



STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
SYSTEM  
of FLORIDA  
Board of Governors



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

### Stakeholder Survey Executive Summary

The survey was available to stakeholders from the SUS and FCS for one week (July 6-13, 2010). The stakeholder groups were Task Force Members (n=15), Library Directors (n=23), Distance Learning professionals (n=6), Chief Academic Officers & Provosts (n=14), and Chief Information Officers (n=14). A total of seventy-two responses were received. A high level overview of themes for each item, as reported by different stakeholder groups, is presented below. Please note that not all items were answered by all stakeholder groups.

**Survey Item 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?**

<p><b><u>Provosts &amp; Chief Academic Officers:</u></b> Transparent process; Increased collaboration/cooperation; eResources: funding and access; Continued statewide purchasing power and mutual funding; Stable and adequate funding; Flexible, robust library systems; Equity of Resources; Open source systems; Well paid, qualified staff</p>	<p><b><u>Task Force Members</u></b> Digital collections and associated funding; Mobile device usage; Structure of what collaboration will look like; Impact of increased collaboration; Needs of different types of schools and libraries; Stable and adequate funding; Accountability and assessment of higher ed.; Ease of use for patrons; “Just in time” learning</p>
<p><b><u>Distance Learning</u></b> Mobile devices/learning; Digital/web-based resources; Stable and adequate funding for such resources; Statewide cooperation; Flexible systems; Legislative understanding of the different needs across the three systems.</p>	<p><b><u>Library Directors</u></b> Increased and more effective sharing of resources; Stable and adequate funding for this in general; Investigating open source solutions; Understanding the differing needs of different types of schools and libraries; Doing more with less; Well trained staff; Print-on-demand publishing; eBooks/eResources</p>

**Survey item 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?**

<p><b><u>Provosts &amp; Chief Academic Officers:</u></b> Lack of stable, adequate funding; Mixing institutions with differing needs without an adequate understanding of those needs; Failure to understand the risks and complexity of consolidation; Accountability of the automation centers; Incremental/non-strategic planning; Vendor product inadequacies; Inadequate privacy and security</p>	<p><b><u>Task Force Members:</u></b> Unrealistic/incremental/non-strategic planning; Fears of failure and collaboration; Trying to do too much; Mixing institutions with differing needs without an adequate understanding of those needs; Lack of stable, adequate funding; Unfunded mandates; Poor collection development</p>
<p><b><u>Distance Learning</u></b> Not planning for growth; Not planning for increased bandwidth needs; Lack of stable, adequate funding; Vendor product inadequacies; Not considering open source; Not utilizing all available resources; Increased responsibilities with less money</p>	<p><b><u>Library Directors</u></b> Not having equity of resources across the three systems; Mixing institutions with differing needs without an adequate understanding of those needs; Lack of stable, adequate funding; Digital divide; Clinging to status quo; Vendor product inadequacies</p>

**Survey item 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?**

<p><b><u>Chief Information Officers</u></b> Cloud computing; Digital media; Open source; Mobile devices; Data mining; Digital rights management; Internet everything; Virtual libraries; Technologically competent staff; Libraries as learning spaces, not full of physical items</p>	<p><b><u>Task Force Members</u></b> Cloud computing; Mobile devices; Open source; Support for distance learners; Discovery systems</p>
<p><b><u>Distance Learning</u></b> Web based/digital learning, Digitization; Anytime access; Standardization; Mobile devices; Web 2.0; ADA compliance; Assisting students (digital divide); Technologically competent staff</p>	<p><b><u>Library Directors</u></b> Mobile devices; Anytime Access; eResources; Digitization; Cloud computing; Open source; Broadband access; Distance/online learning; On-demand publishing; Virtual services; New operating systems</p>

**Survey item 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?**

<p><b><u>Chief Information Officers</u></b>          Inadequate bandwidth access; Non-validation of open source and cloud computing; Not knowing the next trend; Cyber security; Not incorporating technology decisions into the greater academic decision making process; Digital divide; Lack of stable and adequate funding; Clinging to status quo; Not understanding “Just in Time” learning</p>	<p><b><u>Task Force Members</u></b>          Note evolving fast enough; Failure to take tech trends seriously; Incompatibility between library systems; Standards issues; Content management systems that become too complex; Limitations of legacy library systems; Inequitable access to resources; Cyber security; Trends in intellectual property laws/licensing/copyright issues; Lack of pro-education agenda in state government; Downsides of perpetual beta</p>
<p><b><u>Distance Learning</u></b>          Not planning for growth; Not understanding the complexity and cost of merging three systems; Lack of interoperability; Limited bandwidth; Digital divide</p>	<p><b><u>Library Directors</u></b>          Trends in intellectual property laws/licensing/copyright issues; Lack of interoperability in a statewide system; Not enough staff, resulting in negative impacts on student information literacy; Early adopting too much: rushing into untested technology; Inequitable access to resources; Inadequate bandwidth/broadband access; Being risk averse, inflexible, and uncreative; Security and privacy issues; Automation: limitations of current systems; Negative impact of data-center consolidation</p>