



**Executive summaries from the twenty-fourth annual
Online Northwest Conference**

**Corvallis, Oregon
Friday, February 16th, 2007**

Online Coordinators Committee

The Online Coordinators Committee was established by the Oregon University System Library Council to plan and oversee the Online Northwest Conference. The committee consists of one representative from each of the institutional libraries in the Oregon University System.

Shirley Lincicum

Hamersly Library
Western Oregon University
Monmouth, OR 97361
Phone: (503) 838-8890
Fax: (503) 838-8399
Email: lincics@wou.edu

Jane Nichols

Valley Library
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331-4501
Phone: (541) 737-7269
Fax: (541) 737-8224
Email: jane.nichols@oregonstate.edu

Ken Watson

Walter M. Pierce Library
Eastern Oregon University
La Grande, OR 97850
Phone: (541) 962-3546
Fax: (541) 962-3335
Email: kwatson@eou.edu

Emily Miller-Francisco

Southern Oregon University
1250 Siskiyou Blvd.
Ashland, OR 97520-5076
Phone: (541) 552-6819
Fax: (541) 552-6429
Email: millere@sou.edu

Jon Jablonski

University of Oregon Science Library
Eugene, OR
Phone: (541) 346-2871
Fax: (541)
Email: jonjab@darkwing.uoregon.edu

Todd Hannon

Oregon Health & Science University Library
Research and Reference Dept.
P.O. Box 573
Portland, OR 97207-0573
Phone: (503) 494-3474
Fax: (503) 494-3322
Email: hannont@ohsu.edu

Loree Hyde

Portland Operations Librarian
Oregon Institute of Technology Library
3201 Campus Dr.
Klamath Falls, OR 97601
541-885-1965
Email: Loree.Hyde@oit.edu

Tom Larsen

Portland State University Library
P.O. Box 1151
Portland, OR 97207-1151
Phone: 503-725-8179
Fax: 503-725-5799
Email: larsent@pdx.edu

Conference Administrative Support

Jamie LeGore

Conference and Event Marketing Manager
OSU Conference Services
Oregon State University
100 LaSells Stewart Center

Corvallis, Oregon 97331
Phone (541) 737-6443
Fax (541) 737-9315
website: <http://oregonstate.edu/conferences>

Keynote Address | 9:00 am to 10:00 am

Stephen Abram

Stephen Abram, MLS, is immediate past-President of the Canadian Library Association and Vice President of Innovation for SirsiDynix. He is the president-elect of SLA internationally. He has been VP of Corporate Development for Micromedia ProQuest and Publisher Electronic Information for Thomson.

He ran libraries for Suncor, Coopers & Lybrand, Smith Lyons Torrance Stevenson and Mayer and Hay Group. Stephen has been listed by Library Journal as one of their first "Mover and Shakers", the key people influencing the future of libraries and librarianship. He has been awarded SLA's John Cotton Dana Award as well as being a Fellow of the SLA. He was Canadian Special Librarian of the Year and Alumni of the Year for the Faculty of Information Studies at the University of Toronto.

He is an adjunct professor at the University of Toronto, Faculty of Information Studies. He was President 2002 of the Ontario Library Association as well as having sat on the SLA Board of Directors as Director and Secretary. He gives over 100 international keynote talks annually to library and information industry conferences and writes articles and columns for Information Outlook, Feliciter, Access, Multimedia & Internet @ Schools, and Library Journal.

Session One | 10:15 am - 11:15 am

Skill Set for the Librarian of 2010: Panel to follow up on Keynote

Panel: Stephen Abram, SirsiDynix; Rachel Bridgewater, Washington State University, Vancouver; Donna Reed, Multnomah County Library; and Terry Reese, Oregon State University.

Join our diverse panel of experts for a lively discussion of the skills librarians will need in the not-so-distant future.

Speaker Biographies

Steven Abram is Vice President of Innovation for SirsiDynix and is the keynote speaker for this conference.

Rachel Bridgewater is Reference Coordinator at Washington State University Vancouver. In addition to coordinating reference services, she also teaches course-integrated library instruction sessions, develops and supports web applications, and acts as liaison to Biology, Computer Science, Engineering, History and Natural Resources/Environmental Science. Above all, Rachel is a copyright geek. She co-teaches the ACRL e-Learning course "Current Copyright Issues Facing Academic Librarians" with Carrie Russell and hosts a monthly social event in Portland called CopyNight where interested people from many walks of life gather for drinks and talk about intellectual property policy.

Donna Reed is Web Services Coordinator for Multnomah County Library and Adjunct Faculty for the Emporia State University School of Library and Information Management. As Web Services Coordinator,

Donna coordinates the design and maintenance of MCL's public website, its intranet, the interface of its catalog and CascadeLink, a regional community information network. She teaches Information Repackaging and Database Design for Information Professionals for Emporia State University.

Terry Reese is the Digital Production Unit Head in the Oregon State University Libraries, overseeing the libraries' digital production efforts, dealing with matters of quality control, metadata selection/maintenance/migration, project management and software development. Additionally, he is responsible for providing leadership and direction to the libraries' R&D efforts.

Electronic Presence and Outreach: Beyond Your Library's Web Site

Michael Porter, WebJunction/OCLC Western

Terms like social software, electronic community and "Library 2.0" get used a lot these days in the library world, but how can you take these ideas and turn them into practical services for your patrons? This session will explore how all types of libraries are extending the reach into their communities and offering services that make them more visible, available, flexible, practical and successful. Some of the concepts, tools and library examples discussed in this lively presentation include: "the next generation virtual branch" and IM, massive multiplayer on-line games, gaming theory and libraries and the growing importance of both Open WorldCat and RSS aggregation.

Speaker Biography

Michael is a librarian, trainer, technology aficionado, PEZ collector and flickr fan with an MLS from Indiana University ('99). He also authors the Libraryman web site and blog found at www.libraryman.com. In addition to his current position with WebJunction, Michael's professional experience includes work as a library technology trainer for OCLC Western and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation US Library Program. He also worked for ten years with the Allen County Public Library in Fort Wayne, IN before graduate school. Michael recently spent a year helping to establish an education program called "Computers @ Sea" with Princess Cruises, seeing exotics ports of call around the globe along the way. Michael's professional focus is on libraries, technology, community and training. He is coauthor of the "Internet Spotlight" column in Public Libraries magazine.

Integrating Metasearch into Your Library: Social, Technical, and Practical Obstacles

Erica Carlson, Washington State University

Alex Merrill, Washington State University

This session will discuss the process of customizing and integrating a metasearch tool within a library system, noting challenges and possible considerations for other libraries thinking of or involved in providing metasearch tools for their patrons. Presenters draw on their experiences activating MetaLib, the metasearching tool offered by Ex Libris, at Washington State University. Before going "live," WSU Libraries underwent a process of preparing MetaLib for general consumption that included not only interface usability testing but also faculty "buy-in" sessions intended to tune the software to more closely fit the needs and goals of the institution.

Speaker Biographies

Alex Merrill serves as the Digital Initiatives Librarian at the Washington State University Libraries (WSUL). Alex is the primary support contact for WSUL's CONTENTdm installation and for new institutional digitization projects. He is the primary systems contact for the Libraries' SFX implementation and also has shared responsibility for Metalib. Alex graduated from library school in December 2005 from the

University of Arizona. Projects include the completion of the RKO film digitization pilot project at Washington State University, working on the Stewart Udall Papers for the Western Waters Digital Library (while working for the University of Arizona), federated search tool implementation, and integrating locally produced public television content into the WSUL's CONTENTdm installation.

Erica Carlson Nicol is the Humanities/Social Sciences and E-Resources Librarian at Washington State University Pullman. In addition to working with electronic resources, Erica is the liaison librarian for the Edward R. Murrow School of Communication, the Department of Anthropology, and the Department of Women's Studies. Recent projects include usability studies for WSU's federated searching tool, Search It!, and for the implementation of WSU's new online catalog interface. Erica holds an MA in English Literature from Loyola University Chicago and an MS in Library and Information Science from the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, and is currently researching the relationship between library anxiety and reference transactions.

Creating Online Tutorials with Macromedia Captivate: Process and Product

Karen Munro, University of California, Berkeley

Macromedia (Adobe) Captivate is screencasting software, designed to record computer activities such as mousing and typing, and reproducing them in animated Flash files. Captivate lends itself well to the creation of online library tutorials. Academic librarians can use Captivate to record searches, edit and supplement them with audio and visual features, and then render them to users over the Internet.

However, a good online tutorial is more than just a record of a series of actions. Librarians charged with creating online tutorials will quickly find themselves grappling with issues ranging from instructional design to project management to marketing and communication. Online instruction poses very different questions from classroom teaching, and creating a cohesive, centralized plan for online library tutorials can require considerable effort, especially in a large research library.

In this session, we will examine a sample online tutorial created at UC Berkeley and discuss lessons learned from experience and from the literature about online pedagogy. We will also explore good practices for positioning, marketing, and integrating online tutorials with other library services. Audience members may gain some practical tips on using the Captivate software, but the primary emphasis will be on constructing pedagogically sound tutorials that are easily shared, re-used, and modified.

Speaker Biography

Karen Munro has been the E-Learning Librarian at UC Berkeley since 2005. Her responsibilities include the creation of online tutorials, integration of the library into the campus CMS, web management, and classroom instruction. She attended the ACRL Intentional Teacher Immersion Program in the fall of 2006, and co-led the Instruction Section's Current Issues Discussion Group on libraries and CMS at Midwinter 2007. She holds an MLIS from UBC and an MFA from the Iowa Writers' Workshop.

Session Two | 11:30 am - 12:30 pm

Observing Student Researchers in their Native Habitat

John Law, ProQuest

Joanna Markel, ProQuest

Serena Rosenhahn, ProQuest

Understanding how students in real world situations go about conducting research is essential to ensuring that library resources are best positioned to meet their needs. This presentation will reveal key findings of a recent ethnographic study observing university students in the context of performing research for actual course assignments.

What you will learn from this session:

What you need to know about how students are using Google in order to make your library resources relevant to their workflow

What students use as their primary guidepost for determining how to conduct their research

What aspects of library website design are critical for engaging students while in the midst of their research process

Unforeseen outcomes of introducing discipline-specific resources and how to ensure discipline-specific resources are engaged appropriately

Along with key findings, the presentation will include a description of study methods and include select audio and video clips.

Speaker Biographies

John Law is Director of the Strategic Alliances & Platform for ProQuest Information and Learning. He manages the ProQuest search platform and related partnership arrangements. He is responsible for strategic planning, user research and definition of new features for the platform including innovations such as ProQuest® Smart Search and the recently introduced One Click searching™. With over 15 years experience in new product development, John has held positions from R&D core team lead to director of product management. He holds a masters degree from Columbia University focused on technology management.

Joanna Markel, MLI, is Manager of the User Experience Design Group for ProQuest Information and Learning. She is responsible for managing the User Experience Design group at ProQuest. She received a specialization in Human-Computer Interaction at University of Michigan's School of Information and has served in past roles as web experience developer and information architect. Joanna has contributed significantly to the design of several ProQuest products creating intuitive designs that satisfy users' needs, delight customers and rank ProQuest among the best user interfaces in the library market.

Next Generation Catalog

Andrea Peterson, Western Washington University

Librarianship and libraries are in a state of flux, and the relevance of libraries is being called into question. This has been true for some time: Western's president has referred to the library as a black hole; a Dean once asked why we needed the library since everything is online. Most of us have heard such comments over the years from those outside of our profession. However, we are beginning to see more people inside the profession also questioning our relevance. And we should be. Circulation, reference questions, gate counts are down, and usage of our websites is not increasing at the rate expected. People are going elsewhere for information.

This presentation will look at the reasons why people are going elsewhere and look at some of the tools people are using instead. These tools include tagging, faceted searching, and different ways of

displaying information that promote exploration and interactivity. Tagging will be a primary focus of the discussion. Tagging is frequently marginalized by librarians as a non-standard, uncontrolled vocabulary – which it is. However, the social aspects of tagging provide some incredibly interesting and sometimes useful information that should not be overlooked by our profession.

This presentation will also take a look at some of the ways we can and are addressing these changes and moving forward by incorporating tagging, faceting searching, and new ways presenting information in the library world. This includes NCSU's implementation of Endeca, new catalog interfaces proposed by vendors, and experimental projects being done in libraries.

Speaker Biography

Andrea Peterson is the Head of Library Systems at Western Washington University. She had previously worked as a cataloger, a director, and an instruction / reference librarian before discovering that working in systems is much more fun. She received her M.L.S. from Indiana University in 1991.

Plinkit: A Statewide Web-hosting Solution for Public Libraries (using open source software)

Darci Hanning, Oregon State Library

Learn how the Oregon State Library is using Plone, an open source content management system, to provide a web-hosting solution for small and medium-sized public libraries in Oregon. Plinkit provides both content and functionality that are exciting and useful to patrons and library staff alike. This session will provide an overview of the Plinkit project, cover Plinkit features in detail, and discuss briefly the broader topic of open source software in library environments.

Here's how we like to advertise Plinkit to libraries in Oregon:

"Does your library need a website but you don't have the time or resources to build one from scratch? Or perhaps you have an irrational fear of HTML? Does your library have a website but it's hard to maintain? Do you think your website could be doing more for your and your patrons?"

Then Plinkit may be for you! You can use Plinkit to create an intuitive, dynamic website with little effort and no technical expertise. Your website will come with pre-built templates and content that is automatically updated. And best of all, it's free!

But wait, there's more! Library Development Services of the Oregon State Library will host your website, provide you with hands-on training, and give you a copy of your very own Plinkit Manual!"

Speaker Biography

Darci Hanning holds an MLIS from the University of Washington and BSEE from Washington State University. She has over fifteen years experience in software development and several years of IT project management. She is currently the Technology Development Consultant with Library Development Services at the Oregon State Library where her responsibilities include oversight of the Oregon statewide database licensing program, technology-related grants, and of course, Plinkit.

Being Where Our Users Are: Creating Plug-ins, Buttons, and Gadgets

Rich Edwards, Washington State Library

In the September 2006 issue of *American Libraries*, Joe Janes wrote about web browser search box plug-ins saying "That little box is the 21st-century equivalent of the book-mobile or the outreach program--a way for libraries to be where their users are."

His recommendation? "If your library doesn't have one yet, find the person on your staff who can build it, and then publicize the heck out of it."

This presentation will demonstrate what these "little boxes" are, what they do, how to design one to add your library catalog to Google's Toolbar, Personalized Home Pages and Mozilla Firefox, and how to market it.

Speaker Biography

Rich Edwards began his career in library automation making punchcards for an early computer circulation system and filing in the card catalog. Having worked in many positions with several library systems, including WLN, OCLC, ALIS, Dynix, and Innovative, when the web came along he naturally gravitated into being an early library webmaster. After serving as Instructional Technology Librarian at The Evergreen State College in Olympia, WA and Systems/Reference Librarian at Northeastern State University in Tahlequah, OK, he is currently the Manager for Technical Services at the Washington State Library.

Session Three | 1:45 pm - 2:45 pm

Consider Your Users: How Helpful is Your Interface?

Donna Reed, Multnomah County Library

Paul Irving, Insite Web Publishing

Multnomah County Library was aware that its website was due for a make-over well before it began the process in early 2005. The library had delayed the redesign project because it wanted to coordinate the project with the rollout of its new catalog. Additionally, the county was in the process of moving its websites onto a content management system (CMS) and the library was unsure if it should move directly onto the CMS or redesign using CSS and XHTML.

The library had a lot of homework to do before making decisions about which technologies to do. In late 2003, as part of a county-driven project, the library asked a usability expert to evaluate its website. The findings were not too surprising. In a nutshell, the library was told that it had everything the consultant looked for and that the content was well designed and organized. The big problem was that the website did not have a pervasive navigation system and it was difficult to move around on the library's website without going back to the homepage.

The library decided to move forward with the design project in early 2005. As a first step, the library worked with Portland-based Metropolitan Group (<http://www.metgroup.com/>). Metropolitan Group helped the library create a web-based survey and held a retreat with selected library staff to analyze the results of the survey and begin to build solutions. Metropolitan's analysis of the public survey reinforced what the usability experts had reported. There were a number of problems and opportunities but the glaring issue was that the library needed a fully implemented navigational system.

The library's website is managed by its Public Relations section. After the retreat, the PR manager pulled together a team to begin look at what needed to be done to get the project moving. Although it meant setting an ambitious schedule, the library decided to roll out the new design simultaneously with the launch of its catalog. That date had already been set by the catalog team. The library knew this would be a large undertaking but it wanted the catalog to be seamlessly integrated into the website at its inception. It did not seem reasonable to roll the catalog out as a stand alone product and then to have to later retrofit its interface.

After reviewing the results and looking at the county's CMS project, the library decided not to move to the CMS but to create a design that was adaptable to the more structured CMS environment and that the county could use as it moved its public content forward. The PR manager became the project sponsor and the Web Services Coordinator was project manager. Additionally, the library hired Insite Web Publishing (<http://www.iwpi.com/>) to help with the information architecture and design of the new website. Insite had recently finished work on a website for the City of Kent, Washington and the library was impressed with some of the features of that new website. Non-technical team members included a graphics artist, a representative from county IT and coordinators of the library's larger sections (research, kids, books, español, events, teens, etc.).

Early on, the team decided that the content would be coded in XHTML and that the site would be strictly style sheet driven. The first step was to do an inventory of everything on the existing website and to make decisions about its future. The Web Services Coordinator created an accessible space on the library network to start organizing content and gained space to stage content on a county-hosted development server. The team then began stripping content of deprecated coding and tables.

The clean-up process was time consuming. As this work was underway, the technical team worked to restructure the information architecture and to build templates for booklists, events content, web collections, etc. Where possible, the old structure was left in tact. Insite recommended new naming conventions which the library adopted for the most part.

Once the architecture was in place, the documentation was given to Insite's designer who worked with the information architect to make the structure come to life. The designer created templates for the home page, second level pages and a variety of other features including Staff Picks, booklists, subject guides. She also visited most of the libraries and created a color scheme that reflected the wood and lights found in the various libraries.

Once the templates were created, the library's content creators were trained to convert content into the new templates. A lot of this could be done using search and replace but some content needed to be hand coded. As this was going on, Insite created a handbook (http://www.multcolib.org/_handbook) documenting standards and requirements.

In addition to the technical and structural changes, Insite educated the library about more effective ways to use photographs and words. The library's website had previously been written with concise language that was minimal but that sometimes lacked voice or friendliness. Insite helped the library add personality to its writing and to avoid library jargon. In addition to the assistance from Insite, public relations staff took a class on writing for the web and published best practices on the library's intranet. The Web Services Coordinator began teaching a class in writing for the Web for county staff and library employees.

Insite staff also traveled to libraries taking photos for use on the website. Previously, the library has used generic-looking photos of library spaces. The idea was that people should see a photograph and not associate it with a specific location. Insite encouraged the library to change its thinking about photos. As a result many of the photos on the library's website now feature specific libraries. They also show people

using the library in a number of ways. The goal was to create photos that invited people into the library website. Based on the many favorable comments the library has received about its photos, Insite's insight was well founded.

About twenty-five people worked on the content throughout the summer. Work on the catalog began in July. Applying the design to the catalog was tricky because those working on that aspect of the project were learning how to work with the catalog simultaneously with learning to apply the new design. Conditions for doing this work were not optimum due to the tight timeline and learning curve but all agreed after the rollout that it was well worth the effort.

Since its launch, the design has evolved, but the foundations of its design are still in tact. Looking back, the key lessons learned are:

- Take time to talk to users before any redesign project
- Learn what users want before assigning technologies to meet their needs
- Talk to users on an ongoing basis and make changes based on their input
- Test continuously

Speaker Biographies

Donna Reed is Web Services Coordinator for Multnomah County Library and Adjunct Faculty for the Emporia State University School of Library and Information Management. As Web Services Coordinator, Donna coordinates the design and maintenance of MCL's public website, its intranet, the interface of its catalog and CascadeLink, a regional community information network. She teaches Information Repackaging and Database Design for Information Professionals for Emporia State University.

Paul Irving is Web Developer, Information Architect, and Owner of Insite Web Publishing. Paul received a B.A. in Political Science and Sociology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison in 1990 and has a background in social service and community outreach. His commitment to the community building power of the Internet led him to study networking technology and eventually found Insite Web Publishing. Paul has consulted on dozens of Internet and Intranet projects in key positions including project management, marketing, design, information architecture, technical lead, Web development, publication and post-production. He has valuable experience developing websites that are compliant with the World Wide Web Consortium's Web Accessibility Initiative. He lectures Library and Information Science graduate students on Web accessibility and usability issues.

Challenge Your Dark Side: Teaching Google Books and Google Scholar

Dale Vidmar, Southern Oregon University

When Google first introduced Google Scholar and then shortly after entered into an agreement to digitize books, many librarians and academic scholars believed they had sighted the Death Star. Scholar and Book Search had all the making of leading individuals further astray on the Internet and further away from the resources in libraries. Where Scholar evoked questions of adequacy, Book Search erupted into legal challenges. Libraries and librarians watched as institutions and individuals joined the "dark side." Many felt and still feel that this is just the beginning of making information available to everyone, but for a price. As both projects continue their assault on the universe, how can librarians take advantage of this seeming adversary?

Google Scholar has been publicized as the next great thing for academic research on the Web. Scholar went public in November 2004. But as intriguing and controversial as Book Search is, Scholar pales in comparison to scholarly databases found in a larger public library let alone an academic library. Where

Book Search does what the best of library catalogs do not do—search inside the content of books—Scholar is a disappointing substitute for databases such those found in libraries. But there is the rub. A library may not be available to an individual. In more remote areas, school and public libraries may not provide access to expensive full-text databases and indexes. Scholar can provide some assistance and perhaps even limited, yet useful results. But like any other search tool or database, it is important to know the specific features for searching, how they work, and the results they produce.

Features of Scholar:

Cited by – other entries that have cited a document.

Library links – “Find it @” provides a link to library resources for accessing an online copy when you are at the institution. Also, searches WorldCat or a specific library when set in preferences.

Preferences – enables saving preferences for:

Library links -- such as your home institution (Southern Oregon University).

Bibliographic manager – allows the export of citations to sources such as RefWorks, EndNote, etc.

Language.

Number of displayed links.

Related articles – links to related articles, but the reason they are related is not always clear.

Advanced Search – the advance search produces better results.

Search terms in title.

Date.

Publication.

The Google Books Library Project began in December 2004 as a partnership between Google, Inc. and five libraries—University of Michigan, Harvard, Stanford, and Oxford Universities, and New York Public Library. As of November 17, 2006, the partnership has grown to include nine libraries with the addition of University of California, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, University of Wisconsin, and University of Virginia. What began as Google Print has evolved into Google Book Search. In addition to these libraries, Google’s Partner Program includes books from numerous publishers. Google’s goal is “to organize the world’s information and make it universally accessible and useful.”

Many details about Book Search have not been published by Google--such as how many books are available, guidelines for selection, and the algorithm by which books are searched. What is known is that a search in Book Search will retrieve a variety of content from the full text to excerpts including table of contents, indexes, title page, and limited selections in which the search terms are used in context based on whether the content is in the public domain or depending on the arrangement with publishers. The available content is not much different than what is available on other resources such as Amazon’s Search Inside.

Book Search offers the possibility of searching inside books. Searching for information inside books has always been similarly problematic. A book may contain an entire chapter or section with highly relevant information, but the catalog record does not provide any access to that book because the search terms are not used in the record. Why? First, the cataloging record was limited to the information that would fit on a 4" x 6" index card. Currently, online catalog records often still omit chapter headings and provide no access to the index in a book. Finding information inside a book is as problematic as finding information inside a searchable database. What Google Book Search makes possible is the exploration of what is between the covers of a book—information not contained in the catalog records.

Features of Google Book Search:

About this Book – provides information about the book.

Snippets – search terms used in the context of section or sentences.

Table of contents.

Index.

Related books.

References from other books and scholarly works from Scholar.

Find it in a library link – only books in the public domain are linked to libraries.

Advanced Search – provides options to search for better access to books.

Full view books.

Search library catalogs.

Find in a Library or Library catalog search – searches libraries near a zip code.

Keyword searching of complex phrases – Book Search searches more of a book than a typical catalog making it possible to search a thesis sentence or a list of keywords that would often produce no results in a typical library catalogs.

Perhaps the most compelling reason to incorporate Book Search and Scholar into our information literacy classes and stated proficiencies is because students and other individuals are going to find out about it anyway. Who better to introduce them to the benefits of searching Google Book Search to find out more about what is inside a book than a librarian? But this means a shift for some librarians who view themselves as guardians of the book. We are advocates for their use. Librarians who can master teaching the use of Book Search are embracing a resource that assists in doing what Ranganathan advocates in his five laws of library science:

Books are for use.

For every person, there is a book.

Every book has a reader.

Save the time of the reader.

The library is a growing organism.

The last of Ranganathan's laws that the library is a growing organism is important. Recognizing that the library is not something static, that it did not end where the Internet begins, that in the coming years, the same technology that brought us the online catalog and full-text resources will bring about a further evolution of libraries.

So is this really the beginning of the end of libraries, the demise of books, and the culminating defeat of the librarian profession? Or will Google join the list of resources that librarians use in their repertoire to provide individuals with what they need when they need it? Although there are still legal issues to be resolved, the answer may be more of a choice by those in the librarian profession to work with these options as part of an overall search strategy, rather than against it. This presentation will challenge attendees to venture into their dark side and teach Google Book Search and Google Scholar to both students and faculty, so they learn from professionals rather than neophytes.

Selected Bibliography

Baksik, C. (2006). "Fair use or exploitation? The Google book search controversy." *Potal: Libraries and the Academy*. 6 (4), 399-415.

Band, J. (2006). The Google library project: both sides of the story. *Information Outlook*. 10 (6), 35-54.

Jasco, P. (2005). "Savvy searching: Google scholar: the pros and cons." *Online Information Review*, Retrieved December 2, 2006, from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/Insight/ViewContentServlet?Filename=/published/emeraldfulltextarticle/pdf/2640290206.pdf>.

Google. "About Google Book Search." Retrieved December 12, 2006 from <http://books.google.com/intl/en/googlebooks/about.html>.

Google. "Google Scholar Help." Retrieved December 12, 2006 from <http://scholar.google.com/intl/en/scholar/help.html>.

Speaker Biography

Dale Vidmar is an associate professor and the Instruction and Distance Education Coordinator/Education, Communication, and Health & Physical Education Librarian at Southern Oregon University's Hannon Library. He coordinates the Information Literacy program at the university. Dale holds a Master's in Education along with his M.L.S. His work in the Library has always centered around teaching and learning with technology. He has given workshops and presentations both regionally and nationally focusing on topics such as teaching and learning, instructional design, reflective peer coach, and Internet research. Dale is a former Online Northwest Conference Coordinator from 1996-2002 and still oohs and ahs his way through life and learning.

vidmar@sou.edu
<http://www.sou.edu/library/dale>

Digital Archiving on a Shoestring: The Development of the Oregon Documents Repository

Arlene Weible, Oregon State Library
Kyle Banerjee, Oregon State Library

Introduction

The purpose of this presentation is to make the case that you can build a digital archive without the luxury of grant funding or other extra resources. We will describe some of the successes and pitfalls of the approach the Oregon State Library (OSL) has taken to build the Oregon Documents Repository.

The Oregon Documents Repository was established by a recent update of the Oregon Revised Statutes that now requires state agencies to deposit electronic copies of government publications with OSL. No additional funding was allocated to OSL to establish the Repository. Working with this unfunded mandate, OSL established a small work group and began strategizing on how to implement an archive with existing tools and staff resources.

Project management approach

The lack of extra resources allocated to this project eliminated the option to purchase archiving software, or hire an experienced digital archive project manager. Ambitious deadlines for producing a working archive also made it impossible to use an extended planning process.

In order to make quick progress, the work group decided to take small incremental steps in developing workflows for building the archive. For example, the initial focus was to establish procedures for managing monographs in PDF format, which we felt would be the most straightforward to manage. The workflow was established by weekly meetings and use of a wiki to document development milestones and create documentation. Once we learned our lessons from establishing this initial workflow, we were able to move forward with other types of formats, such as publications in html format, and serial publications.

The work group decided to delay decision making about some aspects of the archive, such as a long term preservation strategy, but has made a deliberate effort to make infrastructure decisions that will allow maximum flexibility when those issues are addressed in the future.

The lack of a formal, structured project management process for the Repository has allowed the work group to develop an incremental and flexible approach to development. By not investing heavily in a single approach to solving issues, we have been able to retrench when we have headed down the wrong path and created an innovative environment for problem solving. This approach has worked well in our resource poor environment.

Selection Process and Criteria

One of the ways that the Repository is unique in comparison to archiving initiatives in other states is the way publications are identified. The State of Oregon has adopted a common content management system (CMS) for agencies to use to manage their web sites. OSL staff have been granted access to the system so we may monitor the web publishing activities of agencies. While monitoring the queue of new documents remains primarily a manual process, we continue to work on developing automated rules that will help us filter unwanted material from the publishing stream. Developing rules has been simplified to some degree by important work at the beginning of the project to identify detailed inclusion criteria, which is actually documented in the Oregon Administrative Rules. While these criteria have been very helpful to get us started, our review of the agency publishing stream has demonstrated the almost infinite variety of documents produced by our state government, and how the concept of publication differs in the web environment. We defer decision making about questionable publications to designated work sessions, and do not let our indecisiveness delay progress in adding material to the Repository.

Access Strategies

Our lack of resources had a big influence on the approach taken to providing access to archived documents. The decision was made to use our existing online catalog system; a system in which OSL has already made substantial investment. Using MARC records made sense because it is an established standard we were already familiar with, and it creates records that can be transported between systems relatively easily. MARC records also give us the ability to integrate digital publications with existing print publications, and provide a common information sharing platform to use with other depository libraries. We also decided to perform full cataloging on Repository documents because it was quicker and easier to utilize our existing cataloging expertise than develop new metadata standards and workflows. We anticipate implementing a similar strategy for monitoring serial publications in the web environment by using our system's serials management module to alert us when web sites need to be checked for new issues. By developing a workflow that parallels our existing workflow for printed materials, we have been able to make use our existing cataloging staff. They have quickly become productive with minimal additional training.

The primary goal of the Repository is to archive "born digital" electronic material. We recognize that archiving will also produce opportunities to improve access to this material, but we accept that traditional search engines will continue to provide the primary access to electronic government publications. We also view the Repository's purpose as a way to preserve the content of publications, and do not place an emphasis on retaining native file formats. This principle has influenced the tools we have built assist in the management of the Repository.

Tools

To simplify planning, training, and maintenance, we made a policy decision to incorporate electronic resources into mainstream workflows whenever this made sense – a choice that had an enormous impact on the technologies required to support the Repository. Existing digital repository solutions did not support our workflow or archiving needs, so we developed our own software written in the Python scripting language. Documents are stored on an ordinary file system, and access is provided through the catalog rather than a separate database. Our low-tech approach reduces the effort necessary to design processes for modifying, organizing, or reformatting documents.

Our development process was simplified by a number of factors:

- The documents are created by a finite number of agencies
- Most of these documents still behave like paper
- Most documents are in a the CMS, which makes reformatting them much easier

Although the State Library could be asked to archive anything, most of the documents follow a number of predictable patterns. This makes it easier to devise mechanisms that retrieve web pages and supporting files while stripping unwanted information such as navigation elements. This predictability has been particularly useful for handling multipart monographs and serials.

Ingesting and processing materials cannot be fully automated, so our tools allow staff to provide input when it is needed. Consider the following rather common scenario in which an online journal keeps a few years worth of archives online. However, what happens when new issues come out, particularly if older issues are removed? Even if each issue is ingested individually, how do you associate each item with the other issues? To simplify workflow and ensure consistency, we developed a way to harvest serials, sort them, and add individual issues. This makes it easy for staff to process issues and allows them to be ordered consistently.

Storing resources is more complicated than meets the eye. The most difficult aspect of developing robust storage procedures involves the conversion of materials to an archival format. Converting regular documents composed on standard word processing software is a simple process, but conversion becomes

much more problematic when the original format contains functionality that is not present in the archival format or if the resource consists of multiple files in different formats. We attempt to normalize everything to PDF, HTML, and a few image formats.

The following summarizes the process we use to incorporate new documents into the collection:

- We learn of new documents from CMS reports and other means
- Staff verify presence of documents and determine if they meet collection guidelines
- Tools harvest, reformat, and assign control numbers
- Staff modify documents as necessary and store them in the Repository
- The final result is cataloged using normal procedures.

Future directions

No system lasts forever, so the Oregon Documents Repository was designed with the presumption that document and system migrations will be necessary in the future. Our short term plans include moving all operations out of the CMS to improve efficiency. Currently, staff members must log into the CMS to identify many documents, but that environment is slow and meshes poorly with our workflow. Also, we are seeking partners to help us develop preservation strategies. Although we currently rely on our own solutions, we expect that long term maintenance will be simplified and service will be improved if we adopt methods and mechanisms that are used by a larger community.

Speaker Biographies

Kyle Banerjee is a Library Systems Analyst at the Oregon State Library. He coauthored the 2006 book "Digital libraries: integrating content and systems" and is finishing work on a second book scheduled for publication in 2007 with the working title "Digital repositories: a how-to manual."

Arlene Weible is currently the Cataloging Services Librarian and the Coordinator of the Oregon Documents Repository Work Group at the Oregon State Library. She also worked with several government information digital projects in her previous position as Head of the Government Documents Department at the University of North Texas.

Finding Common Ground on the Read/Write Web: Developing Your Expertise to Make Friends and Influence Learning on Your Campus

Anne-Marie Deitering, Oregon State University

The theme of the third annual Web 2.0 Summit, held in San Francisco in November of 2006, was disruption and opportunity. While those who gathered in San Francisco for this event last November were primarily focused on the question of how the emerging web might affect the commercial sector, disruption and opportunity also describe the potential impact of the Read/Write Web for education, libraries and librarians. The Read/Write Web (or Web 2.0) is volatile. Every day new applications are launched (in beta!) while others fade into obscurity. For busy librarians and educators, just keeping up with "what's new" on the Internet can be a real challenge. Blogs, wikis, RSS and other "2.0 applications" are not hard to understand. Knowing how wikis work, however, is not the same as really using them. Understanding the technology behind social bookmarking isn't enough to explain to others why tagging is useful. Doing these things requires taking the time to use emerging technologies, finding out where they are useful and where they are not. It means doing research, tracking new applications and finding out how other people are actually using these tools. It requires looking at what our students are using and what they are not) and how the Read/Write Web is actually used in the classroom. All of this takes time that can seem wasted to librarians who are faced with a million other things to do, all with deadlines. Looking past the potential disruptions of the Read/Write Web, however, can mean new opportunities for libraries and for librarians. Developing expertise with the landscape of the Read/Write

Web means understanding what students know, what they expect, and how the participatory web affects learning environments and classroom practice. On many campuses librarians are uniquely positioned to help others understand the significance of emerging technologies. They share values with classroom faculty and other academic partners, but they also bring substantial experience with information and communication technologies that many academic partners cannot match. The Read/Write web offers these librarians the opportunity to demonstrate how libraries contribute to student learning environments, providing an incentive for meaningful cross-campus partnerships to develop.

Faculty Concerns A few years ago, educators were inundated with descriptions of technically savvy undergraduates, like Eric:

A junior at the university, Eric wakes up and peers at his PC to see how many instant messages (IMs) arrived while he slept. Several attempts to reach him are visible on the screen, along with various postings to the blog he's been following. After a quick trip to the shower, he pulls up an eclectic mix of news, weather, and sports on the home page he customized using Yahoo. He then logs on to his campus account. A reminder pops up indicating that there will be a quiz in sociology today; another reminder lets him know that a lab report needs to be e-mailed to his chemistry professor by midnight. After a few quick IMs with friends he pulls up a wiki to review progress a teammate has made on a project they're doing for their computer science class. He downloads yesterday's chemistry lecture to his laptop; he'll review it while he sits with a group of students in the student union working on other projects. After classes are over he has to go to the library because he can't find an online resource he needs for a project. He rarely goes to the library to check out books; usually he uses Google or Wikipedia. Late that night as he's working on his term paper, he switches back and forth between the paper and the Internet-based multiplayer game he's trying to win (Oblinger & Oblinger).

Librarians know that most undergraduates do not have Eric's facility with information and communication technologies. They are not using wikis or customizing their own online portals. Even with the tools they use regularly, like search engines or word processors, most students do not go beyond the basic functions.

Despite this, there is a real perception on most campuses that today's students, the "Net Generation" or "Millennials" have a different relationship to technology than students or faculty who came before them. In other words, even after we realize that our students usually do not know how to use advanced features in their online tools, we still think that they interact with technology differently than we do. They do not remember a pre-Internet world, and their expectations for how information will be available to them, and how they can communicate online, have been shaped by this constant connection to the Web.

Even more significantly, we think that the Net Generation's experience with technology affects how they expect to be taught. When the Chronicle of Higher Education tells faculty to change your teaching style and "make blogs, iPods and video games part of your pedagogy. And learn to accept divided attention spans" it can be very stressful (Carlson, 2005). Some faculty members resist the very idea that they should change how they teach. But for others, this sense that today's students are different means they take these claims seriously. Whether this belief is inspired by watching teens text messaging and MySpacing their way through class, or by looking and the cut-and-paste plagiarism that makes its way into research projects and term papers, the end result is that every campus has a group of classroom faculty want to know more about emerging technologies, but aren't sure where to start.

The Framework One way to make sense of this changing landscape is to understand the underlying principles of Web 2.0 - the characteristics that tie these technologies together. It may not seem like Wikipedia, Flickr, Facebook or YouTube have much in common on the surface. Digging a little bit deeper

shows that there are common themes and characteristics that can be used to describe all of these tools. Understanding these common themes help you make sense of new applications as they appear, deciding which tools are potentially useful, and which are not.

Web 2.0 is particularly challenging to understand because so many different groups of people are interested in it and writing about it. Programmers and web developers have written a great deal about the technologies of Web 2.0. Others are interested in the commercial implications of Web 2.0, and write about its implications for business models and relationships with customers. Over the last year and a half, with Rachel Bridgewater, I have been presenting the following framework as a way for educators and librarians to understand what is new about the Read/Write Web.

The Read/Write Web: *Uses the Web itself as a platform *Appears as pieces of microcontent *Displays radical openness *Centers on the user *Is organized around a flattened hierarchy

Connecting with campus partners: Key issues These social and collaborative tools have very significant and very real implications for some of the core functions of higher education. The issues potentially affected include campus culture, campus-wide technology decisions, and even scholarly knowledge production itself.

Classroom faculty are important partners for librarians, but they are not the only potential partners academic librarians should pursue. The Read/Write Web can be a great way to make connections with other units on campus who are interested in issues like student engagement, the first-year experience, student persistence and academic success. At OSU, a conversation with George Kuh, a creator of the National Survey for Student Engagement, in 2006 illustrated this very well. Talking about social networking sites like MySpace and Facebook, Kuh said that undergraduates today are "creating campus culture without us." This simple statement resonated very powerfully with the student affairs and student success professionals in the room. A librarian who can help student affairs and other departments understand these tools, and how they can be used to shape campus culture, can use this expertise to build strong partnerships with these influential programs.

That educational technology is here to stay is undeniable. If the services and tools available on the Internet (especially available free on the Internet) are substantially different than those provided by colleges and universities in the form of course management systems, that could have significant impacts on how effective the CMS tools are, and on how well they are used by students. For faculty looking for technology tools that will allow them to do new things in the classroom, understanding what is available on the Read/Write web is crucial for making informed decisions. As campuses as a whole examine what their technology footprint will look like, it is very important that teachers and librarians, who work with students on learning activities both inside and outside the classroom are knowledgeable, informed and involved in the conversation. On many campuses, librarians are better positioned than their colleagues in the disciplines to develop the necessary expertise to start these conversations. Finally, these tools have implications for traditional notions of authority, authorship and even knowledge production. Collaboratively authored documents challenge established ideas about authorship and authority. Folksonomies challenge traditional, hierarchical ways of organizing information. The dynamism of born-digital writing itself poses a challenge to the ways we organize and store information. Microcontent and the flattened hierarchies of the Read/Write web can make it very difficult for students and scholars to understand traditional disciplinary discourse structures. Academic librarians are in an excellent position to place Web 2.0 into this scholarly, academic context.

All of these issues are important to a lot of people in higher education; by starting conversations about the Read/Write Web, librarians can help shape their campus conversations about these important topics.

Resources There are a variety of resources librarians can use to stay current about the Read/Write Web. For example, RSS feeds make it easy to track a variety of blogs like Blogs the Museum of Modern Betas (<http://momb.socio-kybernetics.net/>), SolutionWatch (<http://www.solutionwatch.com/>), Weblogg-ed (<http://www.weblogg-ed.com/>) and more. These are just some examples of tools that make it possible to scan a lot of new applications quickly. Directories like the Programmable Web (<http://programmableweb.com/>) make it easy to find tools that will appeal to particular audiences. These are just some of the resources that can help librarians develop the expertise they need.

One of the most powerful ways to communicate the significance of the Read/Write Web to others is to demonstrate specific applications that can help students learn. Tools like Google Documents and Spreadsheets (<http://docs.google.com>), del.icio.us (<http://del.icio.us>), Backpack (<http://www.backpackit.com/>) and MyNoteIT (<http://www.mynoteit.com/>) all show the potential of Web 2.0 tools for collaborative learning, while also showing why educators should provide guidance to help students use these tools effectively. Applications and resources that have been useful for talking to a variety of campus partners will be demonstrated further.

References

Carlson, S. (October 7, 2005). The net generation goes to college. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. 34. Retrieved 12/11/2006 from Lexis-Nexis Academic.

Oblinger, D. & J. Oblinger. (2005). Is it age or IT: First steps towards understanding the net generation. In *Educating the Net Generation*. D. Oblinger & J. Oblinger (Eds.). Educause. Retrieved 12/11/2006 from <http://www.educause.edu/books/educatingthenetgen/5989>.

Speaker Biography

Anne-Marie Deitering is Undergraduate Services Librarian at Oregon State University.

Session Four | 3:00 - 4:00

Not a Series of Tubes: Technology Policy, Innovation, and the Future of Free Speech

Rachel Bridgewater, Washington State University, Vancouver

Not a series of tubes

This presentation takes its name from a June 2006 speech against network neutrality by Alaska senator, Ted Stevens. In his speech, Stevens likened the Internet to a series of tubes and argued that deregulation of the Internet was necessary to allow material in those tubes to flow freely. Stevens has been criticized and mocked both for his inelegant phrasings and for his apparent ignorance of how the Internet works. While we can all have some fun with Stevens' speech, how much do we really understand about important technology policy issues facing us in our libraries? As we consider issues important to us as a profession, how do we avoid Stevens-like exhortations?

We all recognize that technology policy can have a big impact on the work that we do and the things we value as a profession. This session will examine current hot topics in technology policy. Since this is an area that's changing fast, it's hard to tell what policy issues will be at the forefront of our discussions in February! It's a good bet, though, that network neutrality, digital rights management and the DMCA, and DOPA will be among them.

Network neutrality

The concept of network neutrality has been around for a while, even if we've only recently begun to refer to it with this moniker. A "neutral" network does not favor one piece of content over another, one application over another, one provider of information over another. On a neutral network, bits are bits. A deregulated network would allow service providers to decide which websites would be fast and which would be slow. Put simply, Internet service providers could reserve "express lanes" on the Internet for their own content and services and the content and services of those willing and able to pay for access. Tiered pricing would allow large corporate content providers to have fast sites, while independent website producers might only be able to afford slow sites. It would allow telecom companies to minimize competition by providing only slow access to voice-over-IP services and applications. What will this do to unpopular viewpoints? How can the "citizen journalist" make her voice heard? What impact will this have on the pace of innovation?

Digital rights management and the Digital Millennium Copyright Act

The Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) made it a crime to circumvent any "technological protection measures" in place on a piece of intellectual property. Increasingly, content that we buy and use is equipped with "digital rights management" (DRM). DRM exists, largely, to prevent users from making illegal copies of content or otherwise using the content in ways not sanctioned by the content producer. Unfortunately, DRM often prevents users from making perfectly legal use of the content they have purchased. DRM presents threats to libraries and library values by:

- eliminating or curbing first-sale rights
- enforcing a pay-per-use model, encouraging us to license rather than own content
- preventing archiving and preservation of content
- eliminating fair use

DOPA

The Deleting Online Predators Act (H.R. 5319) or DOPA would require schools and libraries to block access to a broad selection of web content including "commercial Web sites that let users create Web pages or profiles or offer communication with other users via forums, chat rooms, e-mail or instant messaging." In other words, DOPA would require us to block access to most, if not all, applications broadly referred to as "web 2.0".

Talking tech policy like pros

Understanding the issues at stake in current technology policy debates can help us advocate effectively for technology policies that protect free speech, encourage innovation and the open exchange of ideas, and enable us to provide the services that are central to our missions. These debates can be esoteric – filled with technological and policy jargon that make them difficult to follow. In this session, we'll talk about the technology policy issues of the day in "librarian-speak" rather than "legislator-speak" or "tech-speak".

Speaker Biography

Rachel Bridgewater is Reference Coordinator at Washington State University Vancouver. In addition to coordinating reference services, she also teaches course-integrated library instruction sessions, develops and supports web applications, and acts as liaison to Biology, Computer Science, Engineering, History and Natural Resources/Environmental Science. Above all, Rachel is a copyright geek. She co-teaches the ACRL e-Learning course "Current Copyright Issues Facing Academic Librarians" with Carrie Russell and hosts a monthly social event in Portland called CopyNight where interested people from many walks of life gather for drinks and talk about intellectual property policy.

Going Where the Users Are: IM at the Reference Desk

Valery King, Oregon State University

Paul Frantz, University of Oregon

Elizabeth Breakstone, University of Oregon

Kate Gronemyer, Oregon State University, Cascades

Within the past year and a half three university libraries -- the University of Oregon, Oregon State University and OSU Cascades -- have begun using Instant Messenger (IM) to answer reference questions online at their reference desks (and beyond). The panel will discuss their experiences in establishing and operating Instant Messenger-based reference service, and answer questions from librarians interested in instituting their own IM services.

Most of the reasons given over the years to support use of virtual reference (or "chat") services also apply to IM[1]: it provides immediate assistance for remote users; immediate response is better than email for conducting a reference interview; and users can remain anonymous which may encourage shy questioners. But in addition to these, IM has the distinct advantage of being ubiquitous among today's college students. A 2005 Pew study indicates that 75% of online teens (a group that includes many of our freshman and sophomores) use instant messaging.[2] Teens are familiar with it, and comfortable in that environment. For librarians, it is quick to learn and easy to use, especially compared with the more formal online chat software of library VR services. Most of the questions asked at the reference desk are short, quick and ideal for the IM format. Not inconsequentially, IM is inexpensive, with many free clients (programs) available, so the investment the library puts in is only the (short) time and (modest) effort needed to set it up.

All three libraries established IM services in essentially the same way. All participated in L-Net, Oregon's chat service, which gave us an introduction to virtual reference and showed us the value in being available instantly in an online environment. L-Net is a cooperative service, and we noticed that many of the questions asked were local and not well suited to a cooperative setup. We wanted to find ways to address questions that were specific to our own locations, institutions and students.

OSU and UO both created our own VR chat "queues" within L-Net for our academic communities, where librarians would answer questions for our own students and faculty. OSU Cascades, being a very small library service with only two librarians, could not even consider this approach. UO made a brief trial in 2005 for several months, while OSU provided full service for two years, a much longer period of time. The work involved in setting these up was fairly extensive and required hours of maintenance, even with L-Net's valuable assistance. More importantly, the libraries found that in a time of shrinking budgets (and shrinking staff numbers), staffing such services was not worth the effort. The software required extensive training, with few questions (in relation to effort expended) received. VR sessions require a high level of concentration and were virtually impossible to do in conjunction with anything else, and could only be offered during limited hours. There were also problems with the new VR software. Both libraries decided to discontinue their chat services in favor of trying IM.

OSU Cascades had moved very quickly to offer IM, and was the first to do so in Summer 2005. UO began in April 2006 with a brief trial run during Spring quarter that became permanent service; OSU started offering IM service in September 2006, closing our L-Net queue simultaneously.

Rather than limiting service to only one IM service, all of us use an IM client that gathers calls from several services into one message window. There are several of these clients available for free on the web. OSU Cascades from the outset used Trillian. For UO that client was initially GAIM, but when GAIM started to give login problems we switched to Trillian. OSU also elected to use Trillian, partly due to the presence of experienced Trillian users among the staff.

OSU Cascades did some promotion of the service, by posting information at every computer in the library computer lab, including information in the library brochure and mentioning it at student orientations. OSU elected to go with a "soft launch," putting the IM client up on the libraries' home pages without fanfare or major promotional effort, and trusting that it would be found and used. Most library instructors mention it in their BI classes, however.

To keep it simple, both UO and OSU decided that IM transactions would be dealt with at the reference desk by the reference staff member on duty, whether this was a librarian, a paraprofessional, or a student. There would be no special scheduling or another level of staffing. The OSU Cascades librarian staffs the service from her own computer whenever she is available, while OSU and UO offer the IM service during all hours that reference staff are at the reference desk. The reasoning is that many users would be likely to use the IM service in the evening, even when there was no librarian at the desk. This has been borne out: over half of IM questions come after 5 pm.

After their experiences with VR chat software, library staff loved that they didn't have to go through a lot of training to use IM. At OSU some librarians were already using IM with their faculty and students so it was an easy transition for them. To accustom the rest of staff to IM and prepare for a public launch, AIM was loaded on all service desks and used for communication between the desks for several weeks. We also established a screen name for each reference staff member (for buddy lists, a quick way to contact someone when simply clicking their name connects you) and loaded AIM onto their computers. A reference student account was set up at the reference desk to give reference students a chance to practice, and students and librarians were encouraged to IM each other during slow times. People got used to IM in a safe environment before going "live" and essentially trained each other.

UO individually trained every staff member -- librarian, paraprofessional, or student -- who would be working at the desk and handling IM calls. Very little training is required; IM is essentially intuitive. At OSU the Coordinator checked with desk staff to see if people were comfortable with IM; if not, brief one-on-one orientation was given.

OSU decided to start with a very basic procedure: staff were advised to treat IM calls like phone calls as much as possible, and remember basic reference best practices, and they'd be fine. We will create new procedures to fit situations as they come up, but so far very little has.

The types of questions received via IM are as varied as those received at the desk or on the phone, from how do I schedule a study room, to why can't I access the text of that journal article from my home computer, to help me find refereed articles on x topic. OSU gets a fair number of questions from people within the library that we believe would be "lost" questions never asked if IM weren't so convenient. Students can stay put in their study rooms and tables and still get assistance. OSU Cascades gets little use of their service, due at least in part to the nature of their student population. Few Cascades students use IM in their personal lives; many are older and less "connected" than the more traditional students at UO and OSU. The same 2005 Pew study that indicates heavy use of IM by teens also indicates that only 42% of online adults use IM. Cascades has no plans to discontinue the service, however, since there is no cost to provide it. Cascades also expects that the service will become more popular as IM becomes more common.

There are several attractive features about IM software. IM clients can be set up to open automatically when you log on, and close when you log off. You can also indicate if you are away from your desk, or will "brb" (be right back) when there is no activity on your computer for awhile. If you are away a message can be left. However, there are also some drawbacks. Statistics are difficult to keep, compared to chat software that will automatically tally them. While IM clients can be set up to keep logs of each transaction, there are concerns over the privacy of archived IM logs left on a computer hard drive, and the possibility (hopefully remote) of an IM company accessing them. And someone must still collect and

count the transactions. Logs can be manually deleted, but someone must consciously do so.

IM clients are being constantly improved, which will only make this form of communication more attractive for library use. For example, chat “widgets” are being developed. These are chat windows placed within a browser that allow people without IM accounts to contact you, anonymously if they wish, which may go far to solving the privacy dilemma. Chatango and MeeboMe are two examples of these.

Instant messenger is an inexpensive and easy way to meet your users in their online environment. The value of such contact far exceeds the small cost and effort to set up and operate an instant messenger service.

References

[1] Matt Marsteller and Paul Neuhaus. “The Chat Reference Experience at Carnegie Mellon University.” http://www.contrib.andrew.cmu.edu/~matthewm/ALA_2001_chat.html; accessed 12/8/2006.

[2] Amanda Lenhart, Mary Madden, Paul Hitlin. Teens and Technology: Youth are leading the transition to a fully wired and mobile nation. July 27, 2005. http://www.pewinternet.org/pdfs/PIP_Teens_Tech_July2005web.pdf; accessed 12/7/2006.

Speaker Biographies

Valery King, Oregon State University [valery.king@oregonstate.edu] is a Social Sciences/Humanities and Government Information librarian who has been coordinating OSU’s virtual reference services since 2004. Currently she serves on the Advisory Board for Oregon’s cooperative virtual reference service, L-Net.

Kate Gronemyer, OSU Cascades [kate.gronemyer@osucascades.edu] is an Instruction librarian at the OSU Cascades Campus in Bend, OR. She’s happy to try any technology that makes it easier for students to ask for help.

Paul Frantz is Assistant Head of Reference Services for the University of Oregon Libraries and liaison to the UO School of Journalism.

Eliz Breakstone, formerly Social Sciences Librarian at the University of Oregon Libraries, is now Electronic Collection Development Librarian for the UO Law School Library.

A Library Creates Technology Enhanced Learning by Using a Student Response System

Jenifer Sigafoes Phelan, Seattle Pacific University

Introduction:

This presentation is a progress report on a grant awarded to the Seattle Pacific University’s Library to integrate a student response system, SRS, into the library’s information literacy program. The handheld remotes provide students with an active learning experience while allowing instructors instantaneous feedback on students’ level of understanding. Through grant funding the library purchased two Qwizdom instructor kits that work via proprietary software with MS PowerPoint. In addition, the library has been making this technology and training available to other university faculty as well as using this technology with visiting elementary school children.

Student Response System:

The SRS system is designed to allow for instantaneous feedback in multiple choice or numeric based questions. The data collected from the audience can be done much quicker than with traditional techniques including paper based surveys or asking the class if anyone has a question. In addition, the

feedback from the audience can be collected anonymously. The data collected via the SRS can then be tabulated and displayed instantaneously allowing for a more interactive classroom experience for the students. Rather than simply sitting in their seats and being spoken to, the SRS allows an instructor to quickly engage the class and determine their level of understanding. The SRS system allows an instructor to incorporate simple questions, either text or multimedia based, into a presentation. The questions can be designed to measure student understanding of a topic before or after a presentation has been made to determine what the class knows about a certain topic. These quick surveys used with or without short answer evaluation forms can provide very meaningful assessments of how well we are teaching our students.

Information Literacy Innovation:

The use of this SRS technology is an excellent technology-based educational tool for librarians to use for information literacy instruction. The technology allows for the incorporation of active learning techniques during library sessions. The SRS software can be integrated into PowerPoint presentations allowing librarians to take their existing presentations and insert assessment questions seamlessly. The students are handed transmitters and asked to participate in the class by answering questions about information literacy as part of the instruction. The librarians are then able to get immediate feedback from the class about how well they understand the material. The librarians can then spend time as needed on certain problem areas and less time on areas that the class demonstrates competence in. The SRS is also a great tool to use for asking a few preliminary questions at the beginning of a session to find out what the students already know about a presentation topic. Students feel more comfortable admitting that they do not know how to do a particular research task when they can answer the question anonymously instead of raising their hand in front of their classmates. So far, each liaison librarian has been trained on how to use the SRS software and hardware. Each librarian has been encouraged to try the SRS kits with several of their information literacy sessions over the next two quarters.

Campus & Community Outreach:

The library's SRS kits allowed interested faculty an opportunity to be trained on how to use the system so they can borrow a kit for use with their own classes. The librarians have been training interested faculty on how to use the SRS software and hardware so they can reserve and check out the SRS kits for use with their own students. Faculty who decide they want to use the kits in an ongoing capacity then have the bookstore order the handheld units for their students to purchase along with their text book for the class. Many publishers are helping faculty defray the cost to students by bundling the SRS units with text book packages. The Seattle Pacific University Chemistry Department has been using this model. The text book publishers also provide the instructor with presentation question slides to accompany each text book chapter and an SRS instructor kit (a transmitter, a receiver, and software) bundled in the instructor package.

The library has also been using the SRS with visiting community groups. Each Spring Quarter the School of Education brings fifth grade students from several local elementary schools with highly diverse ethnic demographics to our campus. The visit is designed to give the students a college experience so they can visualize what college will be like and encourage them to consider college as an option. The fifth graders spend one class session in the library having an information literacy session. We used the clickers for the first time with this group last year and it was very well received.

Outcomes Assessment:

The final step in the process of this grant is to put into place our assessment plan which will have four parts. First, faculty or SPU community members who use the SRS equipment will be surveyed after use about their experience by an online survey. Second, the librarians will be surveyed periodically as they work to integrate the SRS into their instruction sessions. Third, students attending information literacy sessions that use the SRS will either be surveyed at the end of the session by SRS questions or later on by an online or traditional survey. Fourth, faculty who have their students participate in information literacy session that use the SRS will be surveyed to gather their impressions of how successful their

students' learning experience was by evidence on the students' post-session research assignments and student feedback.

Speaker Biography

Jenifer Sigafoes Phelan began her career as an archival assistant at the Maryland State Archives and then a reference archivist at the College of Charleston's Avery Research Center for African American History and Culture. She then received her M.L.S. degree from the University at Albany, SUNY in 1998 where she worked as a graduate student assistant at both the undergraduate library reference desk and in the university archives. In 1999 she began her career as a librarian at Seattle Pacific University as a Reference/Catalog Librarian. In 2003 she earned a M.Ed. degree from Seattle Pacific University. Jenifer has now been the Education Liaison/Remote Services Librarian at the SPU Library for 5 years. Her areas of research include information literacy instruction, educational technology, remote user services, and the diversity awareness of pre-service teachers and school counselors.