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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.
Highlights

Past reports have repeatedly shown how technology is changing in fundamental ways how libraries offer their services. This year’s Highlights section will focus on three aspects of technology influencing how the Stark Campus Library is and will be offering library services:

1. Online Teaching and Learning
2. Equipment Lending
3. Support for User-Owned Technology

Online Teaching and Learning

For many years the library has conducted its customized information literacy sessions in its Teaching Area. What was once a demonstration of library services with the use of a cart with a computer and overhead projector is now an interactive learning experience utilizing the following technology:

1. Computer (Instructor’s) Workstation
2. Ceiling-mounted projector
3. Netbooks computers for students
4. Wireless networking to connect netbooks to the internet
5. Free printing
6. Smartboard for more interactive demonstration
7. Clickers (interactive, immediate classroom response system)

And these are only the hardware-related technologies used. The list does not include all of the software applications and online systems that are integrated into each library instructional session. Although not a technology, *per se*, even free printing offers a unique aspect of library instruction. It is often a simple service like this that both students and teaching faculty appreciate and a reason to bring classes back for multiple sessions in our teaching area.

In terms of learning, it is hard to fully itemize the ways library online content and services support student learning. Still here are some to consider:

- **Webpages.** Organizing information in ways that allows users to effectively find and use information for research, using the university’s content management system as well as the library’s Libguides.
- **Off-campus authentication.** Allowing users to gain access to the licensed content at their convenience perhaps at times when the library is closed.
- **Interactive tutorials.** Although still in early stages, tutorials are being created to provide basic instructional modules to help users learn how to use library services.
- **Chat reference.** Communicating with users in real time using interactive chat to answer questions and push content to users unable to get assistance in-person in the library.
• **Consulting with teaching faculty.** Working with faculty to incorporate library services into their online courses either through Blackboard or linkages from Blackboard to library created content.

Replicating services the library has always provided and will continue to provide in person in an online environment is a challenge. It is similar to the challenge teaching faculty face when deciding how to teach a course they have always taught in a classroom in an exclusively online environment.

**Equipment Lending**

With a robust system for tracking the lending and borrowing of books and other library materials, the library is usually seen as the “go to” place for tracking the lending and use of just about anything on campus. As a result, years ago a library outpost was created in the Campus Center to allow students to checkout laptop computers. In addition, the library began circulating a multitude of equipment to users, including:

- Laptops and netbooks
- Camcorders
- Microphones
- Tripods
- Projectors
- Wireless mice
- Tablet devices
- Portable hard drives
- Voice recorders
- Clickers (classroom response systems)
- iPads

The challenge is not just in navigating the particulars of who gets to borrow which device and for how long, it is also the maintenance and having at least some basic knowledge of the equipment being loaned. Since the library is the place to go to get the equipment, it is usually the place to go to get help after the equipment is borrowed. Library staff have taken on an enormous burden in knowing enough about each of the items listed above (and more) to give informed answers to users wishing to borrow these devices. In addition, since some of the equipment is borrowed for course assignments (digital camera equipment, for example), the library has taken on the role of ensuring all components are in their proper bags when they are checked out and for some devices that their batteries are fully charged when a student checks them out.

The fact that the library has taken on the continually growing responsibility for managing equipment without added human resources, expertise, or even training, is a testament to the library’s resourcefulness and ability to adapt to its ever changing role. That is not to say that this new responsibility has not brought with it its share of frustration and aggravation (from time to time).
Support for User-Owned Technology

This final category of technology is presented more for future planning than for reflection on past activities. The library has provided services for users who bring in their own computing devices (helping users with laptops gain access to the campus’ wireless networks, for example). There appears to be a growing trend with users bringing in their own devices.

A few years back, a grant-funded program called “Action-Oriented Students” offered by the campus Student Services provided netbook computers to students who qualified. About 50-60 netbooks were given to these students to use until they graduated or left the university (consistent with the previous section on technology, the netbooks were checked out to these students through the library). Students just needed to bring their netbook in to the library to be checked in and back out each semester (to make sure the student still had the netbook and that it was working properly). At the end of the first semester, the majority of the netbooks were returned and students did not want them back. It appeared that the burden of bringing the device to campus was one reason often voiced for not wanting to continue to use the netbooks, since the campus provided computers for their use while they were on campus.

In thinking about how to provide public computing services to users in the future, the library wanted to measure how often users relied upon library-provided devices (either the public workstations on both the first and second floors of the library or laptops students can check out at the circulation desk) in comparison to how often they bring in and use their own devices (laptops, netbooks, tablets, or even smartphones). During the spring 2014 semester an informal study was conducted. Noticing just a few years after the end of the Action-Oriented grant ran out that more students seemed to be bringing their own devices into the library (for both independent studying and for instructional classes), the library began counting the number of times users on the second floor chose to sit at and use a public workstation provided by the library and when they chose to use their own device, away from the public workstations. While no formal statistical gathering was performed and the counts were taken at random during the day, each count ended with more users using their own device than a public workstation. There was no way to distinguish what each user was actually doing with the device (or with the public workstation). Still, the simple fact that so many were bringing in their own devices was important. It could be that devices are now smaller than just a few years ago and more ubiquitous.

Since this is more of a planning issue, a key strategic initiative for the library (and the campus as a whole) should be to enable technology on campus that allows users to more effectively use their own devices. Depending on their device, some users still have difficulty relying on the campus’ wireless network. More importantly, there is no way for these devices to print. The more seamless the library can make the use of personal devices, the more productive users with their own devices will be. And perhaps most importantly, the less reliant the library will be with regards to providing computing technology (workstations and laptops) for users on campus.
The following includes a description of some specific highlights of library activities during the academic year 13/14:

**Coffee Service**
What started as a response to a student survey conducted in the spring of 2012 for some type of food or beverage service in the library became a reality in the spring of 2014, when the library began selling coffee. While several ideas were discussed, the simple approach of buying a single-serve Keurig® machine and charging $1 per K-cup (having users brew their own) was approved and implemented. This approach also allowed the library to serve several different flavors of coffee, as well as tea and hot chocolate. Although no other similar services are being planned currently, the library did provide free snack bars during finals week in the spring.

**Group Study Room Reservations**
Another concern brought to the library by a student group was the use of group study rooms. Students suggested that the library implement a policy of reserving group study rooms; the library has always simply made them available on a first-come, first-served basis. The policy has always been that if a single student was using a room and a group needed one, the student would have to relinquish the room to the group. Given the concern raised, the library agreed to regularly schedule room #207 using an online form developed by the library. It did not take long before room #207 was regularly being reserved. In fact, with the number of requests submitted, the library began reserving other group study rooms on a fairly regular basis when more than one group requested a room at the same time.

**Art in the Library**
The library continued to display various art selected from courses taught on campus throughout the year. In addition, a performance art piece was performed in the library (a component of the piece was to gauge the reaction of students using the library to the students sitting at a table eating cake). At the beginning of the spring semester the library offered two awards for students who had exhibited art in the library during the previous calendar year. Students Ariana Parry and Brian Dawson received gift certificates from the Bookstore and agreed to exhibit their artwork in the library for the 2014 calendar year.

**Libchat**
In trying to expand or extend its services to those who may not be in the library, the library has promoted the university-wide chat service to its local users. Given that our librarians often have a better understanding of Stark users’ needs, the library decided to more systematically offer its own online chat service. In consulting with staff at the Kent Campus, who have run chat
reference services for many years (and Stark librarians have helped man those services), we discovered that a separate “channel” could be created so that when a user wishes to chat he or she can choose to have their question answered by a Stark librarian during the times our campus has someone manning our channel. This also opened the door for other KSU libraries (other regional campuses and branch libraries) to offer their own channel as well. After discussing the various options, it was decided that when librarians are physically manning the circulation desk, they would also man the Stark Campus chat channel. It should be noted that the library also continued to contribute to the university-wide chat service in addition to manning its own channel. Although the statistics are not overwhelming, 21 chat sessions were recorded with 176 messages passing between users and librarians, accounting for 98 minutes of total chat time (or about 4 minutes per chat session). The Stark Campus Library will be looking for ways to better manage and market this service in the coming years.

**iPads**

In the spring of 2014 the library obtained 4 iPads as a result of requests and surveys conducted by the campus Faculty Technology Committee. The goal was to expose faculty to iPads and have them consider their use in the classroom. The iPads were checked out 10 times by various faculty in differing disciplines (from Journalism to Geology to Spanish and Communication Studies). Faculty using the iPads were asked to complete a short survey to describe how they anticipated using iPads as a pedagogical tool, with the possibility of having the campus purchase a cart of (20-30) iPads for use in the classroom. Although not decided by the end of the fiscal year, the committee did propose the purchase of an iPad cart.

**Reference Area Redesign**

Starting in the summer of 2013 the library began discarding many individual volumes of titles contained in the reference collection that were duplicated online. Titles that the library have long since stop subscribing to but left their duplicated print volumes on the shelf for included *The Dictionary of Literary Biography, Contemporary Authors*, and about a half dozen titles contained in the Gale literature criticism series. So many volumes were discarded that some staff and students decided to create a Christmas tree from the discarded volumes. The next step in this initiative is to remove the excess shelving and configure the open space created. Preliminary plans include separating the space into two areas, one facing the current location of the coffee service (next to the circulation desk) and the other facing the east side of the building. Over the course of the next year the library will be employing participatory design by soliciting input from campus members on the use of the new space. While one half could be devoted to leisure activities, the library will consider multiple, different types of uses for more scholarly activities for the other half.
**Staff**

The following individuals comprised the library staff for the 13/14 academic year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rob Kairis</td>
<td>Library Director (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>Melissa Bauer</td>
<td>Online Learning 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>Barbara Potts</td>
<td>Circulation/Student Worker Supervisor (Senior Library Assistant)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Little changed during the year with regards to library personnel. Melissa Bauer successfully completed her first full year as Online Learning Librarian. Barbara Potts finished her Masters in Library and Information Science from Kent State University, while Kara Carowick (student worker) neared completion of the same degree. Jessica Halter, a student worker, completed her internship in the library in the fall. Her responsibilities were to market and promote library services. To this end she managed the library’s Facebook page, organized the monthly Book Club, updated Libguides, and created displays.
Interlibrary Borrowing and Lending

While last year saw a decrease in both circulation and ILL borrowing, the dramatic change was in ILL borrowing, which hit its lowest mark in over a decade. The 50% decline, as illustrated in the chart below, is hard to explain. No significant changes were implemented last year. However, after seeing these numbers reported, an investigation of how ILL statistics are collected and reported called into question the validity of these numbers. Rather than having separate spreadsheets for each month, a single spreadsheet was “typed over” by a student worker and then printed out for input in another spreadsheet and then discarded. In other words, there is no way to go back and check to see if the numbers added each month were accurate. That does not necessarily mean the decrease in ILL borrowing is attributed to poor statistics gathering, it only calls into question the method for collecting those data. Changes will be made in how ILL statistics are kept. If next year’s numbers go up dramatically, it may suggest that the change was a statistical error.

**Borrowing**

*These figures exclude course reserve and laptop circulation*
It is interesting to note that even with a 50% reduction in ILL borrowing, the total amount of materials borrowed (the vast majority of which are still printed books) still exceeds the number of library-owned items that circulated. The willingness to wait a few days for a book to be delivered (selected from a vastly wider collection of materials across the state via OhioLINK) still out-weighs the convenience of borrowing books from the Stark Campus collection. Since the turn of the century, Stark Campus library users started using more items borrowed from other libraries than from the library’s collection.

Lending

The steady but slow decline in lending over the past 5 years is more anticipated than the sudden decline seen in borrowing (another reason to question the statistics). The library has adjusted its collection development practices to avoid buying materials when they are readily available from other libraries (also contributing to the divide between lending from other libraries and circulation of materials from the local collection). Although that would suggest an increase in lending (as the Stark Campus has more items in its collection not held by other Ohio colleges and universities), the steady decrease in lending is likely more the result of more information available electronically. In particular, electronic books (ebooks) are becoming more prevalent in both the KentLINK and OhioLINK online catalogs. In fact, when books are available electronically, Kent State libraries as well as libraries throughout the state rarely buy them in print. Usage of ebooks not available in print is not recorded as either a local circulation statistic or an ILL borrowing statistic, naturally driving down those numbers. Over time as more ebooks are gradually added to library collections and fewer print books are purchased, statistics for book circulation and ILL lending should be expected to steadily decrease (as shown in the chart below).

Filled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requests</th>
<th>03/04</th>
<th>04/05</th>
<th>05/06</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>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filled</td>
<td>3898</td>
<td>4128</td>
<td>3732</td>
<td>4025</td>
<td>5082</td>
<td>3250</td>
<td>4844</td>
<td>4154</td>
<td>3793</td>
<td>3706</td>
<td>3126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information Literacy

Little changed since last year regarding library instruction. With Stark State College librarians providing their own instruction, very few Stark State classes are taught by the library. Instruction to Kent State classes remained the same (decreased by only 1%). However, the average number of students taught in each class diminished by 11%.

Last year’s report attempted to measure the impact of information literacy efforts by calculating the number of students who come into the library for instruction during the year. At the time it was estimated that on average 43% of students come to the library for instruction each year. That number was based on concurrent enrollment figures (all students who enrolled in a course at the Stark Campus). A better enrollment figure would be preponderant enrollment (students who mostly take their classes at the Stark Campus). Adding last year’s library instruction data and using the preponderant enrollment results in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Enrollment = 4164</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The goal described last year was to reach 50% within 5 years. It could be said that the library is almost there. Instead, the new goal, given the revision, will be to reach 60% of preponderant enrollment within 5 years. Another challenge regarding this effort is that the enrollment figures include students taking online courses, who never show up for library instruction.
Spending for monographic materials rose by 17% last year:

In looking at the activity over the past 8 years, it is clear that library monographic (book) spending has been dramatically reduced. Several factors can account for this significant decrease in spending:

- The library began using more systematic, efficient methods, such as an approval plan, for collection development.
- An important part of current acquisitions workflow is to determine duplication at the state level (to avoiding buying materials readily available through OhioLINK).
- Many print continuations (sometimes referred to as monographic series) were replaced with online equivalents (mentioned in the Highlights section under Reference Area Redesign). In some cases the Stark Library paid an upfront fee and is no longer paying for online access, or access became available (for little or no cost) through OhioLINK.
- More content is being delivered electronically and made available through large consortia (like OhioLINK).
- The graph above does not account for costs paid for electronic resources.
Library Usage

This section on usage focuses on four areas:

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

Head Count

In looking at the past seven years, attendance in the library showed an overall increase of just under 20%. However, the past two years have seen a decline of almost 13%.

Encouraging users to come into the library can be tricky. As reported in 2008/09, 16 PCs were added to the second floor and attendance on that floor doubled. With more and more students bringing their own mobile devices (laptops, netbooks, tablets, and smartphones), it would appear fewer users are choosing to use library-supplied public workstations. In the spring an informal study was conducted on the second floor. At random times during the week (Monday through Thursday) in the morning and afternoon, a count was taken of students using the public workstations and students away from those computers using their own devices. In every instance, the number of users away from the public workstations out-numbered those using library-supplied PCs (this information was also previously discussed in the Highlights section of this report). While certainly not clear scientific evidence, this does suggest a trend the library should be aware of, which
could have contributed to the gradual decline of attendance; more users are less-reliant on library-provided computing making them less likely to come into the building.

One interesting note regarding use of the facility is the increase in use of group student rooms. Although hard to detect on the chart below, the number of people using group study rooms on the second floor increased by 7% (the only location that saw an increase in usage). It is hard to know if more faculty assigned group work, resulting in this slight increase. One initiative that begin last year was the ability for students to reserve groups study rooms. Advertising this new service may have contributed to an increased awareness of our group study rooms and stimulated the growth in usage.

Reference Statistics

This measure of usage has been under review for many years. What used to be recorded as a simple check mark on a piece of paper (indicating a user asked some type of reference question, but with no further explanation) evolved into a detailed account of each reference transaction using first an online service called Sitescripter and then within the past two years, a service called LibAnswers. As noted in the last annual report, the recording of reference transactions was minimal (only 85). It is clear that this is not a matter of having so few reference questions, but a reluctance to report them. This past year there were 120 transactions reported. Again, considering there were some staff who reported no transactions or only very few, this does not indicate little activity but (for whatever reason) resistance to reporting reference statistics. As a result, this and future reports will likely exclude reporting reference statistics until such time as the culture within the library is conducive to taking the time to document these types of user interactions.
Circulation

For the second year in a row, circulation statistics (the number of times Stark Campus Library materials checked out) reached their lowest level:

At its highest point during the past ten years (2005/06) circulation doubled the activity recorded last year. As reported in the past, there are several factors that should be considered when analyzing this trend of declining circulation of the local collection:

1. Reliance on other libraries (via KentLINK and OhioLINK requesting systems) for materials (despite a typical 2-3 day delivery time)
2. Reduction of monographic purchases (buying fewer books to add to the Stark Campus Library collection)
3. Increased focus and acquisition of electronic resources (some that replace print and media resources that circulated through our library in the past)

With regards to #1 above, according to ILL statistics, last year saw a dramatic decrease in borrowing. However, given the questionable nature of the data gathering and recording for ILL statistics, it would be best to wait until next year’s numbers are reported before drawing any conclusions. The other two factors are still valid. In fact, with both OhioLINK and Kent State initiatives in recent years regarding ebooks (buying statewide collections and the establishment of Demand Driven Acquisitions models, where huge
sets of ebook records are populated in the KentLINK and OhioLINK catalogs with usage measures that trigger individual ebook purchases), it is likely that more monographic (book) content is being used as online viewing or downloading of ebooks and not as checkouts of print books. While the logical implication of this is to collect usage of ebooks, it is not possible to separate Stark Campus usage from the rest of the university. So while it is a fair assumption that ebook usage can drive down the lending of print books, there is no way to evaluate the overall (combined print and electronic) usage of books.

Database Searches

In past years as database content has grown, usage statistics were reported. On June 6, 2014 a discussion of a new model for assessing costs per institution for the OhioLINK Electronic Journal Center at an All Directors meeting revealed that usage statistics are not reliable. There were several factors presented leading to this conclusion including:

1. When users connect remotely using OhioLINK authentication, their usage of electronic content at OhioLINK is not accurately recorded. Much like the previous discussion of ebook usage, there is no way to break out statistics by institutions, much less by campus.
2. When users end up at vendor/publisher sites (as opposed to accessing the content on OhioLINK servers) those statistics are not reliable or consistent across vendors/publishers.
3. The Stark Campus assigns usage when users connect wirelessly (from laptops and netbooks) to the Kent Campus, not to the Stark Campus, because we use the Flashzone network, this means that a great deal of Stark campus use is being recorded for the Kent campus.

These factors call into question the accuracy of database usage statistics. One way this measure of usage has been presented in the past has been to compare the use of online database content to the use of print journal content owned by the Stark Campus Library, as demonstrated in the following chart:

![Chart showing comparison of average cost per print article and average cost per online article over years from 06/07 to 12/13.]
While print articles on average cost hundreds of dollars per use (based on subscription costs, which do not include labor or the cost to bind print volumes of serials), the cost of using articles found online (through just the databases the Stark Campus Library pays for) barely registers on the chart—averaging 37 cents per use in the year 12/13).

The interesting result of the nature of the unreliability of the data is that database usage has been significantly underreported in the past. In terms of comparing both usage and value (the cost per use) of print content and online content, this recent discovery just demonstrates how much more cost effective databases are and how expensive print resources have become.

Still, rather than simply use database statistics gathering for the purpose of comparing the use of online resources to print resources, since those data have been proven highly questionable, after this year no future annual reports will include database searching. Unless, of course, new measures for accurately recording usage at the campus level are developed.
**Academic Year 14/15**

**iPad Cart**
As reported in the Highlights section of this report, the library obtained 4 iPads for use by faculty in the spring of 2014. Several faculty checked out the iPads and they were regularly used for a Spanish class. After asking for input from faculty using the iPads, the Faculty Technology Committee issued a report requesting a cart of 20-30 iPads for classroom use. The report indicated that the library would house the cart, manage requests for its use, and deliver it to classrooms on campus when needed. Since the library has already implemented this same type of service for a netbook cart for a few years, adding one more cart should not be a problem.

**Reference Area Redesign**
Also discussed in the Highlights section was an effort to redesign the library’s reference area. With thousands of duplicated print volumes removed, the library is in a position to modify the use of this space. The current idea defines the area by blocking it off with two long, high shelving units. This separates the space from the teaching area on one side and the public computer pods on the other. In addition, a single row of shelving will divide the entire area into two sections. One section (closest to the circulation desk) will contain the coffee service, perhaps a mobile device charging station, the library’s best seller collections (both book and video), with comfortable seating to provide a lounge-like atmosphere for leisure activities. The other section could be shared space for more scholarly activities and perhaps house some newer technology. In early summer, preliminary floor plans were drawn up for space. It is hoped that the shelving will be broken down and repositioned by the end of the summer. Then the lounge area would be created first, with input sought over the course of the academic year for how the other side of the space could be used.

**Succession Planning**
With coming changes to State of Ohio retirement plans and given the likelihood and inevitability of retirements and staff departures, the library will be conducting succession planning during the coming year. Each staff member will be asked to itemize the work they do during the course of a year and describe several aspects of each task, such as:

1. A short description of the task
2. It’s important to the operation
3. How frequently the task is performed
4. The time needed to complete the task

The goal is to gain a clear picture of the responsibilities for each full time position, learn where overlapping responsibilities might exist, and fill gaps as new positions open up in the future.
Web Content Management
It was announced in the spring that the university would be moving to a new content management system. After using CommonSpot to create and change the library’s website, the library will move to Drupal. This can be a fairly intense endeavor because it involves migrating a great deal a data from one system to another. If not the largest website for the Stark Campus, the library is one of the largest, in terms of the content it provides online. One way the library has been preparing for this type of change is its ever-increasing reliance on Libguides. The library recently moved all of its subject-specific pages from CommonSpot to Libguides and plans on moving more of its CommonSpot pages (like it’s Reference webpages) to Libguides. Libguides are easier to manage, since the library controls who can create them. They are also much easier to create and maintain. The simple plan for this web content migration is to move more pages from CommonSpot to Libguides and only create Drupal webpages for the most basic website content.

Summer Renovation
The library will begin the first phase of a multiphase project involving the ceilings. This summer work will be done to upgrade the heating and cooling system, install a new alert system, and upgrade the fire alarm and electrical systems. Because this renovation will be performed on all floors and sections of the library (with minimal work being performed in the Library Conference Room), workers will need to have access to areas where the staff and public do their work. As a result, the decision was made not to extend library hours past 5pm; the library would normally be open Monday through Thursday until 7:30pm during summer sessions. This will allow workers access after 5pm to areas that would normally have people in them during hours the library is open. The second phase of the renovation involves replacing the ceiling (the frame and acoustical tiles) and work to be performed on the elevator.

Discovery@Kent State
As part of an OhioLINK initiative, University Libraries will be rolling out a new online resource called Discovery@Kent State. The technology is generally referred to as a “Discovery Layer” in the library science world. This new service offered by EBSCO (the vendor that provides many online databases within the search interface EBSCOHost), will allow users to search multiple databases simultaneously. The prospect of such a service provides a major improvement for users. Instead of knowing which resources to use and having to find them individually, much in the same fashion as Google, users will have one place to go to search for information. The current challenges to Discovery@Kent State are that not all (although most of the important ones) online resources are included. Also, with search results containing many times more hits than users are accustomed to, retraining them on how to refine and limit their results will be key to its success. Given the nature of this service and its potential, it will be a fixed component of all library instructional sessions in the coming year.