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Highlights

The primary focus of this year’s highlights section is on the use of physical space in the library. Out of necessity, the library lost a significant amount of space that was previously allocated for the shelving of print resources (specifically bound periodicals). With the Stark Campus Library and academic libraries in general facing a diminishing footprint for its collections and services, new approaches for the use of library space and perhaps even a new definition of what it means to be a library in the physical sense need to be considered.

Relocating Print Resources

The major reason this has become important is the construction of 3 large computer classrooms on the lower level of the library. To prepare for the changes in the Mathematics curriculum, the campus needed to accommodate the need for providing computers to students enrolled in developmental math modules. It was determined that the best way to address this computing need, based on the number of these modules taught on campus, was to create three computer classrooms with about 35 desktop computers in each room.

After evaluating numerous options, it was decided that the best place for these classrooms would be in the lower level of the library, replacing the space previously occupied by the Testing Center and Student Development Center as well as a majority of the area used for bound periodicals. The library did have sufficient time to prepare for this change. The biggest impact for the library was freeing up space previously devoted to bound periodicals. With more than half of that space needed for the new classrooms, the library prepared a detailed plan for moving or removing the displaced periodicals. The plan can be found on the library’s website at:

http://local.stark.kent.edu/library/Reports/05-06/Relocating_Periodicals.htm

This change in use of space previously designated as library use is indicative of changes many libraries are currently facing and will likely face in the future. The space libraries occupy on a college campus can be considered “prime real estate.” There are several reasons for this. First, with most institutions of higher education facing budgetary problems, capital money for constructing new buildings is not always an option. On the other hand, the hundreds, if not thousands, of square feet most academic libraries occupy with bound volumes of journals (many of which have their content duplicated online) can be viewed as more efficiently used for other
purposes (such as additional classrooms). The fact that academic libraries are typically cost centers that produce no revenue makes the decision to get rid of what could be considered obsolete materials in favor of classroom construction (that does generate revenue) an attractive alternative. So as electronic content (particularly content from vendors such as JSTOR, where the library maintains permanent ownership of the electronic content) continues to replace vast quantities of print content, the cost savings as well as the freedom to dispose the materials and free up space for revenue-generating purposes will likely become a more common and acceptable practice.

*How the Library is Defining its Learning Spaces*

In several ways the library has been redefining its use of space for years. For instance, when the second floor was re-carpeted a few years ago, most of the single person study carrels were replaced with large tables for seating groups of students. This was a reflection of how more students were working on group projects and studying together, instead of doing independent research. In addition, when shelving for current issues of periodicals and the media collection was replaced, the new shelving was of a lower height to take advantage of the natural light available within the building. Still, these changes were more subtle. With the periodicals relocation and advances in the use of technology, the issue of how library space is configured has changed more dramatically.

*Library Instruction*

As was mentioned in last year’s report, the library is in transition with regards to how it provides class-based instruction. The SAILS assessment tool has shown that traditional methods (mostly demonstrational) have been less-effective than anticipated. The library is currently investigating new methods, involving more hand-on, active learning techniques. One new method directly related to the use of library space involved an Art History course taught by Dr. Molly Lindner. This past year she began to schedule about half of her class sessions in the library (on the second floor). She split the class into groups of 4-6 students with each group doing a combined research project (paper or presentation) for the units of study included in the course. Although no formal instruction was requested, a librarian worked with the class by meeting with each group several times throughout the semester and assisting them informally with their projects. This approach to library instruction (and in a general way, information literacy) introduced several concepts discussed in last year’s annual report:

- Faculty collaboration
- Working with smaller groups of students
- Problem-based learning activities
- Use of laptop computers
- Recursive presence by the librarian in the class
The library will be promoting the concept of having more classes meet more often in the library and will be investigating how the library can better accommodate the needs of classroom teaching. The goal is to provide an environment where a classroom instructor could choose to have his or her class meet in the library and have the capability of either conducting a traditional class session (using the library as a classroom) or having the class take advantage of the resources in the library for research-based activities or doing both during a single class period.

Technology

Perhaps the biggest change in how the library is used as a result of changes in technology is the ability for users to take advantage of wireless networking and laptop computers. As alluded to above, laptops are more regularly used to teach classes information literacy skills. Since they require no physical connection, wireless laptops can be used in any physical space in the library. For example, they are used for the Art History course mentioned above that meets on the second floor of the library, not the teaching area on the first floor, which is typically used for class instruction. This also allows students in classes to work individually (if there are enough laptops) or in groups, either by design or because there are not enough laptops to accommodate all students in a class. It is also important to recognize that more students are bringing their own laptops onto campus. As laptops become smaller, lighter, and more affordable, this trend is likely to continue as students will likely prefer to access the library’s electronic resources using their own computers so that they can more easily save and incorporate information gathered through the library with information already contained on their laptop. Wireless technology is a huge advantage for libraries in that it provides great flexibility. Any space, particularly space near print resources (which are in many ways location-bound), could be considered a learning space for individual, group, or even class instruction, when access to electronic resources is available without the need for a physical (wire) connection.

The library is also investigating other technologies for use in the building. Through a grant obtained from the Institute for Library & Information Literacy Education (ILILE), the library will be purchasing a Classroom Response System and SmartBoard to assist in efforts to provide middle childhood education students with skills to present information literacy concepts to middle school children. It is hoped that this experience will help forge new methods for delivering class-based instruction and provide a more efficient means for assessing the library’s teaching efforts (either replacing or incorporating the SAILS assessment instrument).
Collections

Since a major reason libraries are seeing or will see a reduction in its available space is the amount of space needed to house print collections, those collections are likely to be most affected by space reductions. For the Stark Campus Library the changes described above regarding the bound periodicals collection has also created a change in the book collection. As the plan referenced above details, the shelving reserved for the book collection was significantly reduced to accommodate the relocation of current, bound periodicals. Bound volumes of periodicals the library no longer subscribes to (or what is commonly referred to as “dead serials”) were left in the remaining space available on the lower level. This means that the bound periodical collection, once housed as a single unit, is now separated between the second floor and the lower level. Although this adequately resolved the problem of limited space for print periodicals, it will undoubtedly cause some confusion when users try to locate an older volume of a periodical owned by the library (that is not available online). Less available shelf space for expansion of print collections will also require more frequent weeding and shifting. Consolidation is not necessarily a bad thing. It will mean that the library’s print collection will be better maintained and more efficient. It just means that more staff time will be required for continued collection maintenance.
The following includes a description of some specific highlights of library activities for the academic year 05/06:

**New Methods for Library Instruction**

The fact that the library is in transition and looking for new ways to provide classroom instruction has already been mentioned. Specific techniques that seem to be working include more generic online exercises and the expanded use of laptops. When a class comes into the library for instruction with a specific assignment and students have selected their topics, an online search strategies exercise has been employed. The concepts involved in creating a search strategy are presented and each student creates a strategy specific to their assignment. This leads to more effective use of appropriate databases. Laptops facilitate this approach, which turns the instructional session into a hands-on, active learning experience for the class as well as a way for students to do meaningful research during the session. As was also mentioned previously, the idea of having more classes meet more frequently in the library is a concept the library will expand in the coming year.

**New Website**

The library (as well as the rest of the Stark Campus) adopted the university’s content management system called CommonSpot to manage its website. There are some limitations in how the content is presented. For example, database applications cannot be delivered using CommonSpot. The library maintains a separate server to run those applications. However, CommonSpot has allowed the library to focus more on the content and functionality of its web presence and less on appearance and design. In addition, web development is now a shared responsibility, which has created more efficiency and saved time.

**Purchasing Card**

The transition of the majority of library purchases from purchase orders to direct billing using a purchasing (credit) card has been very smooth. It has decreased the time it takes to order, receive and pay for acquisitions (particularly print materials). With the vast majority of items purchased being paid by the purchasing card, a system for reconciling the activities on a monthly basis has been established and seems to work well.
Millennium Modules

During the summer of 2005 staff were trained to move from the text-based (telnet) interface for KentLINK to the graphical (windows-based) interface known as Millennium. The fact that all staff had been using the Millennium version of the circulation module for years made the transition much easier. Although a few functions (printing certain paging slips, for example) were still only available in the text-based interface, most were more easily performed on Millennium or will soon be available to perform on Millennium.

ILLiad for Interlibrary Loan

Another system emerged from the same vendor that developed Illiad, called Odyssey. The library installed Odyssey in the summer and prepared to test it with the Kent Campus and other OhioLINK libraries. However, Kent suggested all KSU libraries filter their interlibrary borrowing requests through them. This would mean the adoption of Illiad university-wide and the abandonment of Odyssey. With proposed increased efficiencies and the ability to relieve each regional campus of interlibrary borrowing activities (even those currently using OCLC for interlibrary traffic), it seemed prudent to wait to see how this proposal developed before making any significant changes requiring software and hardware purchases and the necessity for training.

Weeding

It had been six years since the last weeding project, so the library decided to conduct a large-scale weeding project last year. The process for weeding the general collection that was established for the 1999/2000 weeding project was used for last year’s weeding project. The previous report can be found at:

http://local.stark.kent.edu/library/reports/99-00/weeding/report.htm

The statistics for last year’s project show that about 5% of the collection was weeded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Books</th>
<th>Percentage of Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circulating Collection</td>
<td>40,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected to Weed</td>
<td>8,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used After 7/94</td>
<td>3,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Before Review</td>
<td>5,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained by Librarians and Faculty</td>
<td>3,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeded After Review</td>
<td>2,128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of Books Selected For Weeding

Instead of just throwing out the weeded materials, the library engaged the services of Better World Books. At no cost for the library, the withdrawn materials were shipped to Better World Books and used to help support libraries in Africa.
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Video Inventory
The library began noticing that users were having difficulty finding videos. A cursory examination discovered that many were not shelved properly. As a result, it was decided to conduct an inventory. Afterwards, it was realized that expansion of shelf space for this growing collection was limited. With the quality of videocassettes deteriorating and the availability of videos on DVD (which take up less shelf space), the library will be investigating the possibility of replacing some of the older videocassettes (particularly the larger, multivolume sets) with DVD equivalents.

Circulation Policy Changes
Last year’s report described some of the changes that were implemented with regards to loan periods, renewals and fines. One way the Stark Campus addressed some of these changes was to offer a “Food for Fines” program. Although this program (which allows users to pay their overdue fines with non-perishable food donations) has been conducted for the past several years during the Harvest for Hunger food drive in the spring, the library decided to offer the option year round. It seems to be well received by users. They have the option of either bringing in an appropriate amount of food (1 item per dollar owed, for example) or donating items directly to a local food donation center and bringing in a receipt to show the library that a donation was made.

Pay to Print
Starting just after the end of the spring semester of 2006 the library began charging Kent State students for printing. The rest of the campus had already been charging students. The library was the last department on campus, since workstations only allowed for internet browsing and because the method for charging required students to have FlashCards and Stark State students do not have FlashCards. A system was developed to enable Stark State students to print and the Pharos print server was installed. In order to print, Stark State students must check out a generic FlashCard from the circulation desk to swipe at the Pharos workstation. The library will track its usage and make sure a healthy balance is maintained. The difficulty for Stark State students is that they must go through the trouble of checking out the FlashCard. The benefit is that they get to print for free. Proposals for charging Stark State students directly will be developed in the coming year.
## Staff

The following individuals comprised the library staff for the 05/06 academic year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rob Kairis</td>
<td>Library Director (Associate Professor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Kooistra</td>
<td>Collection Development Librarian (Associate Professor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Kilcullen</td>
<td>Reference Librarian (Associate Professor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Davis</td>
<td>Serials Librarian (Assistant Professor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Birtalan</td>
<td>Cataloging and Interlibrary Loan (Library Associate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne Hawley</td>
<td>Acquisitions (Senior Library Assistant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Lou Hester</td>
<td>Circulation/Student Worker Supervisor (Senior Library Assistant)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The library was able to change Jeanne Hawley’s classification from the non-library classification of Clerical Specialist to Senior Library Assistant. During the fall and spring semesters Lindi Joy completed her Masters of Library Science Practicum at the Stark Campus Library. Lindi worked on a number of initiatives involving library instruction, reference (including experience with the online OhioLINK Chat Reference service), collection management (assisting with the moving of periodicals from the lower level to the second floor), and assisting with efforts to deal with plagiarism.
Interlibrary Borrowing and Lending

With eight years of data to compare, a definite trend has been established for the use of non-returnable items (mostly books). Although use of both local materials and materials borrowed from other libraries decreased slightly, the gap between use of materials not owned by the Stark Campus library and use of local materials remained steady (62% of materials used were borrowed from other Kent State or OhioLINK libraries).

Library staff spend a great deal of time helping students individually. As a result, staff encourage students to not limit the materials they use to just those found in the Stark Campus Library. With limited resources, compared to the state-wide OhioLINK collection, students are better off (in many if not most cases) requesting materials owned by other research libraries. The fact that it takes 2-3 days for those materials to be delivered does not appear to inhibit most students (although there are still students who show up in the library a day before assignments are due and are unable to take advantage of this library service). In addition, typical library instruction sessions include emphasis on the capability of requesting materials not owned locally.

Another aspect of interlibrary lending and borrowing is the comparison between what the library borrowers on behalf of its users and what it lends to other libraries. As one could guess, with a relatively small library collection, the Stark Campus will likely always be a net borrower—it will borrow more materials from other libraries than it lends to other libraries. While borrowing over the past ten years has gone up and down, lending was flat for many years. About 5 years ago the library changed its collection development strategy such that it began buying more titles not widely available within OhioLINK. This has resulted in an increase in lending, since more OhioLINK users are seeing items only owned by the Stark Campus or owned by a few libraries including the Stark Campus. As a net borrower within OhioLINK, Stark Campus materials are placed higher in the algorithm used to decide which library ends up sending a title owned by

*These figures exclude course reserve circulation
multiple libraries. These two factors have resulted in a shift paralleling increased borrowing and a doubling of lending activity from ten years ago.

![ILL Activity Chart]

As also indicated by the above chart, both borrowing and lending were down from the previous year (8% lower for borrowing and nearly 10% for lending). No specific observations with regards to changes in services can be attributed to this decrease. While enrollment was down very slightly, it should be noted that the previous year (04-05) marked an all-time high for both borrowing and lending and that last year’s borrowing was the second highest over the ten year trend). It will be interesting to see if a trend downwards continues to develop.

Books

**Borrowing**

Although the pattern mirrors overall borrowing and lending, the 7% decrease in returnable (book) borrowing is only worth noting should a trend continue for the next few years. It is just as likely with all the efforts made to encourage students to borrow materials rather than rely on what the campus owns locally that borrowing will increase next year.

**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
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 is to purchase books appropriate for the campus but not duplicated in the KentLINK or OhioLINK 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 decrease or level off.

Articles

Borrowing
The overall trend for the past 10 years is clear. The number of transactions related to the borrowing of articles has decreased by more than 50% 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 with similar content in the online resources available (instead of taking the time to request articles through interlibrary loan and wait weeks (in some cases) for delivery.)
**Lending**

The lending of articles has gone up and down over the past 10 years. And while the percentage of 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 past year has been one of transition. With three years of experience and two with data for the library’s First Year Information Literacy program, it is becoming clear that instructional efforts have to be called into question. As defined in previous annual reports, the program consists of 1 class instruction for students enrolled in University Orientation (mostly taught in the fall) and 1-2 classes of instruction for student enrolled in College English II (mostly taught in the spring). Students take the SAILS assessment test as part of both classes. Unfortunately, data from two consecutive years shows no statistical difference between scores taken at the point of University Orientation and following the College English II information literacy instruction. While there are slight differences (described more fully in previous reports), statistically SAILS tells us that whether or not library instruction is provide students score the same.

As a result of having this data analysis in hand prior to the fall semester, the library backed off a bit in its efforts to push the program. The library will certainly continue teaching all sections of the University Orientation course, since it is a fixed required, component. However, the library did not target all sections of College English II as aggressively as it had in the previous years. This resulted in a second year decline in the numbers of classes taught by the library.

The overall decrease in classes taught of 22% was more significant with Stark State College of Technology classes, which dipped to a low of only 27 classes (53% lower than the previous year and the lowest year recorded on the chart above). Kent State classes decreased by 7%. Efforts for understanding the decrease in Stark State classes should be investigated with energy spent in working with their faculty to discover their needs and encourage more classes to be brought to the library for instruction. Discussions with Stark State administrators and faculty are planned.
for next year in an effort to establish a more comprehensive approach for delivering library instruction to Stark State students.

For the coming year, the library plans to invite more classes to simply meet in the library, regardless of whether or not they receive formal library instruction. This plan is in part modeled after the way Dr. Molly Lindner conducted her Art History class last year (meeting consistently in the library to work on group projects). Faculty will be encouraged to bring their classes to the library. The library would then participate as necessary and see what needs are identified to make the experience as effective as possible (this is described more fully in the Highlights section of this report).

As a final note, the library obtained more laptop computers this past year and began integrating them into formal instruction sessions. This has allowed librarians to use the time for both demonstrational instruction as well as hands-on experience for all students in the class (although for larger classes students did need to share a laptop). The library hopes to get even more laptops and continue integrating them whenever possible or practical into its instructional efforts.
Collection Development

Not a great deal changed in terms of how the library continued to build its collection last year. Overall, spending was down considerably (17%). However, two years ago there was a similar decrease in spending for library materials (an 18% reduction). One thing that can contribute to this is the way serials are paid. Often invoices are paid in the subsequent fiscal year, causing a sharp reduction in one year and a spike in the next. Still, spending on books also decreased. It is likely that the library’s approval plan needs a little revitalization. By now faculty are used to buying books from the slips sent to them. It may be necessary to re-market the plan to faculty coordinators, emphasizing the importance of selecting books for the library to purchase.

The chart below shows a general trend for increased spending, but a fairly sharp decline in spending last year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>96/97</th>
<th>97/98</th>
<th>98/99</th>
<th>99/00</th>
<th>00/01</th>
<th>01/02</th>
<th>02/03</th>
<th>03/04</th>
<th>04/05</th>
<th>05/06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>$64,805.00</td>
<td>$85,121.34</td>
<td>$80,799.94</td>
<td>$81,724.60</td>
<td>$72,879.04</td>
<td>$90,279.77</td>
<td>$112,372.1</td>
<td>$96,623.75</td>
<td>$125,009.8</td>
<td>$101,332.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>$56,840.00</td>
<td>$67,841.36</td>
<td>$65,537.29</td>
<td>$66,511.18</td>
<td>$57,342.97</td>
<td>$70,308.42</td>
<td>$77,788.15</td>
<td>$57,975.90</td>
<td>$85,514.83</td>
<td>$64,424.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>$7,965.00</td>
<td>$17,279.98</td>
<td>$15,262.65</td>
<td>$15,213.42</td>
<td>$15,536.07</td>
<td>$19,971.35</td>
<td>$34,584.03</td>
<td>$38,647.85</td>
<td>$39,495.05</td>
<td>$36,908.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One trend that did continue from last year was the fact that faculty are, for the third year in a row, selecting more items to purchase than the library. This is fairly significant. For years the library has carried the majority of the responsibility for selecting materials to add to the library’s collection. The chart below shows that, even though overall the number of items purchased was less than last year, faculty continued to select more items that library staff:
Finally, the $5,000 allocated by the Kent Campus for our library to spend on books was used to support instructional efforts. In the past, specific academic departments and selected faculty were approached to spend the money. Last year it was decided that the allocation be used for general purposes but tied to courses that were more involved with library instruction to encourage faculty to consider selecting books directly related to courses (perhaps to be placed on reserve) and to encourage them to bring their classes to the library for instruction. Using the allocation in this manner likely also contributed somewhat to the overall decrease in spending for library materials.
Library Usage

This section on usage focuses on four areas:

1. Head Count
2. Reference Statistics
3. Circulation
4. KentLINK Searches

Another area that the library regularly tracks usage for is database searching. This is a bit more complicated in that the library has access to about 100 licensed databases, some available through OhioLINK, some through Kent Campus licenses, and some only available on the Stark Campus. Not all OhioLINK databases break down usage by campus. So getting statistics about Stark Campus users is not possible. As a result, the library selectively lists the databases it tracks on its website at the bottom of the About the Library page (under the heading Statistics):

http://www.stark.kent.edu/Library/AboutTheLibrary.cfm

Head Count

The library continued its practice of physically counting the number of people in the building every hour (on the half hour). In the past, most libraries simply counted the number of times people entered or left the library (through gate counters). More and more libraries are taking head counts of people in the library in different locations to get a more detailed picture of usage throughout the day broken down by the type of activities users are engaged in (a practice the Stark Campus Library began over ten years ago). In the past it was more important to delineate head count usage because the building also included the Testing Center and Student Development Center. Since those operations no longer exist in the library, the breakdown serves mainly to determine whether or not people in the building are doing library work or engaged in non-library activities. With the addition of Math labs/classrooms on the lower level (described in detail in the Highlights section of this report), the library will simply not count students when they are in the lower level of the library.
The chart below shows that overall attendance in the library went up by nearly 2%:

Total head went down the previous year by about the same margin, so the number of people visiting the library was relatively unchanged over the past two years. However, what is worthy of noting is the trend related to users involved in library activities versus non-library activities. The chart below shows a clear trend of increased library use over the past six years, reaching a ten year high last year, while non-library use went down to a ten year low:
With the departure of the Testing Center and Student Development Center, the decrease in non-library attendance should have been expected. What is important to note is the steady increase in attendance related to library use. It should also be noted that the upward trend in library-related attendance started during the year following the library’s summer retreat where many action plans revolved around increasing attendance in the library (which had been on a steady decline at that point in time). It is apparent that some of the increase in library-related attendance is directly due to sustained efforts evolving from that summer retreat (the retreat report can be found at: http://local.stark.kent.edu/library/reports/02-03/R03.etreat%20Report.htm).

Reference Statistics

Counting the number of times users ask for help can be problematic. One problem is that raw numbers of each reference encounter with a user cannot fully describe the extent to which the user may have been helped. Some reference questions involve merely pointing a user in the right direction (showing them where a database is on our website), while others can take a great deal of time (helping a student find several articles on a rather obscure topic, for example). Another problem is that the reference statistics are gathered in a binder that resides on the reference desk. It is not unusual for librarians to simply forget to jot down a hash mark when a user was helped. So the statistics are not as meaningful a measure of quality or quantity one would hope for. The number of times librarians were recorded as helping a user went down again last year (by 41%) to a four-year low:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>02/03</th>
<th>03/04</th>
<th>04/05</th>
<th>05/06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stats</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The library has discussed improving ways to gather statistics, but this can be complicated. Other measures of library reference service (previous LibQUAL+ surveys for example) have demonstrated that users are quite satisfied with the service provided by the Stark Campus Library. Plans for the coming year include simply moving the reference statistics log book to the circulation desk for easier accessibility. Other measures will be considered during the course of the year.
Circulation

Statistics for the 05/06 academic year show a continued trend of increased activity (up 12% from the previous year for a 7-year high):

In spite of the fact that more users are getting their materials from other institutions (as described in the Interlibrary Borrowing and Lending section of this report), users are still borrowing more materials owned by the Stark Campus Library than in previous years. It does stand to reason that as more people populate the library for library-related reasons, more will eventually end up checking out more materials. In addition, circulation activity for the laptops available for students to check out and use in the library has contributed to the increase in these numbers.

KentLINK Searches

Gathering KentLINK usage statistics has been a problem for many years. With a change from the text-based interface to a Windows and web environment for management information purposes, data was inaccessible or lost for 04/05. The library does have raw numbers of searches but not the breakdown that would have been preferred by index (Title, Author, Keyword, etc.). As a result, the only information to analyze from last year is included in the following chart:
There was a slight decrease in the total number of searches from two years ago (down 3%). Since the previously recorded data indicated a six-year high in searching on KentLINK, the slight decrease is probably not noteworthy. Having the searches broken down by index would have been helpful. It is hoped that that data will be available for next year’s report.
Academic Year 06/07

ILILE Grant

In the spring of 2006 the library was awarded a mini grant from the Institute for Library and Information Literacy Education (ILILE). The purpose of the grant was to promote information literacy for education majors. The library’s proposal entitled “Preparing Middle School Educators for Teaching Information Literacy” suggested incorporating the development of information literacy lesson plans based on Ohio Information Literacy Competency standards targeted for middle school students into the course Reading and Writing in Middle Childhood (MCED 40006). The plan is to develop an assessment tool that can be delivered using a Classroom Response System, allowing for immediate feedback. The assessment will be given before students in the class develop their lesson plans and then again after the presentation of those plans for the entire class. It is hoped that two things will be accomplished:

1. Students will improve their own information literacy skills through the development of lesson plans as well as a result of observing the presentations of lesson plans by fellow students in the class.
2. Future middle school teachers will gain an appreciation for the need to teach information literacy skills to middle school students.

ILLiad for Interlibrary Loan

The Kent Campus developed a proposal for delivering interlibrary loan materials for all KSU students, faculty and staff. In the past some campuses (such as the Stark Campus) performed interlibrary loan activities for their users. The advantages of this proposal for the Stark Campus included freeing Stark Campus Library staff from the process of obtaining articles and books from other libraries as well as the prospect of cutting the turn around time between users requesting materials and having those materials delivered. The requests would be made electronically by establishing an account with the Kent Campus ILLiad system and having non-returnable requested materials (journal articles, for example) delivered electronically to the user’s email account.

Stark State Initiatives

Early in the summer a meeting was conducted with Stark State officials to discuss ways to improve services to Stark State students. Plans were made for the coming year to discuss ways to systematically incorporate library instruction into the Stark State curriculum. For instance, a course similar to Kent State’s University Orientation is planned. The library would be a natural fit as a fixed component of that course (as it is with the Kent State Orientation course). Other plans include making Stark State a more visible presence for OhioLINK services, and streamlining the acquisition of library materials purchased by or on behalf of Stark State instructional programs.
Collection Management Initiatives
During the summer of 2006 the library staff met to discuss projects planned for the coming year. Some of the projects outlined included:

1. Shifting the general collection
   Although the general collection was shifted more recently following the weeding project described earlier in this report, with the relocation of most of the bound periodicals collection to the second floor, the general collection needs to be shifted again to make room for the bound periodical volumes that were moved.

2. Weeding the Oversized collection
   The oversized collection has not been weeded for many years (if ever). Even though there has been limited growth to the collection, it was felt that as part of the library’s overall collection management efforts, this collection needed to be weeded.

3. Replacing Videocassettes with DVDs

First Floor Renovation
During the discussions concerning the building of Math classrooms/computer labs on campus, one proposal included moving the Main Hall East Wing computer lab to the first floor of the library. While this proposal was put aside in favor of one for building all three Math labs on the lower level of the library, it did open the discussion about making the library’s public PCs more like computer lab PCs. This would allow students to incorporate other standard computer applications into their library research. They could build PowerPoint presentations or write papers while conducting research in the library. In the past, the library has restricted the use of public PCs to just internet browsing so that students needing to write papers and perform other non-library work on the PCs would not cause others needing to do library research to wait for an available computer. Also, since printing was free in the library (and cost 5 cents a page in all other computer labs on campus), it was anticipated that students would flock to the library for non-library purposes so that they could print for free. However, now that students are charged for their printing in the library, it seems more logical that public PCs be equipped to handle most of the applications available in other labs on campus. In addition, although the proposal to turn the first floor into a large computer lab was not implemented, plans are in the making for renovating the first floor by replacing the current configuration of PCs with pods of 2-6 computers scattered throughout the first floor. It is likely that the change in physical makeup for the first floor and the ability to perform a variety of computer functions (in addition to doing library research) will change the nature of the service the library performs. Anticipating increased traffic on the already busy first floor, the library will need to train all full time staff to handle some basic computing problems. Student workers will also need to be trained to handle such issues as well as be able to diagnose problems so that users doing library work or other computer work (or both) be directed to the proper staff in the library or on campus to address their needs.