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Introduction

This report serves several purposes:

1. Reporting important information to campus constituents so that they have a greater understanding of the services provided by the library
2. Serving as an historical record documenting the growth of the library, tracing its development over time
3. Providing a means for analyzing library activities so that effective strategic plans can be drawn and services improved over time
4. Assessing the value and effectiveness of the services provided by the library

While it can be a time-consuming task, the report is a valuable tool that helps the library not only reflect on the past, but provide important information that contributes to planning the future of the library.

Normally, these reports are written each year. Last year was a particularly challenging one and a report was not prepared. This report covers both the 2010/2011 and 2011/2012 fiscal years.
The focus of this year’s report highlights is divided into three areas:

1. A review of print serials costs
2. Teaching Area enhancements
3. Strategic Planning

The Cost of Print Serials

It is no secret that increases to the cost of print serials usually out-paces the cost of inflation. Scholarly content is getting more and more expensive. The Stark Campus Library is in a particularly advantageous position in terms of controlling costs. Being a KSU library usually allows our library to take advantage of group licenses established by the Kent Campus. Similarly, as Kent participates in shared licenses with the OhioLINK consortium, we also gain access at little or no cost. Finally, because our library has had a practice of purchasing some important print reference sources that are now available online, we have been able to partner with the Kent Campus on migrating from print to online and saving money as a result. Below is a chart illustrating the relative cost for print and online serials content:

The chart shows that while print costs have remained fairly constant, hovering around the $45,000 mark, online content has been dramatically reduced. Starting in 08/09 the cost for online serials content has been on a steady decline and is now less than half the cost in 08/09. A major factor in this reduction is the way some significant deals were forged with the Kent Campus. For example, historically our library purchased all but one of the Gale Literary Criticism series in print. When it was decided to move all of these titles to
their online equivalent in the spring of 2008, the deal we struck with Kent was that they
would pay the on-going costs and our campus would pay for the back files (so that users
could search the entire set, not just the content from 2008 on). Although a significant
cost for our campus, we were able to pay that amount off over three years at a cost per
year about the same as we were paying for the equivalent print subscription. After the
third year (and the chart reflects this) our costs for these series disappeared. Similar deals
had the same effect. Since these print titles were previously paid for out of monograph
funds (because they are reference sources), there was no cost reduction to print serials;
the savings were realized in a different part of the budget.

A related area, in terms of budgeting, that adds to the cost of print subscriptions is
binding. To preserve print materials the library sends recently received loose issues of
journals to a commercial binder so that those issues could be bound together and better
protected for future use. The following chart incorporates binding into print serials
expenditures to show a better picture of the relative direct costs between print and online
content:

Another way to reduce print costs is to reduce binding costs. The library was able to
accomplish this in two ways. The first was to cease binding JSTOR titles. JSTOR titles
are unique in that the content is complete in online form from the first issue up to a
certain date, but not up to the current issue. Each title has what is termed a “moving
wall.” If the content is complete up until 3 years ago, the moving wall is three years. So
in 2012, we will have content for such a title from the publication’s inception until 2009.
In 2013 we will have the same content with an additional year added (until 2010). Since
JSTOR provides the library access to all but the most current years inside the title’s
moving wall, there is no need to bind a JSTOR title. The library identified 53 JSTOR
titles no longer needing binding. The other method the library used to reduce binding
costs was to combine its binding with the Kent Campus. Although both libraries used the
same commercial binder (HF Group), the Stark Campus Library is smaller and was charged a higher rate with a longer turn-around time. By sending our binding to Kent we both reduced the costs (taking advantage of their lower rate) and reduced the turn-around time for having journal issues away from the library. As to this second point, serials binding processes had broken down and were handled so poorly that issues waiting to be bound often sat in boxes for months at a time before even being sent to the binder. With the ability to combine forces with Kent and with tightening up binding procedures, it now only takes 4 weeks between removing issues needing binding from their shelf on the first floor to being added as bound volumes to the permanent serials collection on the second floor of the library. Both of these initiatives were implemented during the past year. The chart below shows how binding has been reduced (by a third this past year and less than half its costs in 06/07):

![Binding Chart]

**The Cost per Use of Serials**

What drives the need to research the cost of serials (particularly the cost of print serials) is the difference between how much it cost to use print serials as compared to online serials. The difference in cost is so vast that the following chart shows online cost per use as zero, while the cost for print continues to rise:

![Cost per Use Chart]
Obviously, the last year did show a dip in costs. That could be attributed to the cost savings described above that were implemented last year. Still, when people are using print serials at a rate of less than 3 times each week and the cost of each use is nearly $400, common sense indicates that even more cost saving measures need to be considered. In comparison (although the chart is not able to describe this), costs for using online content (content used nearly 1,000 times each week) continue to drop to about 37 cents per use, as shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09-10</th>
<th>10-11</th>
<th>11-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ave cost per print article</td>
<td>$80.20</td>
<td>$91.05</td>
<td>$279.25</td>
<td>$425.73</td>
<td>$388.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave cost per online article</td>
<td>$1.01</td>
<td>$0.73</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$0.74</td>
<td>$0.56</td>
<td>$0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teaching Area Enhancements

Perhaps the strategic initiative generating the most impact over the past few years has been the enhancements to the library’s Teaching Area. We are accommodating more classes and attracting others on campus to use the area. It seems that there is more need to give presentations and have computers on hand for users. So while more instructors are bringing their classes in for library instruction or simply reserving the area and the netbooks for their own purposes (without library instruction), the Business Office, Student Services, and other departments on campus are making use of the space as well. The most significant use of this type was for the “First Step” program (formerly known as SCORE). This Student Services program invites incoming freshmen on campus for a day-long orientation. In the past it was mostly done in the Library Conference room or the Main Hall Auditorium. Now that the program includes the need for computers and with the difficulty in scheduling these numerous sessions in computer labs on campus, having these presentations in the library teaching area made sense. Also, the timing was right. The library tends to see less activity in its teaching area towards the end of the spring until the following fall. The First Step program runs roughly during that same time period with presentations averaging about 2-3 per week. Although there is no official library component to the program, simply having incoming students visit the library for this important orientation increases its visibility.

Many instructors realize the convenience of having class sessions in the library (particularly if research assignments are part of the course) as well as the array of technology available. Some classes come in exclusively for the use of the SmartBoard. Both instructors and students like the idea of free printing while using the teaching area. The most common reason instructors reserve the area is the availability of netbook computers. To accommodate larger classes as well as having more than one class in the library simultaneously, the library began adding more netbooks. As the Action-Oriented grant-funded program managed by Student Services wound down and grantees began returning the netbook computers they were assigned, the library was able to repurpose those netbooks and double the number available for use in teaching area. At times when the teaching area was already booked for a class, library instruction sessions were conducted simultaneously using netbooks in the teaching area and in the Library Conference Room.
Finally, with increased popularity and needing to fit larger classes in the teaching area (Geology classes are brought in a couple of times each semester with class sizes of 90 students) the library was able to purchase additional tables and chairs.

Strategic Planning

The library conducts strategic planning every few years. The plans are typically small-scaled and for limited duration. During the summer of 2011 the library developed a plan to address two areas of concern:

1. Get feedback from students about their needs for library service
2. Investigate ways to promote less traditional services in conjunction with putting on public events, and expand the use of the library as a place

With regards to the first concern, the library found willing partners with some key business faculty. Marketing professor Don Thacker presented his class with an opportunity to work with the library in soliciting student feedback. As a result Zach Eckels developed an online survey and conducted a focus group that queried students about their thoughts on library services during the 2012 spring semester. The survey created in such a short time frame was quite impressive. Zach took control of the assignment and seemed to know the right questions to ask. He provided a detailed report of both the survey and the focus group he conducted towards the end of the semester.
The following are some noteworthy results:

- 382 students completed the survey.
- When asked which campus services students use on campus, the library ranked highest:
  - 66% use the library
  - 61% use computer labs
  - 53% use the Food Emporium
  - 51% use the Campus Center
  - 16% use the Physical Education Building
  - 12% use tutoring

  (While it is good to know that more students indicated using the library than any other service, it is a concern that 1/3 of the students responding to the survey do not use the library.)

- When asked which specific library services students use and how often they use them, it seems that print resources are in less demand (58% indicated never checking out books, for example). 29% also indicated never performing database searches. This may suggest that students are relying less on library sponsored resources and more on free internet searching (Google, Wikipedia, etc.).

  (Perhaps greater emphasis on in-person, class, and one-on-one instruction, as well as online tutorials emphasizing the importance of library-sponsored print and online resources is needed.)

- When asked why students do not use the library, the most popular answer was that students can use online resources without having to go to the library; 40% indicated using online services outside the library.

  (Perhaps the library should be marketing personal, in-library services such as reference consultations, to promote the benefits of coming to the library as well as developing more online interaction with students—both asynchronous tutorials and interactive chat reference services.)

- When asked what services the library could offer that are not currently available, the two most prominent seem to be:
  1. Some type of food service (coffee/snack bar or vending machines, 52% and 34% respectively responded positively to these services).
  2. Providing non-educational materials.

The library plans to draft proposals based on Zach’s work in the fall of 2012.

Unrelated to this initiative, another business faculty member, Dr. Victor Berardi asked his Business Consulting class to work with units on campus to find ways to better organize and run their operations. The library was fortunate to work with Dr. Berardi’s students in the spring of 2012. This group worked to create detailed maps and collated some of the data the library has collected over the past 17 years (much of that data appearing in these
annual reports). Dr. Berardi intends to have future groups in this course work with the library. What is clear by having the library work with these smart and inventive students is that they are an untapped resource. Having students work to improve our services as part of a class assignment gives them real-world experience in identifying and solving problems from an outside perspective. These are not just academic exercises. By allowing the library to adapt to cutting edge technology and developing methods for data collecting and processes, they develop skills they can bring with them after graduation. The library gains greatly from their energy and enthusiasm and makes better use of up to date technology and systems to allow it to run more effectively and efficiently.

To address the second strategic initiative, the library worked with the theatre department through Professor Brian Newberg on initiatives related to the production of the play *Plumfield Iraq*. To this end, the library offered space on the second floor for sculptures by students working on an assignment related to the play as well as having artwork by the student group SOFA hang on the second floor. The library spent a great deal of time creating *Reflections of Service*, an online interactive collection of pictures, music, etc. related to service in the military (recently featured as a *Kentwired article*). Finally, the library hosted an event honoring the visiting playwright of *Plumfield Iraq*, Barbara Lebow. The library is already thinking of ways to expand the idea of connecting with other initiatives on campus, providing public events, and in general doing more things outside what is traditionally thought of in terms of library service.

The library has also opened up its public areas for use by others on campus. The second floor is now regularly used by art students to display their work. Although there are other galleries on campus, the ability to display student art is somewhat limited. Sculptures are placed on the floor and a wall on the second floor was fitted for a hanging system for paintings. In addition, the library invites students to display busts on shelves on the first floor. With the addition of some display cases on the second floor, honors students have been creating visual displays related to their senior theses. Finally, a Family and Consumers Studies class used the main display on the first floor to create exhibits as part of their final projects in the course. The purpose of identifying all of these projects is that the library wants to be known as a place that invites campus constituents make use of its space.
The following includes a description of some specific highlights of library activities spanning the academic years 10/11 and 11/12:

**Teaching Area**

Last year the campus purchased new tables and enough new chairs with wheels to seat four students at each table. The library opened the area for more seating by moving the cabinets containing microform materials. With 14 tables dedicated to the Teaching Area, 56 students can work comfortably during library instruction sessions. The library has also accommodated classes of 90 students by squeezing a few more chairs around the tables. With the addition of more netbook computers, these large classes can now be provided library instruction. The library also has the ability to teach multiple classes in the building simultaneously (1 in the Teaching Area and one in the Conference Room, for example).

**Libguides**

For the past two years the library has been adding more and more Libguides. These guides help students in using library resources, usually in a specific subject area. They are easy to create and include the ability to add media content (videos, interactive polling, RSS feeds, etc.). The library plans to replace its existing webpages for Resources by Subjects with these subject Libguides. In addition, the guides have been used for other purposes such as inventoring audio/video equipment and special projects (Reflections of Service, for example).

**Reference Statistics**

Collecting reference statistics has been an on-going struggle. In the past, the library would simply record each reference inquiry as a tick on a notepad, providing no substantive information regarding these critical transactions. Two years ago the university began using the Sitescripter service, which did allow each library to track questions and responses, according to the READ scale (a commonly used standard in academic libraries that measures the difficulty of reference questions). Last year University Libraries decided to discontinue this service. The library is looking into other possible services. One that seems attractive is RefAnalytics from the same company that provides the Libguides service (Springshare). Cost and licensing issues will need to be resolved before the library can adapt to this (or any other) service. In the meantime, the library is once again without a substantive method for tracking reference questions.
Highlights

Instant Message Reference
KSU libraries are also investigating a new way to provide online reference (instant messaging). The free service previously used, Meebo, is being discontinued. Again, similar to the issue with recording reference transactions, the libraries are looking into a Springshare services called LibAnswers. In addition, the Stark Campus Library, as part of its strategic planning during the summer of 2011, plans to investigate possible ways to provide online reference locally (just for Kent Stark and Stark State users). The challenge is being able to offer a viable service with enough hours to justify its existence, given the small staff available to provide the service.

Netbook Cart
With more requests for use of the library’s Teaching Area for both library instruction and simply as a means for creating a computer lab like environment for classes, the library investigated the possibility of obtaining a netbook cart for housing and delivering netbook computers to any classroom on campus. A cart was purchased and loaded with netbooks previously provided to students selected for the Action-Oriented program, who returned their netbooks after the grant ran out. The library began delivering the netbook cart (with 26 netbooks) in the spring of 2012. Faculty who have exhausted all other computer labs on campus request the netbook cart as a way to turn any classroom on campus into a computer lab, with wireless access throughout campus. The service is growing in popularity. The library is committed to delivering and picking up the cart according to specific guidelines.

Digital Video Equipment
For the past several years the library has been using its integrated library system (KentLINK) to circulate various types of audio/visual equipment. A couple of years ago there was a request to manage this type of equipment for the Journalism and Mass Communication program, which has specific courses in digital video production (one such course that is now required for all Commercial Music students). It has been a challenge for staff to accurately account for dozens of pieces of equipment each time a student checks out this equipment. With more demands for this type of service, the library created an online guide to Technology Equipment, which helps users understand the equipment available for borrowing and to determine its availability.
Staff

The following individuals comprised the library staff for the 09/10 academic year:

Rob Kairis                  Library Director (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)
Jeanne Hawley               Acquisitions (Senior Library Assistant)
Barbara Potts               Circulation/Student Worker Supervisor (Senior Library Assistant)

The past couple of academic years have been tough ones for the library staff. As mentioned in the previous annual report, in May of 2010 Jeffery Moore (the library’s former Circulation/Student Worker Supervisor) accepted a fulltime position in the Special Collections Department on the Kent Campus. During the 2011/2012 fiscal year, the library hired Barbara Potts. Barbara has become a great asset to the library. In the fall of that year, Jeffery became progressively ill and passed away. Although only a member of the Stark Campus Library staff for a few short years, we will always remember him fondly. A little more than one year later, Judy Kooistra, after battling an illness for years, also passed away. Judy was a dedicated employee whose humor and laugh will remain with us all long after her passing.
Interlibrary Borrowing and Lending

Both ILL and circulation activity decreased slightly last year. The gap between users borrowing materials from other libraries and using local resources remained constant. It is interesting to note that the idea that users would favor online resources to such an extent that use of print books would decrease significantly seems to be mistaken, at least for the moment. Although they are getting more print resources from other libraries, Stark Campus users are using print resources at about the same level as they were in the late 1990s. As the following chart indicates, they are actually using more print resources than they were ten years ago:

* These figures exclude course reserve and laptop circulation

The shape of ILL activity (the chart below) looks remarkably similar to the shape of the graph comparing circulation to ILL (above). There does seem to be a correlation between the overall borrowing activities of Stark Campus users and ILL activity in general (both borrowing and lending). Just as there is a fairly wide gap between circulation and ILL, there is a similar gap between ILL borrowing and lending:
Borrowing

There is not much to report on ILL borrowing. With the exception of 06/07, borrowing has remained constant between 6,000 and 7,000 transactions each year. These are healthy figures and average more than 500 requests each month.

Lending

There seems to be a little less consistency with ILL lending. Fluctuations such as demonstrated in 08/09 are often the result of changes to the OhioLINK algorithm that determines which libraries are picked to supply materials when many libraries own the same thing. Although there is a slow decline overall for lending in the past five years, the numbers are higher than a decade ago. Whether it is borrowing or lending of library-owned materials (as opposed to online resources), it is clear that the use of traditional (mostly print) library resources is important to our users and libraries will continue to invest heavily in the sharing our collections.
Information Literacy

The library taught 3 more classes last year than the year prior. However, in 2010/11 the number of classes decreased by 19% from the year prior to that. As the chart below demonstrates, the overall number of classes taught has decreased from 2007/08, the year the library exceeded 200 classes for the first and only time. The major reason for this decline is the reduction of classes taught to Stark State College students. In 2007/08 the library taught 80 Stark State classes. Since then the number of classes taught has gone to 61 (2008/09), 36 (2009/10), 5 (2010/11), and zero last year. With two librarians now employed by Stark State, their faculty are content to have instruction done in their facility rather than bringing their students to the library.

Another interesting development is that, although the library taught more classes last year, the number of students taught decreased by 8%. So while more classes are coming into the library for instruction, the size of those classes seems to be smaller. With the anticipated hire of a new librarian in the coming year, a greater emphasis will be placed on reaching out to Kent State classes and inviting them into the library for instruction.
Collection Development

The library’s collection budget remained relatively flat last year:

The chart above only references monographic purchases (primarily books and videos). The past ten years have seen significant shrinkage in spending for monographs. While there has been no conscious effort to minimize purchases, the library has implemented more cooperative collection development practices. With the ability to request books through OhioLINK from other college and university libraries across the state, the library is more careful not to buy titles that are readily available through OhioLINK requesting. In addition, large reference collections (*Dictionary of Literary Biography*, *Contemporary Authors*, etc.) were moved from print to online as part of collaborative initiatives implemented by the Kent Campus. So the amounts included in the above chart do not reflect increased spending for the electronic equivalents. Because those print reference titles were selected by the library, it accounts for the dramatic decline in spending attributed to the library (as opposed to spending for titles selected by faculty).
Library Usage

This section on usage focuses on four areas:

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

Head Count

With the exception of fiscal year 2006/07 attendance in the library has seen steady increases. In fact, over the course of the past ten years the number of users frequenting the library has gone up 85%.

What makes these statistics interesting is that the 2006/07 year was the last year that the Testing Center and the Student Development Center was housed in the lower level of the library and the library counted users in that area. Starting in 2007/08, when those units moved to the newly built Campus Center and electronic Math classrooms were installed.
on the lower level of the library, the library no longer counted anyone using the lower level. Instead of seeing decreases (which is what might have been expected), the library experienced significant growth in the number of users on the first and second floors. The increases can be attributed to the library’s strategic efforts to increase usage (strategic planning that was done in the early part of the century), enhancing important physical locations in the building (such as the Teaching Area) and the addition of more technology, specifically desktop computers on both the first and second floors, as well as laptops that could be checked out to students for 2-hour intervals.

Reference Statistics

Just when we thought we had this issue resolved, we once again ran into a problem. A couple of years ago, in an effort to collect more meaningful data on how the library performs reference transactions, the library began using Sitescripter. This was a university-wide initiative paid for by the Kent Campus. Last year, it was decided that the service would be discontinued. The Stark Campus Library is once again looking for a practical method to record reference transactions in a way that helps it better understand users’ needs for information.

Circulation

Overall circulation activity was flat in 10/11 and went down slightly in 11/2:
The 10-year trend is interesting in that it started with a steady increase and then, with alternating years of increases/decreases and years where statistics remained constant, it ended where it started. It will be interesting to see if the number of checkouts continues to decrease, suggesting less reliance on print materials as more content is provided electronically. As also illustrated with interlibrary lending and borrowing, the reliance of print materials is still a significant part of student learning. As indicated in the next set of statistics and alluded to in the Highlights sections, it seems that the only definitive change in user behavior (in terms of the media preferred for information) is the dramatic decrease in print serials. However, print monographs (books) are still being used at about the same rate as 10 years ago.

Database Searches

The library has provided statistics for usage of online databases for as long as it has subscribed to them. They can be found on the library’s web site at the bottom of the About the Library web page:

http://stark.kent.edu/campuses/stark/academics/library/About.cfm

These statistics are only for a small fraction of the databases available to Stark Campus users. While users have access to nearly 400 different databases, the library is not able to track the use of all of them. Many are licensed through OhioLINK and statistics are provided at the institutional level and not broken down by campus. Of those that the library can track, it selects the ones it feels are most useful for its users. Since each database reports activity in a different format, the library simplifies the data by placing them into three categories:

1. **Sessions**, the number of times users accessed the database
2. **Searches**, the number of unique searches entered during a session
3. **Full Text**, the number of full text articles downloaded during a session

The chart below shows a ten-year trend for use of the databases tracked by the library:
It has already been noted in the Highlights sections that online usage of serials is exponentially higher than usage of print serials. What is curious about the database usage shown in the above chart is the huge increase in the number of searches. Throughout the entire 10-year period the number of sessions and the number of full text articles downloaded remained relatively consistent. For the first 6 years, searching also was fairly consistent. Then in 08/09 the number of searches climbed. Last year the number of searches skyrocketed to nearly half a million searches. Since these numbers are gathered from vendor web sites, it is possible there was a reporting error. If that is the case it will be impossible to identify that type of error. If the numbers are being reported correctly, it may mean that users are searching for but not finding the information they are seeking. If this were a single year where the searches more than doubled, an error would be the logical inference. However, although the skewing of the chart due to last year’s jump in searching lessens the effect, searching did double from 07/08 to 08/09. So there is a pattern to this behavior. Before any definitive conclusions are reached, statistics for the next year or so should be reviewed to determine if user behavior in searching and reading online articles is changing.
Academic Year 12/13

Reference Statistics
As mentioned in the Highlights section, Sitescriptor is going away and KSU libraries will be investigating a different tool for recording reference transactions. One tool under consideration is LibAnalytics. Along with its component service LibAnswers, LibAnalytics is a little more complex in setting up for 8 libraries in separate geographic locations. LibAnswers is a knowledge base that can be developed by populating a database with the questions and answers recorded in LibAnalytics. Again, the issue to resolve is how to separate 8 different libraries in a single knowledge base. If the knowledge base includes a process common on more than a single campus but with different instructions for that process, users may not be able to discern which process refers to which campus.

Student Feedback Proposal
The results of the survey and focus group conducted in the spring of 2012 (as discussed in the Highlights section) will be considered. The library will prepare a set of proposals based on the student responses in the fall and plan to implement whatever is approved during the course of the coming fiscal year. A few interesting findings that will help shape the proposal include:

1. 382 students completed the survey.
2. 66% of the students responding use the library (more than any other campus service listed in the survey).
3. When students who indicated they do not use the library were asked why they do not use the library, the most popular answer was that they can get to online resources without having to come into the building.
4. When asked what services the library should offer that is not currently offered, the most common answer was providing food service (52% indicated a desire for a coffee shop/snack bar and 34% like the idea of having vending machines in the building).

Business Classes
In addition to the student (Zach Eckels) in Professor Don Thacker’s marketing class, who solicited the student feedback just mentioned, the library worked with students in Dr. Victor Berardi’s Business Consulting class on ways to improve the efficiency of certain library functions, also during the spring semester of 2012. This will likely be a more long term project involving successive classes; the current plan is for students enrolled in the fall semester for this course to take up where the students in spring left off. These students are making a real contribution to the library, improving data collection and analysis for such things as how the library records attendance and differentiates how students use the library at different times of the day.
Open House
The library is planning an open house. The plan is to have the event just before the fall semester starts at the end of August. The primary audience will be faculty (both returning and new faculty). This will be an informal way to introduce faculty to our services. Along with promotional items (pencils, Post-its with the campus logo, etc.), the library is preparing an information guide listing library services for faculty. The guide describes the services already presented on the library’s Faculty Services webpage.

Plagiarism Initiatives
Dating back to 2004 the library has been involved with initiatives to educate students about plagiarism. Started locally only on the Stark Campus, the library began offering a session on plagiarism to FYE/Destination Kent State classes (although at the time the course was called University Orientation). In addition, around the same time the concept of “Plagiarism School” was developed at Stark. This provided an alternative to just catching and sanctioning students who were accused of plagiarizing. Over the years, these practices gained some awareness across the university, resulting in the adoption of new university-wide policies and practices that require a plagiarism session as a fixed part of the FYE course and Plagiarism School being offered on all KSU campuses. The Stark Campus and the library in particular have been acknowledged for its commitment to combatting plagiarism.

New Librarian
It has been 17 years since the library was in a position to hire a new librarian. Given the changes in how academic libraries function during the course of that time period, it was decided that before beginning the hiring process, the library would solicit advice about how to fill the position. In the spring of 2012, after consulting with the deans' office, the Stark faculty council was asked for opinions regarding the qualities it would like to see in a new librarian. Council suggested surveying all Stark faculty. The results of this short survey as well as consultation with the University Libraries’ CAC (College Advisory Council) resulted in the creation of the position of Online Learning Librarian. There seem to be great interest in the position having a significant role in teaching information literacy, with a specific focus on online learning. The search will begin in the summer and hopefully conclude with a new librarian starting at the beginning of the fall 2012 semester.
Microform Scanner

Microfilm and microfiche are used much less frequently than in the past. With the *New York Times Historical* available online, users can get to information previously only available in microform through convenient online interfaces. In addition, the maintenance fees each year for the microform reader/printer exceed $1,000 a year. The library started looking for a cheaper, better quality option to replace the large, aging, and loud reader/printer. The most attractive alternative seems to be a scanner. This type of device would need to be connected to a networked computer to allow captured images from microfilm or microfiche to be emailed or printed to the library’s public printer. Another advantage would be that the captured images would be of higher quality and could be edited before being reproduced (a capability not available with the old reader/printer). Finally, these devices are usually about the size of a laptop computer, so the library would be able to set it up in any one of a number of places within the building. A microfilm/microform scanner is hoped to be purchased and in place by the end of the fall semester.