an approval plan that placed more of the responsibility for book purchases in the hands of faculty. Slips identifying recently published books were sent to faculty, who decided the relative importance for the title:

1. is it essential for the academic program?
2. is it something the library should consider (but not essential)?
3. is it not important for the library?
Based on the criteria above, the library either (1) purchased the book; (2) checked OhioLINK to see if the book was readily available for Stark campus users and not necessary for the library to purchase locally; or (3) did not buy the book. Although the approval plan has taken a few years to develop, it was fully implemented last year. The goal of the library over this nine-year period has been to shift the majority of the book selection process from librarians to teaching faculty. The chart above clearly shows that librarians are still outspending faculty. The chart below clearly shows that, starting last year (when the approval plan was fully implemented), teaching faculty began selecting more books than librarians.

The lines cross with last year’s statistics. The extreme drop in librarian purchases that year has already been rationalized. However, the trend of faculty selecting more titles than librarians continued this year. Assuming this trend continues, the library will have been effective in accomplishing the objective of shifting the majority of book selections from librarians to faculty. The fact that librarians spend significantly more than faculty is a result of the high price of the reference materials almost always selected by librarians.
Library Usage

This section on usage normally concentrates on three areas:

1. KentLINK Searches
2. Circulation
3. Head Count

This year there are two changes. First, once again the vendor that supports the KentLINK system made some changes that made it impossible to gather search statistics about midway through the academic year. So there are no KentLINK search statistics to present in this report. A new web-based online management system is in place that should allow the gathering of statistics for the coming year.

The second change is that the library is now including Reference Statistics in the form of the number of times library users ask for help. The library currently has three years of statistics to report on but intends to continue reporting on the level of reference assistance in the future.

Reference Statistics

Starting last year the library adopted a new approach to handling requests for assistance from library users. In the past, a schedule was set and library staff sat at the reference desk waiting for users to ask questions. The problems with that approach included the fact that there is not enough staff to man this desk for all the hours the library is open. So the library looked at the head count numbers to establish a schedule that provided for someone at the desk during the busiest times (usually between the hours of 10am-3pm, Monday through Friday). Because the standard was to send users to the reference desk when they needed help, when the desk was not staffed, student workers at the circulation desk usually assisted users in need of help. The library decided that, in order to provide the best possible service, all reference questions should be directed to a librarian. So a new method was put in place where librarians have office hours (usually one entire 8-hour day a week) where they are “on call” to answer user questions. The following chart illustrates the effect of this change in handling reference transactions.
The chart shows that the number of users asking for reference help went up nearly 130% after the new method of handling reference questions was established. However, it also shows that this year (the second year after this change) produced a 40% decline. A likely reason for this is that over the course of the first year and into the second, without emphasizing the need to retrieve a librarian during their office hours, student workers at the circulation desk again began assisting users when they asked for help. When this happens, no record of the activity is kept. For the coming year, the library will reemphasize the need for student workers to resist helping users when they require reference assistance and have them get the librarian on call so that the user will be assisted by a professional and the transaction will be properly logged.

Circulation

For the fourth straight year, users have checked out more materials from the Stark Campus Library than the previous year:

In the Interlibrary Borrowing and Lending section it was reported that more Stark campus users are getting their materials from other libraries than from their own. In spite of that fact, users are still checking out more local materials now than ever before. This demonstrates just how significantly high the interlibrary borrowing is. It also reflects the fact that having faculty participate in collection development leads to the acquisition of materials more likely to be needed by local users.
Head Count

The library continued its practice of physically counting the number of people in the building every hour (on the half hour). It should be noted that more libraries seem to be moving to this technique of establishing library usage instead of the traditional method of simply using a gate count (counting the number of times people enter or leave the building). This may be due to the fact that more and more library buildings are being used for other purposes than library use.

The chart below shows that overall attendance in the library went down by nearly 2%:

![Library Attendance Chart]

While a 2% change is pretty insignificant, a closer look at the statistics reveals an interesting development. Since the library does count the number of people and where they are in the library each hour, it can separate individuals counted as library users and those who can be considered non-library users. Non-library users may be waiting for class to begin in room 07 or the Library Conference room, working in the lower level computer lab, or using the Testing/Student Development Center. The reality is, when these numbers are separated by library and non-library activity a different picture of library usage is presented.
There is a clear trend that begins in the 01/02 academic year where attendance related to library use increases each year at a nearly double-digit rate. At the same time, with the exception of last year, there was a steady decline in non-library use attendance. This was expected this year with the relocation of the Testing/Student Development Center from the Library to the new Campus Center. It was feared that with this major move and with the addition of another building on campus not designed as a classroom/teaching facility, the Campus Center would create competition for the library as a place for students to spend time in between classes. It was also feared that this new building might cause attendance in the library to decrease. While it is true that overall attendance did decrease, it was a natural result of the Testing/Student Development Center move. Finally, in spite of these changes, library attendance (related to library use) has steadily increased over the past years, years where the library made a concerted, strategic effort to attract more users to the library and raise the visibility of the library within the campus community.
New Methods for Library Instruction
As the focus of this year’s Highlights section, the library will be experimenting with new strategies for providing library instruction. With an information literacy program already in place with an assessment component, the library is in a good position to track the success of these changes. Still, it should be emphasized that the Stark Campus Library (and academic libraries in general) has provided library instruction the same way for many many years. Significant change will likely take many years and much trial and error.

New Website
The Stark Campus is currently redesigning its website. To help facilitate this process, the University software CommonSpot is being employed. It has been a few years since the library redesigned its website. So it makes sense that the library also adopt the CommonSpot model. No significant changes to the functionality of the website are planned. The current content will be mostly maintained. It is the design (look and feel) of the website that will be changed.

Purchasing Card
Starting late in the year, the library began using a purchasing card (credit card) to apply to all library acquisitions under $2,500. So far the transition has gone well and all of the library’s vendors have been able to adapt. There are some new procedures for reconciling the statement at the end of each month. Otherwise this has not caused any particular problem. The library will continue to monitor the use of this card to see if there are any problems.

Millennium Modules
Although the library adopted the Millennium circulation module a couple of years ago, it has been a long time coming for the roll out of other KentLINK Millennium modules. During the end of the spring semester various staff were trained on the cataloging and serials modules. With new desktop PCs to be delivered to library staff, full implementation of these new Millennium modules is expected for the coming year.
ILLiad for Interlibrary Loan
OCLC has discontinued its support for the PC client software Passport. This software was used for cataloging and interlibrary loan processes. Other online, web-based interfaces have been developed to replace Passport (Connexion for cataloging, for example). However, the Kent Campus has used a software package that interfaces with OCLC and the end user, called Illiad. The Stark Campus Library will be looking into the use of Illiad during the coming year.

Weeding
It has been a few years since the library weeded its collection of outdated and unused books. The general criteria for discarding a book are: if it is old (usually 10 years past its publication date) and not being used (not checked out during the past 5-10 years). The library likes to maintain a collection of current, useful materials and keeping old, unused materials can cause problems. Regardless of the criteria used to target a book for withdrawal from the collection, faculty and staff are given the opportunity to put books selected for weeding back into the collection for any reason.

Video Inventory
Along with the weeding project discussed above, with the problem of missing or mis-shelved videocassettes appearing in the spring, the library will inventory the entire videocassette collection. Since the collection is just under 3,000, the process should not take that long and should produce a more easily accessible set of videos and help identify those missing from the collection so that they might be replaced or withdrawn from the library’s catalog.

Circulation Policy Changes
This year the Kent Campus established a task force for reviewing existing circulation policies (loan periods, fines, etc.). Some sweeping changes were proposed. It should be noted that KSU libraries have always agreed to share circulation policies so that students on one campus can go to any other campus and expect the same privileges. In the case of the changes proposed by this task force, the Stark Campus was not in total agreement with a few of the proposals. It is the feeling of the Stark Campus Library that at a time when collaboration with faculty is among the library’s primary objectives, instituting policies that reduce the time faculty can keep checked out materials and fine faculty for not returning materials on time at this time may be counter-productive. However, with some compromise, the proposals are targeted to go into place this coming fall semester. The changes all users should be aware of include:

1. Reducing the loan period for students from 4 weeks to 3 weeks
2. Reducing the number of renewals for all users from 3 renewals to 1
3. Fining all users (including faculty) for books not returned within a month of their due date