



## Task Force on the Future of Academic Libraries in Florida

### **TASK FORCE MEMBERS (15 respondents)**

**1) What are (up to) the three most important issues that a state level planning effort should consider for higher education library services for the next ten years?**

#### *Technology issues*

- Web scale discovery and information management services for all Florida Higher Education (HE) libraries.
- Management of digital collections
  - Managing the hybrid library of print and digital information, while migrating to digital.
  - Funding for the creation of the electronic infrastructure
  - Funding and prioritization digitizing(both common and unique) and licensing access (any device any place)
  - Digitization of high-use print materials
  - The service impact from the transition of collections from paper based to electronic
  - Evolving formats (digitization of stored information)
- Developing a vision for library technologies beyond current structures (catalog, commercial databases and e-resources).
- Access to materials via mobile computing
- Centralized phone/chat reference across universities
- Opportunities to use technology to support the ever growing population of distance learners
- Maintaining/increasing quality content and delivery mechanisms

#### *Governance and Collaboration*

- The need for a governance structure that can provide an appropriate balance between state level fiscal and leadership need and the capacity to provide for institutionally specific library and information needs
- Establishing an organizational structure and institutional authority (including governance structure) for academic libraries in Florida, including SUS, FCS, and ICFE.
- An understanding and appreciation for the advantages and disadvantages of state level approaches to library automation in general (pros, cons, challenges, opportunities, positive and negative experiences nationally)
- Are there different needs for community college & state schools versus state universities, and if so what are they?

- Academic libraries partnering with higher education institutions in Florida and other research institutions to create, disseminate, and preserve scholarly information, including digitization of unique institutional resources
- The need for increased collaboration in building libraries (collections, services, and place) to support higher education in Florida while preserving collaborative and institutional identities. This includes virtual and print collections (e.g. quality and convenient information – just in time); services (e.g. personalized/customized research assistance- virtual and in person); and library as place (e.g. virtual and physical learning commons or knowledge exchange centers)
- Identifying opportunities for collaboration within our institutions, within higher education and within our local communities.
- Resource sharing (affordability of group buying versus specialization within individual collections)
- Accountability/Assessment – demonstrating value and impact on student learning is no longer abstract, no longer assumed to be proved simply by productivity, and no longer limited to our one institution
- Personnel skill sets – supporting the paper/electronic scholarly collection and services as well as the social mobile applications collection and services while maintaining intellectual property, copyright, collaboration and diversity
- The future of intellectual property on information resources and services, teaching and research, commercial vendors, and equality of access to information and knowledge

#### *Higher Ed and the Library*

- Relating library services to "The New Florida" plan for higher education state-wide and to individual institutional priorities "
- Positioning libraries to become flexible, entrepreneurial, proactive agents of change in the provision of information services.
- Structure/function of the physical library - the Commons
  - How many different paper collections will be needed and how are those best distributed.
- Structural changes in HE (distance ed., rise of the for-profits, cost containment, assessment, etc.)
  - Implications of the Google library project for the SUS
- Convincing faculty to support open access publishing as an alternative to the current unsustainable system for financing scholarly publishing

#### *Patron issues*

- Ease of use for patrons
  - Ease and transparency of use of any system
  - Ease of use
- Addressing the level of service to the under-served
  - Universal access
  - Cost effective library services for all library types

### *Funding*

- Financial stability while considering rising costs
- Dealing with shrinking budgets while serving larger and more diverse populations in multiple modalities.
- The need for sustainable and predictable funding within a fiscal scheme that is considered core and fundamental by all levels of academic administration
- Budget - appropriate use of scarce resources during changes in patron demand styles (“just in time”),

### **2) What are (up to) the three most important potential pitfalls that a state level planning effort should consider for higher education library services for the next ten years?**

#### *Planning*

- Too aggressive, or unrealistic in the planning effort
- Not planning wisely
- Incremental planning. We need to plan a major change that will sustain us for 10-20 years because we are only going to get limited funding to do this once.
- Inability to communicate effectively a vision with regards to the features and functionality of systems and the physical library

#### *Cognitive/Psychological Issues*

- Fear of failure
- The perfect as the enemy of the good.
- Trying to do too much and (ironically) lack of imagination.
- Failure to address increasing need for information literacy
- Lack of buy-in from all sectors
- Thinking that there is always a technological answer
- The fear that collaboration (both digital and mass storage of print collections) will lead to less access for certain patron groups in some resource sharing situations. However, greater and more diverse collaboration can also lead to enhanced access to similar resources.
- Changes and challenges in “search engine dependent” access to information where academicians trust the technology to find what they need and assume that all searches are equal, valid and ethical.

#### *Collaboration/Consolidation*

- Desires/needs of the 3 delivery systems of education: K-12, state colleges, and SUS
- Differing technology needs across institution types: Given the wide range of academic institutions in FL in terms of size and types of programs it will be important to understand the kinds of technology services that are needed. It is not only a matter of what

centralized services are needed, but what services individual libraries are maintaining locally

- Only consolidate if "real" savings and improvements can be had. Dig for details. Keep the channels of communication open and use them often (2-way).
- Overcoming the inertia of the existing bureaucracies (at the system and institutional level)
- Complexity. The system must be designed for ease of use and access.
- Shifting services inappropriately

### *Funding*

- Failure to fund adequately
- State funding levels. FCLA and CCLA do not now have the funding they need to sustain excellence in library technology services. Whatever plan is developed, it will only be successful if it includes appropriate documentation of the necessary funding levels.
- Failure to adequately fund with respect to future needs
- Funding skill sets / staffing within the library, i.e. the need to provide formal instruction in information, visual, and technological literacy as well as to know how to create meaningful content with tools. identity of the library.. what they should be providing
- Lack of funding increases to keep up with publisher price increases
- The need for increased funding and innovation during periods of shrinking budgets and economic downturn
- Letting fiscal issues drive program planning
- Sacrificing quality
- Unfunded mandates/plans

### *Higher Ed and the Library*

- Failure to convince faculty to support open access and thus remaining captive to monopoly publishers, especially Elsevier and Wiley-Blackwell
- Library staff members do not need just technology skills/experience (they change quickly), but to be able to think in a creative, critical and open way about how to solve problems and meet new demands in order to support and enhance student learning.
- Greater understanding of the value and role of academic libraries in higher education
- Maintenance of strong print collections and preservation of all collections in light of the potential for network destruction (cyber warfare)

**3) What are (up to) the five most important technology trends that a state level planning effort should consider for higher education library services for the next ten years?**

### *Emerging Technologies*

- Cloud computing and growth of such options for libraries

- Portable/Mobile Smart Devices such as phones and iPods and all of the features that come with them (podcasts, web on the go, etc.) and the ability to access library services from them
- High demand for technology-related library services and its requirement for increased funding, collaboration, and incorporation of “green technology.”
- Open Source
  - open source software for libraries which can reduce costs and give libraries options for in-house IT (decentralization)
  - Vendor/publisher dependent technology versus open source access
- Virtual and augmented reality
- Gesture based computing
- Social networking
- Interoperability with course management and learning object repositories
- Support for changing technology and adapting automation systems
- Internet2 exchange
- Expanded use of Web 2.0
- Broad Wi-Fi access
- New software that creates, manipulates and presents content
- Dealing with digital scholarly material that will be increasingly multi-media
- Rapid growth of digital scientific data
- Integration of library resources directly into the course management system
- Wanting resources “just in time” and complete (only full-text)
- Dependence on the way search engines “find” information when most search engines are driven by advertisers and only cosmetically concerned with searcher privacy. (This is also a pitfall in my opinion.)
- Embedding library resources and librarians into the research environments and courseware
- User-driven access tools
- Storage
- Digitization
- Open Access
- Digital rights management
- Computer-mediated technology
- Community based innovations(OSS)/vendor solutions

### *Higher Ed and the Library*

- University/library as publisher – institutional repositories
- Support for distance learners from a local, national and global perspective
- State wide institutional connectivity and internet I & II change everything. By providing a “reliable” and beefy intra-state network, all things are possible.”
- Possible slowing of IT cost/benefit improvements over time (Moore's law diminishing)
- Direct interaction of patrons with information not just searching for information, but also reviewing and commenting on the information itself and the process.
- Federation and inter-institutional collaboration aspects(collaborative environments)
- Clear, standard protocol

- Licensing
- Employ content management system
- Web scale discovery and information management
- Discovery systems

**4) What are (up to) the five most important potential technology pitfalls that a state level planning effort should consider for higher education library services for the next ten years?**

*Pace of Change*

- Not evolving fast enough to meet users "where they are"
- Quick/easy solutions instead of best solutions

*Emerging Technologies*

- We no longer can wait until the technology is perfect to use it – Always beta
- Dependence on the way search engines “find” information when most search engines are driven by advertisers and only cosmetically concerned with searcher privacy. (This is also a trend.)

*Cognitive/Psychological*

- Assuming that doing more for more user groups will cost less
- Falling for buzzwords or trends du jour instead of looking ahead to the long term
- Free-flowing sharing of information without “validation” or recognition of original source

*Collaboration*

- There are so many discrete systems throughout the state that some sort of state wide federated authentication plan must be created to drive some benefits forward
- incompatible systems and standards
- Interoperability with multiple campus systems (e.g. financial systems, student/staff databases, content management, course management): Whatever library technology solutions might be implemented across academic libraries, they must have efficient and effective crosswalks to local enterprise systems.
- systems that are difficult and/or expensive to upgrade
- systems with complex interfaces difficult for users
- Growing repositories of digital knowledge without coordinated access, planned collaboration or consistency in platform
- Failure to keep abreast of open access publication
- failure to take the need for digital preservation seriously
- Ability of libraries to adjust quickly enough and to keep abreast of changing technology and library applications

*Automation*

- Limitations of existing library management systems: Libraries have been limited by legacy library systems for the past decade and we are finally seeing some new development that has the potential to transform the library technology marketplace. The future is not clear yet, though, so it will be critical for the task force to identify some clear priorities so that FL might influence the development of the marketplace (as it has in the past)
  - Legacy systems
  - Reliance on legacy systems
- Automated platforms that lack expandability and interoperability

#### *Users*

- Not all have access to same types or technology, or levels of infrastructure
- Cost of leveling the playing field
- Cost not to level the playing field

#### *Infrastructure*

- Maintenance of backbone system of internet access, e.g. Lambda Rail
- Issues related to privacy
  - Cyber security
- High expense of upgrading software and hardware
- Licensing/intellectual property limitations: The stranglehold of vendor licensing and copyright restrictions severely limits our ability to move forward on technology solution
  - Licensing issues

#### *Governance/Funding*

- legislative interference in library technology planning and decision making based on last century IT ideas on hardware consolidation
- Lack of library priority in any consolidated multi-purpose IT organization
- Swinging the pendulum too far toward decentralization in order to avoid the excessive centralization that interferes with library service progress
- Lack of prioritization for lib
- Shrinking technology budgets and
  - Funding for technology-related library services and continuing research into emerging technologies

**5) To work effectively on these issues, what types of information do you think Task Force members will need in order to participate fully?**

#### *Expert/Outside Information*

- Expert information on: - new technology innovations

- In the initial phase we need to have industry leaders from places like ECAR, Gartner, etc that can speak to the future of both the technology and the library, outside the box where we are today.
- Discussion with international experts in higher education, libraries, and statewide consortia
- occasional consultation with national experts
- Presentations by experts on the committee,
- Consultation with experts
- Examples from other states and countries of outstanding library systems
- information about developments in other states

#### *Input from Stakeholders*

- Consultation with vendors
- Consultation with patrons

#### *Communication*

- Open discourse
- Use technology to communicate often, email, video conferencing, web conferencing, conference call, etc.
- Collaborative sharing of knowledge base between members
- Ideas from within Florida libraries.
- Online discussions/blogs
- Concerns, recommendations from all stakeholders
- Time for review and comment by stakeholders
- Possibly regional town hall meetings
- Interactive section on website (blog?)

#### *Environmental Scan*

- A clear understanding of where libraries are/aren't today
- understanding of the current state of library automation in Florida
- Literature review (including scenario research)
- Florida higher education priorities and plans
- Current assessment of where we are today
- Information that represents the needs of libraries in all institutions of learning (i.e., information covering both research institutions and teaching institutions).
- Demographics for service districts
- Some thoughtful pieces like EDUCAUSE's 2010 Horizon Report, and ACRL's Higher Education in 2025
- Review of new models of service
- Technology trends/environmental factors
- understanding publisher monopolies and the fact that through mergers there are now fewer, but huge, publishers
- Understanding publisher pricing models, their inflation impact, and how there is no escape except through open access.

### *Vision*

- A vision for the future
- The delta between [where we are and where we want to go] then becomes the gap analysis which ultimately must be prioritized with ownership assigned.
- From there we should look at a complete assessment across our institutions today and how we plan to integrate the institution components. Comparison to these two then should create some gaps which we will need to be prioritized and funded in addition to a committed team for the ownership and execution.
- Creation of a strategic planning template
- Transparency

### *Funding*

- Potential funding
- Fiscal context--constraints and opportunities

### *Users*

- (For) both library systems and personal devices – architectural design, sustainable, ergonomic and people centered

## **LIBRARY DIRECTORS (23 respondents)**

**1) What are (up to) the three most important issues that a state level planning effort should consider for higher education library services for the next ten years?**

### *Technological Issues*

#### *Collaboration/Automation*

- Systems and policies that will promote the sharing of print and electronic resources amongst all of the higher education libraries within the state
- Adequate funding to provide access to quality electronic and print resources
- To build, create and enhance academic library collections in all formats, including print, electronic and digital to support teaching, learning and research.
- Access to electronic resources appropriate to the audience
- Continuing to provide low-cost, local and remote access to academic resources, e-books, e-resources, databases.
- Increased cooperation among academic libraries that will actually provide better services and more cost efficiencies
- Adequate financial support for libraries in new medical schools.
- Funding in general for academic library service/resources at the institution level as well as at the consortial level
- Publishers are unwilling to support a traditional library model for eBooks and therefore are much less likely to allow for discounts for consortial purchases or "sharing."
- Effective resource sharing

- Flexible Systems: The discovery tools we offer our users need to be flexible to the needs of the users of the institution. For example, we need a user-friendly OPAC that takes advantage of the individual database searching features; such as providing full feature of the search interface at the front-end.
- New service models to support a statewide system (possibly including K-12 and public) need to be reviewed. The existing models for automation (CCLA and FCLA) remain dependent upon proprietary products. Open source figures heavily in this equation.
- Developing an open source solution. Why are we paying significant dollars for a product that two state agencies must finish developing and that undermines information literacy? Use the budget and staff of CCLA and FCLA to do open source solution that meets our needs and that can fold in K-12 and public libraries.
- Pursuit of collaborative purchasing agreements (state contracts)
- increasing the economies of scale for purchasing/leasing content (collaboration and partnerships)
- CCLA provides centralized support for all of the 28 institutions in the FCS. I could hire 30 people and still not get the level of support I get from CCLA. Changing this would be disastrous to our students.

#### *Higher Ed and the Library*

- Support for new BAS/BA/BS degrees

#### *Patron Issues*

- The needs of all levels of higher education students in Florida
- Students - Always keep in mind our students, especially developmental learners who may not be prepared for college. Keep in mind that we need to serve every student.
- Bridge the learning curve of "digital natives" and educators/librarians.
- Resources and support is needed for face to face students and those at a distance

#### *Funding*

- Libraries are doing more with less staff and funding & must meet the needs of the user.
- The impact that a statewide system will have on institutional budgets, staffing, resources, and services. Service district demographics are critical as K-12 and public libraries may increase local needs in the aforementioned areas.
- provision of adequate annual funding for library resources
- funding should be sufficient to maintain a basic level of print support while keeping pace with double-digit price increases to provide access to proprietary full-text databases
- Adequacy of Funding: Making sure that funding sources are sufficient for institutions to adequately support appropriate resources and services for the programs provided to our students.
- Recurring funding for library technology, thoughtful library technology acquisition and replacement plans, and an investment in emerging library technologies.
- Funding technology

### *Vision/Future of the Library*

- Developing vision for library technologies beyond current structures (catalog, commercial databases and e-resources): The future of library technology does not lie in our traditional framework of the catalog, databases/e-resources, and digital collections, but in a broader strategy that integrates these resources along with a broader integration of academic content from outside of the library (research data, learning objects and other course content, university intellectual property, etc). For example, the eScholarship project at the California Digital Library (<http://www.cdlib.org/services/publishing/escholarship.html>).
- The future of libraries calls for more locally supported functions, such as local institutional repositories and focus on local special collections and archives. Access to these should be global, but collection development must be local.
- Change - There are services/technologies that are continually changing. What is on the horizon now will be obsolete and we have to be prepared for that change.
- Be proactive rather than reactive as we are witnessing the rapid changes toward the digital age.
- Provision of technological infrastructure to assure libraries' ability to make resources available to the public
- The changing environment for user services: Libraries are all about providing services to our user communities, and as we plan for our future, we must ground those discussions in the needs and expectations of our users. So, for students how do we think about their needs for library spaces and services (for example, the information commons) and their need for remote delivery of services. For faculty, how do we facilitate their discovery and delivery of research and teaching materials?
- Respect for local (college level) needs
- Increasing availability of academic content for users
- Shared resources among universities and state colleges instead of separate funding for each segment
- Develop "knowledge workers" who will be familiar with technology and its uses
- Provision of sufficient staffing to enable libraries to do things like digitization in addition to their other more traditional tasks, from reference work to technical services work
- Planning for and implementation of library management system migration to provide the best technologically advanced system available.
- Integrity of the platform & sensible backup
- Resource support at the same or better level as current.
- The demands for accountability and assessment results based on statewide learning outcomes continue to increase. Information literacy (also known as information fluency or digital literacy) is the key outcome assessed by library professionals.
- Support for information literacy learning outcome
- To enable the graduates of the public academic institutions to perform effectively in an information-rich environment, include the teaching and learning of information literacy, technology competency, and critical thinking for every student.
- accountability through effectiveness, especially in teaching and learning
- Ensure that library collections and services meet accreditation standards and true digital literacy
- Cyberwar-cybercrime: being prepared for the eventuality

- New ""freshman"" class: bigger gap between the have/have-nots in technology
- Bridging the digital divide to make all students' computer and information literate will remain a critical issue. The concept of "library" exists virtually as well as physically;
- Accessibility to all students
- Demonstrating (not just claiming) value
- Student use of physical space in the library requires repurposing of areas. Space is still needed for quiet independent study and collections, but collaborative group space and multimedia space is needed.
- Copyright for materials being used
- Print-on-demand books
- Replacement of print reference books with e-books
- Support for online classes and the impact of rapidly increasing enrollment.
- Continuous Communications Effort: Higher education serves a broad and diverse community of users, with varying degrees of needs. In order to best serve these needs and provide adequate and timely access to services and resources, this effort should continue to solicit and consider the expressed needs of its constituency.
- Preservation and, in some cases, digitization of unique or rare library collections is critical and underfunded in most institutions.

**2) What are (up to) the three most important potential pitfalls that a state level planning effort should consider for higher education library services for the next ten years?**

*Planning*

- Not relating objectives to outcomes

*Equity*

- Institutional silos that exclude open access to resource sharing statewide
- Excessively weighting the needs of any one sector of the higher education community against those of other sectors
- No one size fits all; community/state needs are not always equal to university.
- Research institutions cannot lead the parade.
- Consider the mission of the state/community college versus the university. (Students versus research)
- Differing technology needs across institution types: Given the wide range of academic institutions in FL in terms of size and types of programs it will be important to understand the kinds of technology services that are needed. It is not only a matter of what centralized services are needed, but what services individual libraries are maintaining locally.
- Libraries for K-12, Community college, 4 year, and universities are all different and require different resources and different interfaces. For example, a 6th grader isn't going to be able to find a book in their library using an online catalog built for a college library.
- Not including ICUF
- Disparity among institutions and their constituencies

- The possible unintended consequences of access to all college level content for under-age high school students in IB, Advanced Placement and dual enrollment.
- Assume that everyone has equal access to services and technologies.
- Assume that “cookie cutter” services and collections will serve all needs for a very diverse population
- Underestimating the differences among the constituencies served by different kinds of libraries and the concomitant differences in library operations, organization, staffing, collections, programs, and services.

### *Funding*

- Inadequate funding to support academic library collections.
- Unequal Distribution of Funding: Providing inadequate and insufficient funding to meet the required level of library support services is a major pitfall. One which is noted during a visitation by an accrediting agency.
- Inadequate funding for library faculty and staff positions
- Continuing challenges related to declining revenues, changing technologies and increased costs
- The potential exists for eroded funding and reduced services with a statewide system
- The myriad ways public and school libraries are funded and administered locally - the lack of standards and adequate funding creates a gap that cannot be filled by colleges and universities.
- State funding levels: FCLA and CCLA do not now have the funding they need to sustain excellence in library technology services. Whatever plan is developed, it will only be successful if it includes appropriate documentation of the necessary funding levels.
- Lack of Budget
- Reducing of funds for library resources
- Decreasing funds for library staff professional development
- Community colleges have a mission to serve the most needy and cannot be self-sustaining.
- Cost of resources
- Chronic underfunding of K-12 and public libraries cannot be solved by tapping into the inadequate resource base of the public universities and colleges.
- Equal access staffing--brick & mortar and virtual
- Digital Divide - how can we bridge the gap
- Lack of high speed internet in rural areas
- Sufficient online access

### *Governance*

- Still having to convince institution of library value/purpose
- Inaccurate perceptions in state government with regard to academic libraries: electronic resources, collaboration and access to information.
- Uninformed opinions/dictates from those outside higher education but with political clout

### *Status Quo*

- Main pitfall is a continuation of the status quo, i.e. gradual or precipitous reductions in support for all aspects of library service decision to move FCLA/CCLA computing into state data centers is potentially disastrous for service and support
- Getting stuck in the existing models, rather than thinking broadly and creatively
- The continued reliance on contracted service with a budget in excess of \$13M, a staff of ~79 employees, and no accountability at the institutional level has been problematic.
- Continuing business as usual - allowing state agencies to finish developing an expensive vendor product that is faulty
- Not establishing new leadership and real accountability for library automation that supports user needs
- Continued utilization of products/service models that undermine institutional accountability and assessment efforts will create future problems when the expertise exists to explore new options
- Once you start offering a particular resource statewide, then it is difficult to negotiate a lower price or a minimal increase because publishers know it would be devastating to stop offering their product. This happened to GALILEO when they cancelled their Project Muse subscription when JHUP tried to charge them a 15% increase. It was devastating to the smaller colleges who couldn't pick up the subscription on their own."

### *Cooperation*

- Because students want instant access to information, cooperative print collection development and resource sharing are not practical ways to reduce spending.
- More realistic solutions include cooperative contracts that influence pricing for the purchase of books and eBooks and licensing databases.
- Failure to comprehend the complexities of integrating library management systems with institutional enterprise systems (e.g. Banner, PeopleSoft), course management systems (e.g. Blackboard), and library document management & delivery systems (e.g. Iliad, Docutek, eRes, etc.

### *Vendors*

- Rigid and Inflexible Vendor Products: Given the intellectual diversity of our students providing vendor products which are geared to advanced researchers is a serious pitfall. Designing open source products increases the flexibility and efficiency for the individual institutions tailoring products for our particular users.
- Publishers are not interested in saving the state money. They may give us a break on a "per user" basis, but only if they can profit from doing so.
- Combining services with non library vendors, outsourcing
- Pursuit of collaborative purchasing agreements (state contracts)"

### *The Library*

- Staffing – may need more
- Technical--potential pitfall with digital content. Will consumers be able to access or read the content once it is delivered?
- Technology is not an ends -- it is a means to an end
- Building and maintaining functionality in library systems as new technologies are tested and released (i.e. fully functioning resource discovery and link resolver tools)
- eLearning model for students and faculty discourse: leaves the library (services and personnel) out of the loop
- Measurement of the “use of libraries” should include the use of virtual services and librarian-instructor course collaborations.
- Lack of input from end users (students & faculty) in selecting/building integrated library systems
- Ignoring "Google" impact will kill the library.

### *Privacy*

- Identity management and trust--will consumers be assured that the content provided is authentic, offered at a fair price, and produced by a qualified authority?
- Social--Will rights be protected and preserved, such as copyright and fair use, information literacy fairness and equality in student access, use and consumer privacy?

### *Learning*

- The effect of the rapid increase of open access resources widely available on the Internet.
- Critical thinking skill may be lost in an environment of easily accessed information

**3) What are (up to) the five most important technology trends that a state level planning effort should consider for higher education library services for the next ten years?**

### *Anytime Access*

- Ubiquitous access to networked resources
- 24/7 anytime, anyplace access to digital services: Library resources and services must reflect the new paradigm of service rather than place. Accessibility to materials

### *Emerging Technologies*

- Interoperability of electronic resources
- Preservation of electronic resources
- Inclusion of all types of media in electronic resources
- Providing textbook access online with choice or price range, as rental, or to keep.
- Increased use of eBook devices
- Video Chat/eReaders

- Open content and e-publishing
- E-books replacing print versions
- Standardization: Improved access to downloadable e-resources provided by downloadable e-readers needs to be standardized in order to serve all of our users.
- Increasing preference of delivery of content in digital format
- digitize unique content in each institution
- digitization of library collections
- Continued growth of electronic collections and its impact on library spaces and services
- Development of new services based on mobile technology.
  - Mobile technological devices
  - Technology is changing toward a single device that can perform multiple applications
  - Convergence of devices, higher education products, and services
  - Next generation technology tools yet to be discovered for and beyond mobile services, texting, readers, touch screen, new publishing platforms.
  - Mobile/handheld technologies The need to work with campus IT on capturing and archiving research results (large data sets in particular)
  - Mobile technologies
  - Mobile access
  - Mobile technology of resources for students -resources available anytime anywhere
  - New services will need to be developed for those students using mobile devices (51.2% of students responding to the ECAR 2009 survey said that they owned an internet capable mobile device).
  - synergy of content and function with personal mobile devices
  - Mobile devices and applications will require libraries to further diversify methods users can access information and services.
  - Full service mobile access
  - Mobile compliancy: Enhanced mobile compliancy for online databases and catalogs which are accessed from smart products (i.e. iPhones, iPads, Droids, Blackberry's, etc.)
  - Delivery of services and content to a variety of mobile devices and remote locations
- Development of increasingly "cloud-based" technologies (*note: this was mentioned by MANY respondents, however most simply wrote 'cloud computing'*)
- Use of open source software
  - Open source, open source, open source!
  - Development of an open source solution which can fold in K-12 & public libraries.
- Wireless broadband access
- Technology use vis a vis individual disciplines: science, health, vs. humanities
- Safeguarding privacy/ID security; deterring cybercrime/hacking
- Digital rights management\*
- Migration from MARC to an XML platform
- Discovery systems
  - Discovery Tools

- Ability to watch streaming video
  - Streaming media
- Online availability
- Rapid growth of online classes
- Online learning, fully integrating library resources and services into learning management systems
- ADA compliancy for online databases, catalogs and eBooks is a requirement and a major pitfall if not considered.
- Multimedia Messaging Service (MMS)
- Google chrome OS (release date late 2010)
- Not a pen, but a PC

### *Library Trends*

- Changes in how materials are cataloged & organized will drastically change how we do business.
- Publishing trends: paper disappears - newspapers, university presses
- ILS changes will have huge impact on day to day work
- Print on Demand
- on-demand publishing
- Print-on-demand books and textbooks
- Delivery methods
- Virtual Branch: library services as robust as physical branch
- redefine the library's role in teaching and learning by delivering instruction "just in time" based upon the user not the library
- Hybrid Content Infrastructure: When users are seeking information, library services and resources must be developed with the understanding that there are differing levels of intellectual engagement. Services and resources must reflect both a print and a digital information environment to meet these needs.
- Distance needs of students who do not always have state of the art technology off campus.
- Development of institution repositories serving scholarly communication needs
  - University/library as publisher – institutional repositories
  - Libraries as electronic publishers (eJournals, blogs, wikis)
- College resources do not always support the trends
- Equitable access of resources
- Students need to access digital information but do not have the hardware or internet services required to do so from home;
- Physical spaces for accessing technology are still necessary on campus.

### *Library Systems*

- Need for one statewide system (something like Galileo).
- Improved and emerging operating systems
- New operating systems
- Library system that work seamlessly with Learning Management Systems and business/accounting software (PeopleSoft etc).

- Interoperability with learning management and learning object repositories
- Integration of library services into course management systems
- Librarians are expanding the library's virtual presence in the course management systems for their online students.

**4) What are (up to) the five most important potential technology pitfalls that a state level planning effort should consider for higher education library services for the next ten years?**

*Licensing*

- Legal trends in intellectual property law as it relates to information access, uses and costs
- Licensing/intellectual property limitations: The stranglehold of vendor licensing and copyright restrictions severely limits our ability to move forward on technology solutions
- Copyright and licensing regulations may restrict the delivery of services and content to remote users.

*Collaboration*

- Not pursuing the integration of systems across the state, top to bottom
- Interoperability with multiple campus systems (e.g. financial systems, student/staff databases, content management, course management): Whatever library technology solutions might be implemented across academic libraries, they must have efficient and effective crosswalks to local enterprise systems.
- Building or purchasing programs and features that do not function across integrated library systems

*The Library*

- Libraries are not staffed to keep up with technology trends; especially K-12 and community colleges, but really all libraries.
- Online services still require staff! example: Virtual reference still requires a person
- All library resources will be available on the internet. Librarians will still be needed to show the users how to use them. Some students still prefer the face to face help.
- Technology has not replaced the need for librarians to teach critical thinking skills that facilitate information literacy.
- Technology changes impact budgets as they require more professional development for library staff.
- Future of Journalism
- Local resources (staff and equipment)
- Local IT resources are inadequate at the community/state level
- Studies show students learn better from printed books, and are more inspired by them

*Emerging Technologies*

- Early Adoption of Technology: Outpacing student demand for e-resources is a potential pitfall. In an effort to be on the cutting edge we may place traditional services and resources in a detrimental position by providing resources or services that are marginally useful to our students. Being an early adopter of new innovations, in some cases, may be detrimental.
- Electronic archives - who will collect and preserve?
- The technology driving the publishers and the authors.
- implementing technologies that have not been thoroughly tested AND ignoring new technologies because they are perceived as fads
- failure to realize that library service is completely dependent now on more than just barely adequate technological resources
- Sustainability of digital services increasing demanded by constituencies (can we ever identify and then resolve ""fleeting"" demand?)
- Accessibility of electronic resources/technology & Rapid transformations in technology
- Rapidly changing technologies
- Technology needs to be accessible (ADA).
- Students rely heavily on the college at the community/state level since they don't have adequate technology at home. Don't make it complicated!
- As we seek totally seamless and ""all-the-time, ""every-place"" access, we must preserve our focus on our curricula and their relationship to our academic resources, our changing labor force and state, local and national educational need. Technology is great, but it is and should remain the tool that takes us and our students through this century and the next. The need remains for information service professional, librarians, and spaces to accommodate them even though our libraries will change and evolve. "
- Lack of uniformity in technology may restrict or bar users from accessing needed information
- The speed of access to content may decrease as more and more simultaneous users access digitized content.
- Failure to adequately invest in emerging technology
- Lack of Broadband access for users
- Limited bandwidth is a technological pitfall as more resources are media driven.
- Digital information will need high band for transfer of multimedia resources but the band width may decrease day by day due to its over utilization.
- Planning for 10 years - technology changes faster and faster
- Not realizing that technology is actually advancing faster than Moore's Law.

### *Cognitive/Psychological*

- Not thinking broadly or creatively enough
- not willing to be cutting-edge, take risks, try new things
- Inflexibility and inability to tailor technological resources and services as needed and when needed is a serious pitfall
- belief that library technology and data requirements are simple and easy to handle
- Lack of interpersonal skills
- Failure to comprehend the need to continually refresh technology and technological approaches

- 

### *Security*

- Increasing concerns related to information privacy and security
- Privacy
- Cell phone safety
- Student access to databases – SSN or ID #; who will be responsible for monitoring
- Security of information

### *Equity*

- Assuming that all sectors of the higher education community have adequate access to networking utilities and bandwidth
- The technology gap exists with the haves/have nots. With the current economic situation not expected to improve in the near future, this gap may expand.
- Ignoring the reality of the digital divide - there are haves and have nots among students and citizens.
- Ignoring the digital divide that still exists, particularly among economically disadvantaged students, is a major pitfall.
- Users are technologically diverse; technological innovations must be flexible enough to meet the cognitive needs of the least technologically advanced users
- rural vs. urban access

### *Automation*

- With a combined staffing of more than 134 people (CCLA (staff=79) and FCLA (staff=55.5)), Florida has the resources to explore other options besides proprietary ones. A state developed product could grow when technology advances occur or statewide needs change without reliance on a dwindling number of proprietary products. We can steer the Florida product rather than product steering us. Vendor consolidations occur often in the library field and they can be costly to the institutions. We are currently spending time and money to fine tune a product that has never been fully developed by the vendor. The expertise and the funding are currently in place.
- Allowing the state agencies of CCLA and FCLA a decisive voice in this process. They are not held to institutional accountability; they have large budgets and staff and a vested interest in perpetuating themselves and the status quo - which does not work. They have never supported open source. Why didn't this survey come directly from legislative staff on an independent survey instrument such as Survey Monkey? Why is this survey being conducted by CCLA who has a vested interest in the outcome?
- Allowing Florida library automation providers to purchase and develop (as partners) software programs for commercial enterprises, resulting in tools that provide inferior functionality
- decentralization and/or the reorganization of technical assistance provide to the institutions from the state level that would result in reduced effectiveness locally

- Possibility of reduced service and/or downtime if data center cannot handle the expanded load. Currently CCLA houses the data center for library resources for the community (now state) college system. It would seem to me that the success of combining systems requires the most up to date, well maintained system in order to provide 24/7 service to so many institutions and students.
- Limitations of existing library management systems: Libraries have been limited by legacy library systems for the past decade and we are finally seeing some new development that has the potential to transform the library technology marketplace. The future is not clear yet, though, so it will be critical for the task force to identify some clear priorities so that FL might influence the development of the marketplace (as it has in the past).
- Continuing to buy expensive products that are not fully developed and do not support information literacy.
- Proprietary access to information, no standard for universal access
- Maintaining products that do not provide adequate functionality for end users

#### *Students*

- Challenge in supporting needs of "net" generation students
- Continued use of existing products that lack the features required by library professionals and teaching faculty to enhance the portable skill set needed by students in the global economy. Students at all levels of education need these skills.
- Not doing needs assessments and determining the real characteristics of those we are here to serve.
- Not integrating learning outcomes into the design of the state library services

#### *Governance and Funding*

- Inadequate funding to support current and future developments in library technology
- Eroded funding for technology in higher education libraries
- Lack of Budget Staffing - we need to be competitive with the private sector so we can have the best staff
- Assuming that the budget will be there
- ignoring the fact that technology is part of a library's infrastructure and technology then becomes "deferred maintenance"

### ***DISTANCE LEARNING (6 respondents)***

**1) What are (up to) the three most important issues that a state level planning effort should consider for higher education library services for the next ten years?**

#### *Technology Issues*

- Digital Resources
- Technology to support digital and web-based resources

- Support to continue to provide the web-based and digital resources
- Orange Grove Textbooks
- Web 2.0 authoring tools
- mobile learning

### *Funding*

- The erosion in resource access brought about by increasing vendor costs and declining institutional budgets
- The libraries have had their funding cut but their duties have been increased.
- They are expected to support both face to face students and online students.
- They must have both print and online resources for students and staff with no additional funding provided.
- Adequacy of Funding: Making sure that funding sources are sufficient for institutions to adequately support appropriate resources and services for the programs provided to our students.

### *Collaboration*

- Statewide union catalog
- Statewide resource-sharing
- Reciprocal lending/borrowing
- Flexible Systems: The discovery tools we offer our users need to be flexible to the needs of the users of the institution. For example, we need a user-friendly OPAC that takes advantage of the individual database searching features; such as providing full feature of the search interface at the front-end.
- Continuous Communications Effort: Higher education serves a broad and diverse community of users, with varying degrees of needs. In order to best serve these needs and provide adequate and timely access to services and resources, this effort should continue to solicit and consider the expressed needs of its constituency.

### *Governance*

- Legislative intent that does not recognize how the marketplace for academic library resources actually works and the fundamental differences between the SUS, state colleges, and K-12 institutions and their resource needs and supply chains

**2) What are (up to) the three most important potential pitfalls that a state level planning effort should consider for higher education library services for the next ten years?**

### *Planning*

- Not planning for tremendous growth
- Not planning for increased bandwidth need

### *Funding*

- Money
- Unwarranted assumptions that it will save significant dollars
- Unequal Distribution of Funding: Providing inadequate and insufficient funding to meet the required level of library support services is a major pitfall. One which is noted during a visitation by an accrediting agency.

### *The Library*

- Students and staff must have resources and the staff to assist them.
- Rigid and Inflexible Vendor Products: Given the intellectual diversity of our students providing vendor products which are geared to advanced researchers is a serious pitfall.
- Designing open source products increases the flexibility and efficiency for the individual institutions tailoring products for our particular users.
- Single sign on/K-20 seamlessness for library logins
- Not tapping into existing resources which already exist (Orange Grove or Publisher high quality content)
- Over- (and under-) simplification of the real academic library resource environment
- While the role of libraries has changed the critical nature of their responsibilities has increased.
- Current support on the state level is being cut while the responsibilities have increased
- Cooperation with "non-library" entities
- Maintaining three distinct library systems

**3) What are (up to) the five most important technology trends that a state level planning effort should consider for higher education library services for the next ten years?**

### *Emerging Technologies*

- Increased use of web-based and digital resources
- Online learning -increased growth of hybrid courses
- Increasing digitization of print and media resources
- Digital repositories
- With the advent of open source content students must be able to access this anytime and anywhere.
- Standardization: Improved access to downloadable e-resources provided by downloadable e-readers needs to be standardized in order to serve all of our users.
- 24/7 anytime, anyplace access to digital services: Library resources and services must reflect the new paradigm of service rather than place. Accessibility to materials
- Hybrid Content Infrastructure: When users are seeking information, library services and resources must be developed with the understanding that there are differing levels of intellectual engagement. Services and resources must reflect both a print and a digital information environment to meet these needs.

- The advent of mobile devices
  - mobile learning
  - Enhanced mobile compliancy for online databases and catalogs which are accessed from smart products (i.e. iPhones, iPads, Droids, Blackberry's, etc.)
- Web 2.0
- Animation/simulation/gaming
- Improved search tools to improve findability

#### *Students*

- ADA compliancy for online databases, catalogs and eBooks is a requirement and a major pitfall if not considered.
- Need to share with students how to find accurate and credible information sources
- Need to create multimedia tutorials teaching FL HE students how to access the current online resources
- Constructivist learning

#### *The Library*

- All library staff need to have timely training in the use of resources that reflect the current trends.
- The library is the one point that all students can benefit from but if they do not have the hardware, software, training and staff, they will not be able to do this.
- Students look to the library staff for help in many areas and the staff needs to be able to respond.
- Open textbooks

### **4) What are (up to) the five most important potential technology pitfalls that a state level planning effort should consider for higher education library services for the next ten years?**

#### *Planning*

- Not planning for tremendous growth
- Not planning for increased bandwidth need

#### *Collaboration*

- Interoperability
- The cost, difficulty, and risk of attempting to merge very different library database systems and records structures
- Variety of platforms libraries run on
- Single sign on with other systems
- Underestimation of the governance structures required to make a more unified approach work in practice

### *Emerging Technology*

- Common devices/readers
- Early Adoption of Technology: Outpacing student demand for e-resources is a potential pitfall. In an effort to be on the cutting edge we may place traditional services and resources in a detrimental position by providing resources or services that are marginally useful to our students. Being an early adopter of new innovations, in some cases, may be detrimental.
- Replacement/life cycling costs
- Limited Bandwidth: Limited bandwidth is a technological pitfall as more resources are media driven.

### *Students*

- Inflexible accommodations: Inflexibility and inability to tailor technological resources and services as needed and when needed is a serious pitfall.
- Just because the world is going electronic, does not mean that our students do not need the personal assistance that only the library staff can provide. This staff needs to be highly trained and have the resources to be able to do this. They need up to date hardware, software and access to a huge number of electronic databases.
- Ignoring the Digital Divide: Ignoring the digital divide that still exists, particularly among economically disadvantaged students, is a major pitfall.
- Technological Diversity: Users are technologically diverse; technological innovations must be flexible enough to meet the cognitive needs of the least technologically advanced users.

## **CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICERS (14 respondents)**

**1) What are (up to) the five most important technology trends that a state level planning effort should consider for higher education library services for the next ten years?**

### *Emerging Technologies*

- According to ACRL (Association of Colleges and Research Libraries), “Cloud computing, augmented and virtual reality, discovery tools, open content, open source software, and new social networking tools are some of the most important technological changes affecting academic libraries.
- In addition, digital datasets collection and discovery tools, access to full-text online sources, mobile applications as well as integration and standardization will all have major impact on the future of library.
- High demand for technology-related library services Digital media
- Digital Rights Management (DRM) and provision of digital content. As libraries move to offering more and more content that needs to be downloaded to devices, users demand and institutions require more seamless applications to accomplish these tasks. As it stands, purchasing and distribution of digital content (eBooks, podcasts, streaming video, etc.) does not have a workable model for higher education/libraries. A collective approach to this issue could move the industry.
- Datamining. Even though most library users search for information that can be invisibly tracked, this information is not yet used to its best advantage through systematic collection and analysis. If we know what users are looking for, this should inform our collection development efforts. Search information and patron patterns of use have the potential to increase accountability and assessment, which ultimately improve services and education. Libraries and higher education still focus on quantitative and not qualitative use of data and even most of that data can't be locally manipulated from state systems.
- Mobile technologies
  - Smart device access
  - Delivery methods for mobile devices
  - Support and deliver content over the growing number of mobile devices our customers are using and will be using (iPhones, iPads, etc....)
  - Support and prepare for the growth of eBooks and eReaders platforms
  - iPad support
  - Mobile computing applications
  - Full service mobile access
  - Mobile technologies – wireless and mobile devices for anytime/anyplace access
- Alternate content delivery – eBooks and eReaders, and semantic search engines
- Print-on-demand books and textbooks
- e-books
- Cloud technologies and services
  - Use of cloud computing technologies and shared environments

- Contract for computing cycles from anywhere in the world instead of building and maintaining IT infrastructure local to the organization
- Virtual infrastructure – cloud computing to host virtual library data centers and provide infrastructure resiliency
- Internet everything
  - Increase in social networking usage (Facebook, twitter, etc.)
  - Web 2.0
- Virtual libraries
  - Virtual services – web portals and social networks
  - Utilization of free or low cost online libraries.
  - One eLibrary for the state
  - Borderless library, our libraries need to push the services to where our customers are anywhere and anytime.
  - Ever-expanding reach to users through virtual space. This reality will continue to require us to rethink how we collect, distribute and educate users as well as design library spaces. Most immediately, new collaborations or alignments need to be established in higher education so that when we talk about purchasing, creation, or distribution of digital content (i.e., streaming video, eBooks, digital textbooks, etc.), efficient and fiscally sound decisions are made.
- Open source environments
- Augmented reality applications
- Gesture based computing
- streaming video
- online, real-time resource sharing between institutions
- consolidation of resources
- Applications – seamless integration of library systems with learning management systems and administrative management systems

### *The Library*

- Libraries will need to invest and recruit staff with technology competencies
  - Emergent Technology and the new library worker. Librarians, staff and administration must rethink job requirements and skill sets. Technology is not something that happens in another department (i.e., network and media). Developing, using, and imagining services and spaces requires crossing/dissolving historical divisions within higher education and accepting a new educational landscape for our workers.
- Libraries are becoming “learning commons”, requiring extensive computing and networking capabilities, and socializing/networking space. Libraries no longer need to hold physical assets; shared resources and databases and fast networks are a must
- Collaborative tools and the library user. Through the use of new technologies, libraries have the ability to engage users in new ways to create, archive and distribute local content. This orientation would require, again, rethinking staff, rethinking the tools we offer users and redesigning library spaces.
- Student access from multiple venues
  - Authentication Coordination

**2) What are (up to) the five most important potential technology pitfalls that a state level planning effort should consider for higher education library services for the next ten years?**

*Emerging Technologies*

- Adequacy of network bandwidth
  - Bandwidth
  - Adequacy of network authentication and security
  - Internet band-width restrictions
  - Exponential growth in bandwidth, data storage and computing
- Validity of open source
  - Guardianship of open source materials
- Legalities of virtual licenses
  - copyright infringement
- Validity of Cloud Computing
- Different delivery methods (hardcopy, DVD, electronic, etc.)
- Can't predict what next trend will be
- Lack of Wi-Fi coverage
- Privacy issues
- Cyber security
  - User Security
  - Compliance and security issues
- The infrastructure required for library automation, learning commons, shared library resources over the Internet, etc., make the library services environment more complex and far-reaching than a traditional library. Libraries should work in concert with their central IT planning and governance boards to efficiently equip the libraries for effective services for students, faculty, and the public.
- Failing to incorporate decisions about technology as part of a larger discussion about teaching and learning. Historically, the provision and maintenance of technology and technologically-based services was housed outside the library. This has changed to some degree, but higher education lives with the legacy of this truth and often hardware is purchased, rooms are wired, applications are purchased, etc. without involving the very departments that will use those services.

*Students*

- Student access from multiple venues (both a trend and problematic)
- Different customers with specific needs.
- Off site and virtual technical support
- Lack of internet access and computer equipment for students
- Economics of students
- Use of the student's College email address for communications

*Funding*

- Funding for new trends
- Cost of such services
  - Investing in gadgets as oppose to solutions
  - Funding for technology-related library services and continuing research into emerging technologies
  - recurring costs
  - Overinvesting in a particular technological tool or application. With the ever-increasing proliferation of devices, tools, applications and platforms, it is important that any purchase fits a larger mission of teaching, learning and collaboration. As it stands, individual colleges, departments, and or campuses make decisions that exclude system-wide use of a services or item by users.
  - Funding and limited IT budgets

### *Status Quo*

- Accepting the status quo and it is business as usual. We have to change
  - Reliance on legacy systems will hamper research progress

### *Higher Ed and the Library*

- eLibrary will not eliminate the need for the Library. Instead, eLibraries will complement the physical libraries, creating a place where people will visit to collaborate, conduct research, socialize and get assistance form trained librarians
- Ability of libraries to adjust quickly enough and to keep abreast of changing technology and library applications
- Proprietary and decentralized library system
- Be aware of the national trend to move from “Just in case” to “Just in time” library resource building
- The myth about having more desktop computers in the library
- Library staff need information technology skills, which includes not only day-to-day operational and troubleshooting skills, but strategic planning and analysis.
  - offering enhanced technology services without providing baseline technology training for library staffing
- Lack of user support and training
  - IT competencies and digital media literacy of faculty

## **CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS/PROVOSTS (14 Respondents)**

**1) What are (up to) the three most important issues that a state level planning effort should consider for higher education library services for the next ten years?**

### *Collaboration*

- Transparent public negotiations for information products. This effort should demonstrate an honest effort at securing the best possible pricing and terms while, at the same time, holding vendors more accountable.
- Strong leadership to conduct an environmental scan of the emerging trends and changing realities in the areas of instruction, research, technology and public services and with the power to make changes as needed.
- Access Cost Service
- Implications of the Google library project for the SUS
- Partnership opportunities with other public higher education institutions and with public libraries throughout the state.
- Developing more intensive collaborations with shared services and joint use libraries
- Better leveraging of cumulative resources – e.g. statewide technical services, librarians working trans-institutionally.
- Shared resources among the SUS and FCS instead of separate funding for each sector.  
- Round-the-clock support (i.e., access to library resources) for online classes to help colleges deal with the impact of rapidly increasing enrollment.
- SUS combined strategic planning for educating students and conducting research to meet the workforce demands of the next decade and beyond in Florida.
- Need to retain FCLA and CCLA as part of the university and college systems, as legislatively they should be according to the agreement recently reached between the Chancellor and the Legislature, with control over their own hardware and software, to provide the level of service needed , which is more than state data centers can offer.

### *Electronic Resources*

- Funding for the creation of the electronic infrastructure
- Electronic resources that can be shared to lower costs across the state
- Providing quality resources that can be shared by diverse institutions and students.
- Access to online library resources for students who may not have access to computer and broadband technologies at home.
- Too many eBooks not enough databases like NEXIS/LEXIS.

### *Funding*

- Funding
- Continued state-wide purchasing power for data bases and services
- Stability in funding for library services

- Need to provide secure funding for library resources to assure support for higher ed research and teaching
- Annual subscription and e-material costs that outstrip available resources
- Lack of a dedicated source of funding for university libraries and the inclusion in the state strategic planning as a distinct element of world class research
- Adequacy of Funding: Making sure that funding sources are sufficient for institutions to adequately support appropriate resources and services for the programs provided to our students.
- Financial resources to realize the vision and strategic plan developed in support of the future of academic library access, resources and services.

### *Product/Systems*

- Flexible Systems: The discovery tools we offer our users need to be flexible to the needs of the users of the institution. For example, we need a user-friendly OPAC that takes advantage of the individual database searching features; such as providing full feature of the search interface at the front-end.
- A product that can do full text, peer reviewed literature, Boolean search, single search portal – current product is costly and doesn't.
- Technology mediated delivery systems.
  - Making services available to all digital platforms - cell phones, ipads ...and anticipating what comes next.
- A commitment to online repositories and Print-on-Demand books to expedite students' access to learning material and to combat the rising cost of textbooks.
- Ease and transparency of use of any system

### *Higher Ed. and the Library*

- The part libraries can play in lowering textbook costs for students
- Equity issues associated with the distribution of e-resources from the state to individual university libraries
- Awareness that first-class library service would require a secure and ongoing commitment to hardware, software, and personnel, as well as to subscription costs
- Professional Staffing (MLS or higher)
- Salaries for Professional Librarians
- Modern and up to date facilities
- Access to physical higher education libraries and services for all public higher education students.
- Libraries need support for information literacy learning outcome
- Support for new BAS/BA/BS degrees (electronic core collections aren't chosen that way)
- Developing an open source solution, if we develop it we own it and can change it as our needs change and fold in K-12 and public libraries. There is budget and staff at both CCLA and FCLA who should be devoted to open source instead of dedicated to fixing a faulty vendor product.
- Continuous Communications Effort: Higher education serves a broad and diverse community of users, with varying degrees of needs. In order to best serve these needs

and provide adequate and timely access to services and resources, this effort should continue to solicit and consider the expressed needs of its constituency

**2) What are (up to) the three most important potential pitfalls that a state level planning effort should consider for higher education library services for the next ten years?**

*Funding*

- Inadequate budgets for modern and high quality services
- Lack of funding can torpedo the best thought-out plans—need to find a secure source of funding not subject to vagaries of annual shortfalls
- The myriad ways public and school libraries are funded and administered locally - the lack of standards and adequate funding creates a gap that cannot be filled by colleges and universities.
- Unequal Distribution of Funding: Providing inadequate and insufficient funding to meet the required level of library support services is a major pitfall. One which is noted during a visitation by an accrediting agency.
- Not funding the libraries at the levels necessary now and ten years from so that academic libraries can continue to provide the electronic and print resources needed by students and faculty, maintain their current levels of services, and continue to provide professional development for their library staff. Thinking the Florida taxpayers and students are willing to share more of the economic burden.

*Consolidation*

- Mixing institutions with different missions and needs
- Desires/needs of the 3 delivery systems of education: K-12, state colleges, and SUS.
- Not considering total costs--\$\$, faculty and staff time, level of service, etc.--of consolidation
- Technology mediated delivery systems will require systemic coordination, staffing and oversight that may not be well supported.
- Risks/rewards of statewide centralization /local control. What is the appropriate balance?
- Simplistic belief that one size fits all (K-12, public libraries, state library, community colleges, universities)
- Attempts to micromanage university operations and remove them from higher-ed system
- Assuming that higher quantity and all collaborations will lead to better pricing and service
- Complexity. The system must be designed for ease of use and access.
- The possible unintended consequences of access to all college level content for under-age high school students in IB, Advanced Placement and dual enrollment courses. (There might need to be some mechanism for limiting what these types of enrollments can access.)
- Losing sight of local needs and institutional differences related to library services

- Not realizing that each library is a reflection of its institution and the discipline taught there and therefore different than other libraries. A one size fits all approach is a pitfall.
- Not being competitive in terms of providing world class quality educational resources, both print and electronic for students at state universities.

#### *Automation*

- Continuing to allow state agencies to fix an expensive vendor product that is faulty
- Not establishing institutional accountability for library automation that supports user needs and a strong non-performance clause in our contracts for faulty products purchased by state agencies.
- Over commitment to long standing institutional arrangements such as the library automation centers and the failure to change them responsively to changing circumstances

#### *Higher Ed. and the Library*

- Misunderstandings regarding the role of libraries in the levels of distinct educational delivery systems
- The inability of university libraries to articulate clearly their value to the academic enterprise and the long term economic prosperity of the state
- That books will vanish over this period. We will be living in a multi-formatted environment for the foreseeable future and should not discriminate information based solely on format.
- Lack of inclusion of Professional Librarians in overall academic issues on college campuses (Curriculum/facilities planning/computer services)
- Inadequate numbers of Professional Librarians (MLS)
- Defining the role and the complementary skills necessary for the faculty librarian of the future.

#### *Planning*

- Incremental planning. We need to plan a major change that will sustain us for 10-20 years because we are only going to get limited funding to do this once.
- Long range strategic planning maintains focus upon what is important, but if too grandiose or costly will fall by the wayside during difficult economic times.

#### *Technology/Products*

- Rigid and Inflexible Vendor Products: Given the intellectual diversity of our students providing vendor products which are geared to advanced researchers is a serious pitfall. Designing open source products increases the flexibility and efficiency for the individual institutions tailoring products for our particular users.
- The effect of the rapid increase of open access resources widely available on the Internet if it is not monitored/operated by a state entity. (Students need reliable access that is not available via a Google search.)

- While not a "library services" issue, per se, one of the major pitfalls of E-Learning is cheating. We must find a way to prevent (or catch) students from cheating and plagiarizing that is rampant due to the availability of resources on the Intranet. "
- Who has access is important, how the access is delivered is also important

#### *Users*

- User privacy/information security issues.
- Need for education in information literacy for all library constituents