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Abstract

In the summer of 2011, the Library Assessment Workgroup began an investigation into the Lesley University and Episcopal Divinity School faculties’ information needs for research and teaching. By exploring faculty members’ perceptions of the library, and behaviors as researchers and instructors, we hoped to discern how well the library addresses their needs. The resulting project is a qualitative analysis of Lesley University and Episcopal Divinity School faculty members’ use of the library in the research and instruction process. Through twenty-five interviews and 3 focus groups, we studied the information-seeking strategies of forty members of the faculties. The examination focused on three areas: faculty research habits, student research required by the faculty, and faculty perceptions of student research strategies and results.
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Executive Summary

A library research team used three focus groups and twenty-five individual interviews of faculty from the Art Institute of Boston, Episcopal Divinity School, Lesley College of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies, and the Graduate Schools of Education and of Arts and Social Sciences to identify information needs and behaviors for research and instruction and to reveal perceptions of students’ use of information in the university environment. The analysis of a wealth of data revealed what our faculties need, how they practice their scholarship, and how well they think their students are doing in the same information environment.

Faculty members start their research in a variety of places, both within and outside the library. While some individuals mentioned library-supplied databases and the online public access catalog as their points of entry into the research process, many more said they relied on Internet starting places, including Google, Google Scholar, and even Wikipedia. Many also noted that information is overwhelmingly available, perhaps too much so.

Faculty members collaborate both within their respective schools and in their broader professional circles. Technology has helped make some of this collaboration easier but only to a point. Faculty use established Internet technologies such as email and listservs and some newer technologies such as Skype and DropBox, but fewer have found the right scholarly use for social media tools such as Facebook and Twitter. They continue to publish, but many are becoming aware of the new politics of publishing and are beginning to think about the economics of scholarly communication.

Currently, the most common assignment faculty members give their students is the traditional research paper. Many have adopted a strategy of breaking this final assignment into pieces in order to monitor progress throughout the semester, sometimes because instructors have
noticed a lack of preparation and a lack of research skills among their students. It is clear that alternatives to the traditional research paper have also been assigned, but it is not yet clear how common this approach is or what the ramifications are for library collections and services. To remedy students’ lack of readiness to attempt research assignments, many of the faculty members in our study refer individual students to the library while others arrange for in-class library instruction in addition.

Faculty members have expressed concerns about their students’ ability to do research, think critically, and produce scholarship. They see their students using any electronically accessible resources without regard for authorship, bias, currency, or accuracy. They believe their students have technical skills that have not been enhanced by disciplined critical thinking skills and that they don’t seem to recognize the value of library resources in an ocean of unqualified information.

Many faculty members expressed confidence that the library could meet their needs in terms of resources and services, but there were some notable exceptions. An established relationship with a member of the library staff allied well with this confidence, but some faculty members felt that there was no clarity around whom to talk to about acquiring resources and services. This group was clearly less satisfied. The interviews also highlighted subject areas of the collection that faculty felt were underserved.

In every conversation, faculty members identified technology that has become integral to their professional lives, and yet many expressed concern that they didn’t have a grasp of technology, were underusing it, or did not know how to find help and support. Many turned to the library for help with technology for themselves and their students; others were at a loss for
whom they could turn to and wondered if the library staff and others around the university could do more in terms of technology training and support.

There is an appreciation for our library spaces as cultural institutions, as work spaces, as teaching spaces, and as spaces in which to connect with a librarian. For faculty who are physically near their libraries, access breeds both use and fondness. Faculty members are also concerned that their students will not realize the value of the physical space. For those who are at a distance, time is a problem, the shuttle service is a problem, and parking is a problem.
Introduction

This project is an ethnographic analysis of the use of the libraries in the research and learning process by Lesley University and Episcopal Divinity School (EDS) faculty members. Lesley University is composed of four schools: the College of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies, the Graduate School of Education, the Graduate School of Arts and Social Sciences and the Art Institute of Boston (AIB) which confer bachelors, masters and doctoral degrees. During the summer of 2013, the College of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies will assume the name College of Liberal Arts and Sciences while the Art Institute of Boston will become the College of Art and Design. Episcopal Divinity School grants graduate degrees at the masters and doctoral level.

Sherrill Hall, built in 1965 and named for Henry Knox Sherrill, the twentieth presiding bishop of the Episcopal Church, is now Sherrill Library, the joint library for Lesley University and Episcopal Divinity School. From 1976 through 2008 the library was shared between EDS and the Weston Jesuit School of Theology. In 2008, when Weston moved to Boston College, Lesley University and EDS announced their partnership for a shared campus; both schools now jointly use the Brattle campus. In a press release from December 2009, “Lesley President Moore noted the challenges of ‘a secular institution, with 100 years of history, and a spiritual institution, with 142 years of history, working together as each institution maintains autonomy and their own identity.’ But the library represents the promise of the partnership, where the common goals of academic inquiry and research are fueled by the facility and a talented library staff.” Further, “EDS’s Academic Dean Angela Bauer-Levesque said both institutions ‘are out to change the world. It comes together on the progressive end, and it’s symbolic of the conversations now happening between our faculties.’”
At the time of our study, the Lesley University Library was composed of the Sherrill Library on the Brattle Campus, the Art Institute of Boston Library in Boston, and the Kresge Library Media Center, housed on the Porter Campus, which supported media resources for Lesley’s two graduate schools, undergraduate school and AIB. In addition to the full-time resident students across multiple campuses, Lesley offers worldwide distance learning programs, hybrid distance/on-campus programs and online programs and EDS offers a distributed learning program. The need to provide universal access to resources and services for this worldwide student population has emerged as a topic of interest in the study.

This collection of different schools, campuses, programs and institutions represented a challenge as our study preparation began. The importance of the multifaceted nature of the two institutions must be represented in the study, as well as the impact that these variables could have on both faculty and student perceptions of research and learning.

Through interviews and focus groups, we studied the information seeking strategies of a representative sample of the faculty. By developing a clear understanding of the faculty's research habits, and their perceptions and use of the library, we hoped to ensure that our collections and services are indeed aligned with the faculty's needs. We wanted to uncover ways in which we can increase the support we offer to faculty for their own research and teaching, and for student research and learning.

**Review of Literature: Implications and Future Research**

The purpose of this review is to examine best practices for assessing faculty research habits, student research required by the faculty, faculty perceptions of student research strategies and results, and a library’s potential for impact in these areas.
The publication of Megan Oakleaf’s *The Value of Academic Libraries: A Comprehensive Research Review and Report* (2010) was a pivotal moment for academic libraries. The report emphasizes an outcomes-based assessment strategy that involves identifying the university’s mission statement and goals; determining how the library contributes to these; and deciding how to effectively communicate this relationship. Research that demonstrates library value and the various methods available to assess resources and services has burgeoned. As libraries begin the task of self-evaluation, discipline-specific methodologies have been developed and shared in the professional literature. At least one researcher has highlighted the importance of aligning library assessment with the service environment for the success of the library in increasing access to strategic opportunities: as academic libraries effectively align their assessment processes with the strategic goals of their universities they can become a visible and valued component of the higher education environment (White, 2010).

Evaluation methods cover the spectrum from quantitative to qualitative, incorporating various strategies of information gathering and varied scopes and scales of inquiry. The diverse nature of our own learning communities guided our choice of an ethnographic approach as the best method to retrieve nuanced information about faculty behaviors. The ERIAL (Ethnographic Research in Illinois Academic Libraries) Project provides a comprehensive overview of ethnographic research in libraries, and was a key resource for our workgroup as we designed our study. This report includes a start-to-finish explanation of the process of planning and executing an ethnographic study in a library, from pre-project planning to generating service changes and presenting conclusions (Asher, 2011).

Focus groups and individual interviews emerged in the literature as effective tools to gather information from faculty. We consulted sources in which the historic value of the focus
group in social science research methodology and its current resurgence are assessed (Walden, 2006). The focus group is identified as a useful, if underutilized, tool for libraries that are looking to “appraise the quality of library programs, services, and policies” (p. 222). Other ethnographic techniques can also be employed to enlarge on information gleaned in conversations with faculty such as photo elicitations, campus maps, and architectural/design drawings (Hobbs and Clare, 2009). These methods can be especially effective for the visual impact they provide. These techniques lie outside the scope of our current study, but they may have value in the planning of future studies.

Effective focus group conversations begin with perceptive questions. In addition to crafting questions particular to library services, our sources emphasized that questions should also reflect or incorporate institutional missions and goals (Cottrell, 2011). Resulting information can highlight the link between the goals of both the library and the university. The focus group format can serve as an introduction, informing faculty and eliciting their feedback on research-related issues. According to one study, “Focus groups are effective in generating insights and providing qualitative data on participants’ feelings, values, opinions, and attitudes” (Courtois and Turtle, 2008, p.161). They can also provide a window on the impact of technology, the role of librarians in the research process, and the relationship of each to student information literacy (Weber and Flatley, 2006).

Like focus groups, in-depth interviewing can provide a wealth of detailed information. Interview guidelines can vary widely. Best practices include: finding an appropriate setting, choosing to record or videotape, working with a uniform set of questions, and training interviewers to use effective techniques such as avoiding yes/no answers (Boyce and Neale, 2006). Interviews present an opportunity to enlarge on quantitative data gathered in other ways
(Turner, 2010). For example, a library’s gate count may be dropping, but faculty respondents might describe their reliance on databases and other electronic formats such as texting, that allow access to the library and librarians without leaving the office.

The drawback to interviewing is that it is both time and labor intensive. The recording and coding of respondents’ information also requires staff investment or funding to employ experienced analysts to sort through the data. As one study suggested, “Qualitative data consist of words and observations, not numbers. As with all data, analysis and interpretation are required to bring order and understanding. This requires a systematic approach” (Taylor-Powell and Renner, 2003, p.1). Numerous studies describe the necessity of a clear plan, well trained interviewers and competent coders (Turner, 2010) (Boyce and Neale, 2006). Standardizing the process before the interviewing begins helps to ensure a consistent analysis of the data. “By applying a coding and categorizing scheme in analysis of the data we were able to inter-relate terms from multiple groups and condense these into what we felt were the outstanding themes of information seeking” (Young and Von Seggern, 2003, p.272).

The information seeking behavior of faculty has been widely studied; however the majority of studies are quantitative surveys rather than ethnographic research. The Ithaka Faculty Surveys exhaustively evaluate the changing needs of faculty members over a range of years (Housewright, Schonfeld, and Wulfson, 2012). The role of the library is assessed in six categories: gateway, buyer, archive, teaching support, research support, and undergraduate support. “Buyer” defined as the “the library pays for resources I need” was rated as “very important” by the largest share of respondents, but other areas showed strong support as well (p.66). It is these other areas that represent the bulk of library assessment literature. These habits are evaluated by research area, such as engineering faculty (Engel, Robbins and Kulp, 2011);
teaching versus research comparisons (Borgman, et al., 2005); faculty rank (Wisneski ,2005); and faculty supervising graduate students as opposed to those who don’t (Kyvik and Smebly, 1994). These studies share a number of conclusions related to the research environment at colleges and universities. One common finding is that time constraints for both faculty and students create a need for quick and easy access to information. The time crunch also influences the quality of search strategies. Electronic access to current research materials tops the wish list of respondents across surveys. Area of specialization did not have much impact on user needs as demonstrated in studies of engineering faculty and education faculty, among others (Engel, Robbins and Kulp, 2011), (Rupp-Serrano and Robbins, 2013).

Additional studies that we reviewed sought to understand the role of library instruction and outreach to improve faculty and student research success rates. Findings most often show that graduate students have a working level of information literacy but that undergraduates do not, and would benefit from in-depth library instruction (Singh, 2005). Digital literacy is a focal point of instruction, blending more traditional research information with digital tools to assist researchers in the investigation as well as presentation and storage or their work (Carlson, et al., 2011). Library outreach as reflected in the literature includes the role of library liaison programs and their value as perceived by faculty (Zheng Ye, Y., 2000). One study that looked at library use of institutional repositories as a way to understand, accommodate, and promote faculty research needs, noted that lack of technological expertise can act as a barrier for faculty who might otherwise embrace the opportunity that such a repository can provide (Foster and Gibbons, 2005). Cross-disciplinary studies of faculty and graduate student use and satisfaction (Maughan, 1999) highlighted the need for faculty and students to have an understanding of the library and
its services, what it can and cannot provide, and how researchers and the library can communicate to effectively meet each other’s needs.

Although our ethnographic study focuses on faculty and their perceptions of student behavior, we also looked at the literature regarding student behavior in order to understand how students skills are reflected in the research they produce, how they use library resources and services, and how the roles of the faculty, students and the library merge in the research effort. Technology and digital resources have the greatest impact on students: how they search, where they search, the efficacy of their search, and how they create, present and store the finished product. The University of Washington studies provide ongoing assessment in these areas (Head, Eisenberg, 2009, 2010, 2011). The “Google Generation,” as student researchers are described (University College London, JISC, 2008), expects convenience and speed when searching for information; members of this generation also tend to rely on what they already know. (Connaway, L. S., Dickey, T. J., & Radford, M. L., 2011), (Kingsley et al., (2011). What students don’t know, however, is often evident in the results of their research efforts. Students rely on a broad, shallow swath of information and are reluctant to develop more comprehensive search strategies as they don’t see the need (Kolowich, 2011).

The literature we consulted helped inform our methodological approach as well as our process of writing and assessing interview and focus group questions and training interviewers. The ethnographic study format suited our assessment needs across the variety of schools, programs and research areas. This method allowed interviewers to ask probing questions and follow-up questions to discern meaning beyond the interviewee’s initial reply. The breadth of information provided by this ethnographic study will help us to enrich the research and learning experience of faculty, students and administrators.
Methodology

Developing Questions

In August 2011, the Library Assessment Workgroup was convened. Members of this group were: Elizabeth Allen, Tamar Brown, Aura Fluet, Marilyn Geller (Chair), Kathy Holmes, Anne-Marie Mulligan, Pat Payne, Deb Verhoff and Jaime Wimmer. The Workgroup was charged to “to develop strategies for assessing our collections and services.” Early in the development process, we submitted an Application for Review of Human Subject Research to the Institutional Review Board and received exempt status. As a starting point for focusing our research interest, we reviewed several official papers that documented the library’s goals. We chose to analyze two of these documents, the Association of Theological Schools Standard, Section 4 and the Lesley University Library Mission (see Appendix I: Source Materials) for specific statements about content, services and tools we are charged with delivering specifically to faculty and for areas of interaction between the library and its staff and the faculty in their roles as researchers and instructors. We identified eleven statements in these documents that addressed this interaction. These statements spoke to a range of services the library provides such as teaching information literacy, providing content or acquiring access to content, creating technology solutions related to information discovery and use, and collaborating with faculty to provide the services and content their students will need.

The library currently has many procedures in place to meet the goals we identified. Traditionally we measure how well we meet these needs by reviewing annual statistics such as how many items have circulated, how many information literacy classes have been taught, how many reference questions were answered, and how many downloads were made from our databases. The workgroup, however, wanted to understand not only how well we were serving
the information needs we identified but also whether we had accurately identified these needs for our faculty. While the annual statistics told us many useful things, they didn’t isolate information about the faculty, and they didn’t go beyond what we had predefined as important information needs. We purposely chose to use ethnographic methods to help us focus on a qualitative exploration of this area of faculty information needs.

To examine the topic from the faculty perspective, we started with the eleven statements that were identified in the goals documents and asked ourselves what each statement would look like from the faculty perspective. For example, the library’s mission statement says that we will “guide students, faculty, and staff in their use of increasingly complex information.” Turning this around to the faculty’s perspective, we wanted to know if they were aware of the capabilities of advanced library systems and support technologies. To assess this, we developed this set of questions: “How do you stay current with technologies, research databases, and field or area studies? Who do you ask for support in understanding what information is available and how to get to it?” The simple principle that guided the development of these and other questions was to discover what faculty do and what faculty want, not whether or how well the library satisfies the needs.

Once we had identified all of the goals statements, examined them from the point of view of the faculty, and created sets of appropriate questions to explore these areas, we had a very long list of questions that we then sorted among general research and instruction needs and specific research and instruction needs. We felt the more general topics were suitable for focus groups while the more specific topics could be better used for individual interviews. We worked to create an order for each set of questions that would flow logically, and we edited the wording several times to remove any library jargon.
We decided that focus groups should not last longer than one and a half hours and should allow all participants to converse with each other and with the moderator to more fully explore some topics if desired. For the focus groups, we created a list of seven questions (See Appendix II: Questions). We determined the individual interviews should be no longer than one hour, and for these also, we wanted the conversation to range somewhat freely. We limited ourselves to ten questions for these interviews in addition to a warm up question and a wrap up question (See Appendix II: Questions).

Focus Groups and Interviews

To get participants for our focus groups and individual interviews, we held a number of face-to-face meetings with the Lesley University Provost and Dean of the Faculty and the Episcopal Divinity School administrators, explaining the project and asking for support. They were all helpful in disseminating information and showing support. We created websites for each school (http://research.lesley.edu/faculty-study and http://research.eds.edu/faculty-study) to explain the project and to allow faculty to fill out an online volunteer form. We also gave a brief presentation about the study at the Lesley University Faculty Assembly and handed out bookmarks with the URL for information about the study. The online volunteer form allowed faculty to choose either the focus group or the interview or both and also asked how often they used the library and for which school they taught. This form was intentional short and clean to allow faculty to volunteer quickly and easily. Of the 24 people who filled out a volunteer form, four faculty members said they used the library daily, fourteen said weekly, five said monthly, and one said that she used the library once per semester. No respondents selected “Never” as an answer. Individual library liaisons also sent out personal email messages to faculty in our
assigned divisions explaining the project and inviting people to volunteer. This email campaign yielded another sixteen volunteers.

Initially, we planned for four focus groups to be conducted during the month of March 2012, one on each campus (Art Institute of Boston, Brattle Campus, Doble Campus, and Porter Campus) that would be no smaller than three participants and no larger than ten for a collective total of between twelve and thirty volunteers. We were unable to get enough volunteers to convene a focus group on the Art Institute of Boston Campus, but we did hold a focus group of six faculty members on the Brattle Campus, three faculty members on the Doble Campus and six faculty on the Porter Campus. Of these fifteen focus group attendees, one represented Episcopal Divinity School, six represented the Graduate School of Arts and Social Sciences, three were from the Graduate School of Education, and five faculty participants taught in the College of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies.

For the individual interviews, we wanted to get between twenty-five and thirty volunteers. We were able to schedule twenty-five interviews that were held in April and May 2012. Of these interviews, two faculty members were from the Art Institute of Boston, five represented Episcopal Divinity School, three were Graduate School of Arts and Social Sciences faculty, five taught in the Graduate School of Education, and the remaining ten represented the College of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies. The majority of the interviews were conducted on campus either in the faculty member’s office or in a private space in the library. One interview was conducted via Skype, and two interviews were conducted using a speaker phone. The total number of faculty participating in focus groups and interviews was forty. For EDS, this represents slightly more than 40% of the faculty. For Lesley, participating faculty represent 18% of the core faculty.
Training Interviewers

All three focus groups were convened by the Lesley University Director of Assessment and Institutional Research. One member of the workgroup attended each focus group to manage the voice recorder and take notes. For the individual sessions, we asked members of the library staff if they wanted to volunteer as interviewers. In addition to the eight workgroup members, seven members of the library staff were willing to conduct interviews, and several other members of the staff were willing to act as test interviewees to allow us to polish our interviewing skills. Before any interviews were conducted, the Director of Assessment and Institutional Research held a training session and provided handouts to help us learn how to conduct a research interview well. The training also included practice sessions as well as coaching and analysis of issues arising from our learning situations.

Recording and Transcription

At the outset, we agreed that audio recording was necessary to capture the complete discussion. We considered and chose not to pursue video recording for several reasons. We did not have easy access to the equipment or set up that would be necessary for good video recording. We also felt that it might be perceived as invasive, and because of this, we believed it might color the interviewees’ responses. Finally, we did not believe we had the expertise to analyze any non-verbal information, such as body language, that might be embedded in video recording. All focus groups and individual interviews were recorded using a digital audio recorder only. Some interviewers also took notes.

The audio files were outsourced to a transcription service which produced reasonable text files with a short turnaround time. The alternative to using this professional service was for
members of the workgroup to try to transcribe the files ourselves, which would have been a
difficult and time-consuming effort. All transcripts identified participants only by a code number.

**Coding**

To understand how to recognize and organize the data in these transcripts, we relied on
the Lesley University Director of the Program Evaluation & Research Group who was able to
help us understand how to identify a coding structure and process. She was also instrumental in
identifying coding software to organize the task better. Working in teams, we read transcripts
and tried to categorize the kinds of information nuggets that came out of the focus groups and
interviews. To do this, we used our initial research concerns to establish codes for analyzing
transcripts. We also reviewed the initial chart of mission statements to identify topics. We were
then able to organize this list into topics and sub-topics and assign mnemonic codes. Wherever
we found information that did not fit comfortably into an existing category, we considered
whether to add a new code or change a definition. This was a continuing process that went on
throughout the time we spent on the coding task.

Coded transcripts were marked up using a data analysis program. Coding of the
transcripts began in May 2012 and was completed in November 2012. Data entry began in June
2012 and was completed in November 2012.

**Data Analysis**

From November 2012 through April 2013, teams of workgroup members read and
discussed reports that were generated by the data analysis program. These reports were
comprehensive lists of all quotations from the transcripts that had been identified with individual
codes. The discussions were focused on identifying themes and addressing our original research
concerns. In several instances, team members referred back to the audio file to understand
context and verify that the initial coding had accurately defined what the interviewee was trying to convey. We also separated participants’ code numbers from the analyzed transcripts. The data gives us a deep sense of what the Lesley and EDS faculties think and do in the aggregate. It was only when all the analysis had been done and discussed that these reports could begin to give us a picture of the research and instruction needs and habits of our faculty.
Findings

Faculty Research Habits

Our conversations with faculty members about the research process elicited information about where faculty get their research ideas, where they start looking for information, how they organize the research process and how they keep up with topics of interest. It isn’t surprising that faculty mentioned information overload, but they also identified information technology overload. They suggested that the old familiar research process has become messy. We heard about a variety of starting places both within and outside the scope of library collections and services. Faculty also used a variety of strategies to compensate for time constraints and ongoing information bombardment. The library, and in particular, the staff were seen as helping to ameliorate these problems, but faculty also identified areas where the library could be more helpful, including training and support at the point of need and as regularly scheduled programs and higher visibility for new services and resources.

Research Starting Places

For some researchers, the library just wasn’t on their path. One faculty member commented that:

I think my problem with interacting with the library is more one of my own use, rather than a lack of library resources, right? So I never go to the library as my first stop. The library’s just not the first place that I go to.

In addition, the Internet provides a broad range of options for finding information. Amazon book searches were common as were visits to websites of publishers with whom faculty are familiar. Faculty also mentioned Google and Wikipedia as starting places, although some faculty members have caveats for their students about using Wikipedia. One respondent said:
I actually Google, I just Google whatever it is and see what pops up. And I will be honest and say sometimes Wikipedia is a great place to start because there's a bibliography. And even if you don't believe or agree with what they wrote, they do send you other places. And I tell my students that, too. I say if you get stuck, just look it up. You can't cite it, but you can look it up, and then you can go to the bottom of the page.

Google was also seen as an entry point for topics that are new. As one faculty member stated, “If it's something I know completely nothing about, I would maybe go to Google to find the simplest thing to look at and then I just get a quick idea of what that is, and then I move into Academic Search Premier.” Also Google seemed simpler to use than more complex library supplied databases. One faculty noted this difficulty in the statement: “Well, I do use ARTSTOR and I'm trying to be better about using ARTSTOR, but I still quite often would simply go to Google.” This suggests that faculty members might benefit from additional training in their discipline-specific databases, so they can feel more comfortable and efficient using them and have unfettered access to the wealth of information these databases provide.

There is a sentiment among many of the individuals we spoke to that traditional research content has been changed by the Internet, and this different type of content has altered the way faculty look for it. As one faculty member explained, “I really do a lot of searching on the Internet because I'm looking for more recent voices, and a lot of people aren't even publishing, I mean they're voices, but they're not necessarily publishing in peer-reviewed journals.” This perception of the scholarly journal article as potentially outdated by the time it is published has implications for the culture of research within the university as well as the kinds of resource packages the library acquires.
Google Scholar had a special place in the research universe in that it appears to offer entry into both the world of Internet content and the world of library content. One faculty member disclosed that “I make heavy use of Google Scholar, which is like my favorite thing ever because I can both link into the whole wide world, but I can also, generally speaking, pull up Lesley resources when I do that.” Another suggested that “I first go to Google Scholar to see what kind of recent activities have been happening, and then I look in the database to see if that's available through the library.”

Google Scholar and its less academic sibling, Google, weren’t always the solution, however, as noted by one faculty member who stated:

When I'm doing things that are really time-driven, I will just type a variety of stuff into Google and Google Scholar and see what comes up. Then if I'm not happy with that or I don't think it's heading me down a good path, then depending on the topic area I'll choose a database, like I might choose Medline or I might choose PsychInfo and start really trying to generate some things there.

This statement suggests a subtle acknowledgement of the value of narrowly focused subject-specific databases of scholarly content with topically appropriate thesauri that use controlled vocabulary to bring together all relevant content under one heading.

For those who did start their research at the library, some used the digital library resources first, and some relied on the physical library as their launch point. The most frequently mentioned digital library tools were databases and journal indexes to find articles. Respondents also mentioned using the online public access catalog (OPAC) to find monographs. It was the experience of serendipity in the physical library that some faculty used to start their research.

One faculty member mentioned the use of print journals by saying “You go look at a journal, and
you find that there are other journals in the same area. So it is a way of really expanding, not only understanding of what's out there, but expanding the way of accessing those materials.”

Many faculty members also spoke to the value of wandering through the stacks and finding printed books. One respondent contributed this thought about connecting with print books:

Sometimes you just look across the spines of books and it's not what's in them but it's what your mind wants to be in them, that gets it really exciting. And just the thought that were I to grab this modern Germany book off the shelf here, that I -- within probably five pages, will connect all sorts of information to things that I read last week or information I learned while shooting, you know. And so that's what makes me want to take it off the shelf. Rather dry looking, dense, kind of archaic-looking book that in and of itself doesn't have a lot going for it. But of all the ones on that shelf, that's the one that jumps out at me because I know within ten seconds, I can connect.

Yet another faculty member spoke of the excitement of discovery in the physical environment this way:

Let's just see what's going to happen in Sherrill [Library] today when I go to the stacks over here; I find that invaluable. I don't have to make a huge investment -- like I don't have to buy a bunch of books, I don't have to know what I want, I can just try something like the experimental factor of bringing a ton of things out that I can just go through at my leisure, not reading full things; it's more creative, and then I can bring them all back. And then I can go do it again with another load, and I don't have to be so committed to every little thing. I love that just about libraries in general.
The Mechanics of Research

No matter where faculty started their research, there was consensus that the process is not entirely orderly or easy. The word “messy” was used by several respondents, as in this exchange during one focus group:

First Participant: I think I'm just kind of really messy. I'm a messy starter, and I just plunge into the databases, and I'm on Google Scholar, and I'm on the web, and I’m shooting [the librarian] an e-mail and say I'm getting started with this; help me think about language and sources, and I read a lot of journals. When I start out I'm really kind of just messy. Just try to get immersed in it.

Second Participant: That's funny. I describe myself in the same way. When I started graduate work I remember having the nervousness that you had to sort of be comprehensive and systematic and complete in a topic, which is impossible now, and I don't even try.

In a separate interview, another faculty member used the same word, “messy” saying “I'm kind of messy as a researcher. I don't know if my desk gives me away, but, I know where everything is. But I'm messy in the process of beginning.” Another faculty member described the messiness this way: “What I'm saying is this is very sloppy; the way I get started is very sloppy. I'm a Michelangelo kind of [scholar]. I get a piece of marble in front of me, and I keep chipping away, try to find out what I want. That's the best way to describe my work.”

Searching in the digital environment may have its messy side, but it can also be neat and organized. A few of the faculty members we spoke with appeared very organized about their starting places and the mechanics of doing research. As one faculty member said, “Basically, my clinical tactics inform my questions and then I go to the literature to help explore those questions
that I have.” Another respondent said, “Sometimes I've run across something, and I have it saved in a folder, right? And so I might start by going back to that, looking at the references and thinking about that and then going to develop some search ideas.”

Using clues in electronic records frequently helped pinpoint material, as one faculty member remarked, “what I have found the most helpful thing is Google Scholar because it will list all kinds of things and then from there it's like, ‘ah,’ and then you find that one article, you go back and oftentimes you'll find other keywords and things spelled out in the abstract and stuff and it's like, ‘oh, bingo.’” Another respondent felt the same way, saying that “in recent years it's become so simple to do a search with our various databases, just the keyword searches that lead you to a string of other items.” In addition to the opportunity to build on searches based on information from previous searches, electronic databases were also used in different ways to address time sensitive needs or broad vs. narrow inquiries as one faculty member suggested:

Sometimes I limit to full text. It kind of depends on what I'm looking for and why.

Because if what I'm looking for is just I'm trying to cast a net to read anything about a topic, then I'm likely to limit to full text, because then I'm going to only get things I know I can actually read. And then if I'm actually wanting to drill down by specific things, then I'll go more broad, because then I'm likely to look for things that I might request through interlibrary loan.

Faculty have also developed different ways and different reasons for using digital vs. printed copies of content. Some said that when they found content online, they would immediately print that content:

I tend to access an article electronically when it's available. And then print it -- I mean I still work with print and I'm the underlining type and then I take notes on the articles. I
don't even yet take my notes on the computer because it means sitting there for hours. I take notes in little notebooks, and then I go back; it's an antiquated process, but it works for me. So that when I'm ready to write I have a lot of research notes in notebooks that are there for the purpose. And I also keep the articles in more or less a coherent pile and review them.

Conversely, some faculty members have learned to read online under specific circumstances. As one faculty member remarked: “If I really know I need to use it I still need to print it out, otherwise, I much prefer to read it online, which surprises me for articles, not necessarily for books.” Knowing under what circumstances our users prefer to read material in print or online can help the library shape its future purchasing decisions and services.

**Information and Information Technology Overload**

Very few faculty members noted a difference between research for their own scholarly purposes and research for course development. One respondent indicated that time constraints and level of intellectual accessibility are the two elements that might lead her on different research paths. She stated:

If it was for my own research . . ., I would have to scour the journals a lot more. But my experience is that often journal articles are too technical for students. They assume too much knowledge or understanding for the majority of students I teach. It would just be way too hard.

She later suggested:

If I'm in a rush at all to put together a syllabus, what I'll start with is finding the text that I want students to read. So I will start with books. And then I will work the other way to flesh out my own understanding of the area, whereas if I'm starting with my research I'm
not, I wish I was a little bit in a rush. But I'm in less of a rush, so I'll start where I want to start, and if there's an interesting looking, slightly tangential article, I can read it. I might not have the freedom to do that if I have to get core text decided by Friday.

Time constraints also contributed to feeling overwhelmed by information and information resources. One faculty member lamented, “I'm always saying to myself, I wish I knew more about blah, blah, blah, and I don't take the time when I have the time because I'm doing something else.” Too much information was also seen as problematic, as another faculty member noted that

I'd say most of my days I feel like I'm chest deep in the Internet. And I'm always exploring new things. But I feel like it's the information overload that I struggle with. So what I try to do is end up zeroing in on something without diluting myself too much.

Some responded to this overload by attacking it with a different strategy as in this comment: “it is sometimes this feeling that I get anyway that there's probably so much stuff out there that for whatever reason I'm not accessing it, and how could I be trying to search more intelligently.” Others have simply retreated from the information overload, as illustrated by this statement:

Sometimes it just comes through at such a pace that I have to go and watch TV or draw and not do research. Most of my work is in response to the overwhelming information that is just constantly there. So I have to go and work with my hands and when I work with my hands for a period of time, then I will start to remember the things that I needed, and then go back and get them.

There are several strategies that faculty identified to cope with information and technology overload and the need to stay current. Some faculty felt that learning at the point of
need worked best. They said “I learn it as I need it, because if I'm not using it then it just goes away, it's just a waste of my time to try to learn it.” Others used the specialized filter of membership in a professional organization, or a small set of topically focused scholarly journals for which they have subscriptions, or a previous relationship with a publisher who has sent complimentary copies. Only one faculty member noted that social media was a tool she used for this purpose:

I'm trying to constantly stay on top of what's going on so, in terms of, the library usage, magazines and periodicals, but I would say that's a small percentage. I tend more to read the blogs and the various articles that people share on Facebook.

Faculty also said they used the current physical journals and books on the New and Noteworthy bookshelf in the library to identify new topics and new research in a particular subject area.

**Library Support for Research Needs**

Beyond staying current, faculty identified several ways in which the library could or did support their research needs. The area of training and orientation was one where the library could be doing more to support faculty. One faculty member was asked if she had been given any kind of library orientation and said, “No, the only orientation I had was when we decided to do it with students, and it was very helpful for me because I didn't know.” Respondents did feel that they could count on point-of-need support from the library. Many commented that librarians frequently identified and delivered resources that answered a specific research or curricular need or were able to help focus a research topic. One simply said “If I get in a bind, I write you. And I say I'm looking for blah, blah, blah . . .” Interlibrary loan services were also frequently mentioned, as one faculty member suggested: “I use Illiad for my own research. If there's an article I can't find, I just request it and then you guys are able to send it right over.”
Some faculty saw the state of the collection as very problematic and commented:

I'm telling you, it is a problem for a lot of us now because, if our institution cannot support our research, we're still expected to do research but good luck finding it. So that's been a constant source of frustration for me.

Another acknowledged this issue but said “We may not have the best library in terms of all the money to buy everything that you need, but we do have the best people.” In general, faculty prized the staff of the library. One faculty member commented:

And you need the people, people, people, people to help us do what we need to do.

Because, frankly, I don't think there's enough time to figure it all out. And in my experience, I'm often reluctant to ask what I think are stupid questions, but I don't know how else you can. . . And nobody has ever made me feel like, “oh, my God, I can't believe you're a faculty member and you don't know how to do this.”

**Scholarly Communication in the Digital Age**

One of the key themes that emerged in our conversation with faculty was that of scholarly communication. Lesley and EDS faculty are producers, as well as consumers, of scholarly material, and the library is interested in understanding how our faculty communicate and collaborate with their peers, both here and at other institutions. We were also interested to learn about their typical practices for disseminating their research, and found that traditional methods, such as publishing books or articles and presenting at conferences, co-existed with an openness toward new forums and strategies for scholarly communication.


Faculty members are clearly collaborators, who employ traditional means, such as face-to-face meetings at conferences, as well as newer technologies to share ideas and work with their
Faculty members mentioned tools including telephone conference calling, personal e-mail, listservs, Survey Monkey, Google Docs, Dropbox, Skype, and shared blogs as essential for collaborating and sharing works-in-progress with distant colleagues. Many respondents embraced the variety of options open to them; as one interviewee said, “In terms of modes of communication, I use everything I’ve got.” In general, faculty members expressed appreciation for new opportunities to collaborate with their peers using digital means—as one individual put it, “it’s really world-wide collegiality.” This vision of the world wide web as a valued player in fostering scholarly collaboration was shared by many of our interviewees.

Popular social media applications such as Twitter and Facebook were also mentioned, but appeared to be more polarizing than other technological means of collaboration (such as e-mail, blogs and Google Docs). One faculty member proudly proclaimed, “I tweet,” explaining that she thought it was vital to keep up with new media: “things change, and if you don’t change with them, you’re left behind and you don’t get hired.” In contrast, another faculty member mentioned hating Twitter, but added “I don’t use it so I say I hate it as an outsider.” Faculty opinions of Facebook were similarly divided, with some mentioning its usefulness, and others saying they preferred to avoid it entirely. One speaker described a change in her own thinking regarding the relevance of Facebook. She explained that after a student convinced her of its potential relevance,

I said, my God, you're right and I got a Facebook page. And, as time went on, I realized that being a neo-Luddite wasn't serving me. I mean, it's very nice to say that the new technology's a waste of time, and I can't imagine going on Facebook and talking about how I ate a chicken sandwich, or “Want to see beautiful pictures of my stepchildren?” I just don't use it that way. I use it professionally.
Other speakers also described changes in their own attitudes toward the relevance of social media and other tools for professional communication; several suggested that their students’ openness toward new technology, and awareness of what was available, inspired their own adoption of digital communication tools.

In some conversations, we found that communicating with colleagues and with students often bled together for plugged-in faculty members who spent time working online. One interviewee mentioned that her students “can see I’m on Skype and they have no qualms about instant messaging me and saying ‘do you have a minute?’” This speaker valued this additional avenue for reaching (or being reached by) her students; she mentioned that in the past, she would search for means to communicate online with her students, but that she no longer feels she has to go out of her way to search: “People are coming to me saying look, you can do this, you know.”

We did not find a consensus on the relevance or value of social media, specifically, as a means of promoting scholarly communication. Nevertheless, it was clear from our focus groups and interviews that faculty have embraced a variety of technological tools to facilitate their communication and collaboration with peers, both within the university and across academic institutions. As one faculty member put it, “We meet in person because we like to, but we actually work pretty effectively with these other tools.” Moreover, as another interviewee pointed out, “You’ve got to be ready to go in any direction to either find people or find expertise in that particular field.” The speaker here emphasized the value of being able to communicate and find information using a variety of tools. Her efforts to master those tools, in her view, were justified by the fact that they made it easier to find what she needed, and to be found when she herself was the “expert” on a given subject.
Some faculty members are very willing to embrace every tool they have access to. Others are less confident about co-opting social media for the scholarly realm. For the library, this divide provides food for future thought about our own services. A major challenge of communicating in the digital age is simply the amount of time it can take to keep up—as one interviewee put it, “it takes a certain gregariousness to stay linked,” which not all scholars share. Listservs can be rich in information, but for those working in a very specialized area, it can be challenging to pinpoint the truly relevant conversations, when there is so much material to get through. One speaker summed up her inbox full of press releases, news articles, interview requests, etc. as simply the nature of the “contemporary conversation”—she called it a “big messy thing” that was nevertheless a great driver, insofar as it enables “participating with your colleagues on a professional level.” Certainly, there may be a role for the library in helping our faculty overcome what one interviewee described as “the filter problem”—the challenge of narrowing searches, separating wheat from chaff, and generally avoiding the peril of drowning in a flood of information.

**The role of the academic conference in the digital age**

In contrast to the different opinions that our interviewees had regarding the usefulness of technology-enabled collaboration, they were almost unanimous in emphasizing the importance of conferences to their work. Among all those who mentioned conferences in interviews and focus groups, there was no one who thought that they had become less relevant than virtual means of communication for fostering scholarly collaborations. Faculty members cited conference presentations as a frequent first venue for sharing their research, mentioned them as a means of cementing professional relationships that they had begun conducting online, and repeatedly described them as a key means of keeping current and up-to-date with new work in
their fields. One interviewee mentioned the value of “knowing [colleagues] electronically,” but also added that her virtual relationships were valuable in part because they made it easier to form in-person connections at conferences, built on having previously “e-mailed or seen each other’s names.” Another speaker mentioned that conferences are helpful because “I know what I need to know more about most of the time. And so if I can go to one or two conferences a year, then I can listen to people and check out [new publications].” Clearly, despite digital communication technologies, our faculty members value face-to-face meetings, not only for the sake of collegiality, but also for the sake of learning and staying current in their evolving fields.

**Scholarly Publication in the Digital Age**

In addition to attending, presenting papers, and chairing panels at conferences, faculty mentioned a variety of venues for disseminating their written work. As one faculty member discussed a particular project, she emphasized her lack of allegiance to one particular means of sharing her work: “it matters to me that the research that I do gets out into the public forum in some way, whether it’s a conference presentation or, in this case, a book.”

The book chapter, the monograph, and the peer-reviewed or professional journal article were all mentioned by some interviewees as key formats for publishing their work, but they were by no means the only forums for publication that faculty envisioned. One interviewee mentioned her involvement with a project to publish short professional briefs online. Another described a blog that she publishes in collaboration with other faculty members, and a third mentioned that her first e-book would soon be released.

Alongside the discussion of forms of publication, another theme that emerged in our interviews was the politics of publication. One faculty member pointed out that scholarly journal articles are all “peer-reviewed by people who do not get paid, and [publishers] charge an
enormous amount to libraries to carry [their journals].” She went on to suggest that there might be a role for the library in directing faculty members toward open-access journals in which they might publish. Another remark on the murky issue of profit for scholarly publication came from a member who mentioned receiving pressure from her publisher to assign her own book in the courses she teaches, in order to increase sales.

Other interviewees touched on the challenges of publicizing their work. Here, again, Facebook was mentioned but opinions were divided. One interviewee mentioned “trying different forms of social media to get the word out” about a project, while another mentioned feeling “nervous” about using Facebook as a forum to promote their own scholarly work. One interviewee mentioned that there was not enough support for faculty to do research, and suggested that finding avenues to publish was a “source of burden.”

For some faculty, collaborative projects are a key part of their scholarly process, while others described research and writing as solitary endeavor. The faculty members in our study also described a wide range of comfort levels when it came to learning new communication technologies, but most expressed appreciation for and comfort with more established and familiar tools, such as e-mail and Skype. Despite the fact that we spoke to many people who professed an allegiance to the printed page, and to the physical library, it is clear that when it comes to scholarly communication, faculty see great value in using technology to build relationships and produce collaborative projects with colleagues in their fields. At a time when research libraries are carefully considering their changing roles in the scholarly communication enterprise, this feedback from faculty on the importance of collaboration, and on their openness to sharing information in formats that go beyond the article and monograph, is particularly valuable for our organization.
Faculty Instruction Behavior

Faculty members were asked several questions related to their roles as teachers. In our conversations, major subjects that participants discussed were their teaching habits, assignments they give, and their attitudes towards referring students to the library.

Teaching Habits

When preparing to teach a new course, faculty members said that they used a combination of library resources, conversations with colleagues, and web searching to gather the information they need to create a syllabus and choose readings. “We tend to have internal meetings with faculty and discuss what our goals are and what the objectives are for the courses,” said one participant, adding that she also consults literature on the topic: “I look first at textbooks that are available to see what other folks consider to be most important in a particular field.”

One faculty member specifically mentioned her division’s library liaison as her starting place. She said, “If I were going to develop a new course, one of the first things I would do would be to email [named librarian] and say, ‘Hey, I'm thinking about developing a course on [topic]. What do you have?’” Others said they relied on library resources in this process: “I basically went to the library and looked at every book you had on [named subject area] and chose the one that seemed most interesting to me, something that I could really build off of.”

More than one interviewee said they also search online for ideas and examples: “I just check out syllabi that are online at different schools, to get an idea of how other people have been teaching these classes, and the types of readings and texts… that they use.”

Many interviewees said they used technology in the classroom, both in their online teaching and their face-to-face teaching. Only a few specific tools were named: PowerPoint,
blogs, Jing, and online discussion boards. The most frequently mentioned tool was PowerPoint. As one faculty member said “I have never written a full script for a lecture. I work off PowerPoint slides.” Another participant said that in addition to making PowerPoint lectures, she also often uses technology in her classroom in a less prepared, more off-the-cuff way:

Because we have the smart classrooms or the laptop hookups to the projector, it is -- I know myself and a lot of my colleagues, it's very common to just not even prep a slide show for a class, and start a conversation, and as ideas unfold, simply start dropping names or words into Google and throwing those things up on the screen.

Some faculty members described using online discussion boards in their classes, requiring students to post a certain number of times per week and respond to the posts of their peers. One interviewee said she used the screencasting application Jing in order to bring “a human element into the online classroom.” Another said she set up a blog for her class to post their artwork on, as a creative solution to the problem of transporting the work to and from class, and so that she and other students could all access the artwork. Only one participant said she does not use much technology in her classroom, but she expressed a desire to use more: “I put a screen up there with terms on it, but I don't do PowerPoint and I don't put pictures, and I do have to improve there…”

Participants described using only a wide variety of technological tools in their classrooms and in other facets of their professional lives. Many incorporated social media into their collection of instructional tools as we discuss elsewhere in this report.

As faculty members discussed their methods of teaching online, it became clear that few courses follow exactly the same format, and the lines between “traditional” teaching and online
teaching are sometimes blurred. One participant mentioned several different ways of interacting with students in distance classes:

I work online with students. So, I've taught simulcast courses. Two of my students, one was in California and one was in North Carolina. They turned up on screen in the classroom but I was obviously doing a lot of email contact with them rather than the one-to-one, face-to-face. And, yes, I do advising often. So, supervising, advising, whatever, online, through the phone and email.

Another participant described using online tools and techniques normally associated with distance education for her face-to-face classes:

I have online components for all my classes. I use the myLesley gizmos all the time… So, I'm not doing, like a national program completely, an online thing. But I'm not just doing twice a week on campus.

Approaches to online teaching versus face-to-face teaching seemed to vary. One interviewee described at length the extensive preparation that she and other colleagues put into designing her online course portal, while another said that online teaching is “pretty much the same” as face-to-face teaching. “You have to be a lot more prepared and you can't just be spontaneous in the classroom,” she added, “but it's tweaking rather than substantive.”

Though they were not specifically asked about this, one recurring theme that emerged was how the faculty see themselves in their roles as teachers. Many of them see themselves more as facilitators, coaches, or guides than as “the sage on the stage.” One faculty member stated:

I really feel that the teacher is a mediator. I don't see myself as being someone who stands in front of a class and gives a lecture and I know everything and the students are
madly writing notes. I think it goes both ways. And I think the students have a lot of knowledge in them already. It's my job to bring that to the forefront of their brain.

More than one faculty member expressed frustration at what they perceive as the expectation that education would necessarily be entertaining. As one faculty member put it,

All of us who are instructors say that the students need more entertainment than they may have before, and I'm stubborn about giving it to them. I want them to listen and talk and read…I don’t feel like I have to go in there with a show.

Beyond teaching discipline-specific information, these instructors want to foster intellectual curiosity and initiative; one said, “I view my job almost entirely as about promoting investigation and the research and the questioning.” Another said that “everything I'm doing is to privilege critical thinking and analysis.” To that end, several participants said they tried to set a high bar for their students, and to push them a little: “there’s something important to me about actually being able to sit with knowledge or stuff that you find a little bit difficult for the sake of learning.” Their hope is that students will be lifelong learners, and will continue to intellectually and artistically explore beyond their time in school. According to one faculty member, “I tell all of my students, ‘If we're lucky, we'll be doing this until we're 90, 95, 100.’ I mean there's no reason that commencement is the arbitrary finish line.”

Assignments

Faculty members described many types of assignments they use—take-home exams, weekly homework assignments, creating a book of art images, responding to discussion board posts—but the most frequently mentioned assignment by far was the research paper. Most faculty that we spoke with said that they assign research papers to their students, but that the
assignment is often done cumulatively throughout the semester, with students handing in pieces of the assignment step-by-step. A typical description of this was process was:

[I] really try to break it down for students, so they have to send their research topic, and then turn that into a question, and identify three preliminary sources … and some of the preliminary bibliography in APA format… I’m always trying to prepare them to move further and further and further, and then they’ll submit a draft portion of their lit review, not the entire lit review.

Another faculty member described her approach to this process as a way to overcome students’ procrastination: “I try to force my students to give me pieces of the research earlier in the semester … so that they get to thinking about it and don’t leave everything until the night before.” Another interviewee said she used a step-by-step approach for research papers in order to get higher quality work: “I tend not to get a lot of really bad work, because there’s all these catches in the middle.”

An increasingly noticeable subset of interviewees said they do not assign research papers.

The prevalence of ineffective web searching, the corresponding excess of information and students’ difficulty with research has prompted these members of the faculty to take a hard look at the research process,

I think people maybe need to have a more robust conversation around what -- what is research, as in I got the answer to the question, and what is research, as in I understand why the question was asked in the first place.

It seems that some faculty members are struggling with their commitment to the traditional research paper in the face of the mounting pressure on the student learning environment. Student desire for the quick and easy 24-hour access to information from home or
dorm makes it increasingly difficult to develop research skills. One faculty member noted, “I think the fact we’re living in much more of a digital age in a sense keeps students away from the library. I also do think that the distance is a problem and I wish that the shuttle ran more frequently because I think more people would get over there.” This comment suggests one way in which a simple, practical service change—more frequent shuttle van runs—might have far-reaching pedagogical implications, encouraging more students to use library visits as one of the steps in their information-gathering process.

Many respondents mentioned moving from traditional research to practical applications or personal reflections. One faculty member said that she has stopped having her students use the databases to find book reviews because it was “very burdensome,” and described how her approach to assignments had changed from being research-focused to more practical:

I’ve gone full throttle the other way in terms of really having almost every assignment be working with a single child or doing something in their classroom and then writing about it … and less about what other people say in the traditional notions of research.

Others said that they do not assign major research papers because there is not enough time in the semester, or because the course requirements are already time-consuming enough. One professor said: “I rarely send them off to start doing some research on an area because they just might not find time to do it well. They’ve got four to six papers due at the end of the term.”

As these responses show, faculty members are seeking other ways for students to present what they are learning, even as the research paper remains dominant for the present. Several respondents echoed the above interviewee’s shift from the research papers to a more “practical” orientation. This response captures the direction that many faculty are moving toward,
I rarely give research assignments … the final assignment was using the text and ideas and materials from the course to do a critical analysis of a […] care situation they’d be involved in… so they’re often reflecting on their own context and constructing something in light of what they’ve learned for that context.

Information sharing can be a two-way street; as one respondent described, “They have to do assignments on Blackboard where they post their research and respond to each other. So they’re also always making suggestions, and actually, a lot of what I know about the most current research comes from the students.” Some students, then, are able to search effectively for course-related research materials, but there is room for instructors and librarians to collaborate in order to make sure that all students learn these skills.

One faculty member is allowing student blogging instead of writing research papers and is pleased with the results:

And this semester with blogs, it's been liberating to them and so they've been talking to me about how they don't like writing these academic papers because they feel like they can't express themselves, whereas on -- in a blog, it's personal, and they can say what they think, even though I'm asking them to do more or less the same thing. Even though in the blog they don't have to cite sources and things like that to such an extent, but they do have to put a link in to something that they watched and then reflect upon it, which for me is a form of research.

In addition, photos, videos, artwork, and other visual information are easily available on websites, blogs and streaming. As previously mentioned, one faculty member described these formats as useful sites to post student work. “I set up a blog that was kind of a website so I was able to post photographs of their [student] drawings from each class. So they would not have to
worry about documenting, but they had access to the photos and they could post photos of their work… I was able to look at their work as a body of work.” Students can use these venues to post, organize, share and modify their work. Feedback from other students as well as faculty becomes a key feature of the set up. Participation issues for distance students are mitigated by the universal access provided on these sites.

In addition to discussing types of assignments, we also asked faculty how they assess the projects they receive from students. Various criteria were given, but all centered on presenting a thesis, engaging with a topic in a clear, meaningful way, and arguing a case convincingly. One typical response to our question was that instructors are looking for “something that demonstrated engagement and personal processing of the materials that we looked at in the term.” Students, then, need to be able to find and engage intellectually with scholarly materials.

Strengthening our information literacy programs to help students evaluate sources better may help them engage with and demonstrate their understanding more successfully.

Several interviewees said that they give students thorough rubrics before they turn in their assignments in order to establish clear expectations for their work. A subset of faculty, however, expressed frustration with the rubric-driven culture that they perceive in their students; they said that they do not give rubrics, because they believe rubrics discourage students from thinking critically and taking ownership of the research process. According to one professor, “what I'm most interested in is seeing how students think, and so I purposely don't give really detailed step-by-step directions as to how I want them to do things.” Another said, I don't have a rubric…it just drives them crazy because they're all looking for rules at this age. Do I first go here and then do I go there? Well, in the case of [named subject area], which I teach, you go to various places. Sometimes you might just go to the New York
Times and see what they were saying. But, sometimes the story involves something the
New York Times got wrong. So, you don't necessarily want to go there. So, what I try to
teach my students to do is critical thinking.

Finally, one faculty member indicated that she tries to dissuade her students from getting
so hung up on their grade that they lose sight of the process: “a huge part of my job is simply the
investigation of the process and if it happens to lead to pleasing results, all the better….I've
actually told them …There's no right or wrong. It doesn't matter if I'm happy.”

A major concern of faculty members is what they perceive as significant deficits in their
students’ informational literacy. Perhaps in order to address these deficits, many faculty
members take it upon themselves to use class time to teach information literacy and research
skills. Many see this as an important part of their jobs as teachers. According to one interviewee:
“I think that it's my obligation … beyond just the librarians, to educate them on how to access
the online databases, as well.”

The instruction that faculty described ranged from brief introductions to databases, to
more complex lesson plans. For example, one faculty member who expressed concern that her
students did not know how to make effective use of search engines told us, “I gave them a cheat
sheet on how to optimize Google searches, which I kind of feel they probably aren't going to do,
but you've got to start somewhere.” Another faculty member said “I start off by telling them that
I will be there to guide them through learning how to use the databases.” Another interviewee
described her approach to teaching students about types of sources:

I also do bring in hard copies of journals and I'll bring in like the Yoga Journal and then
I'll bring in Psychology Today and then I'll bring in a journal of music therapy and then,
you know, Arts and Psychotherapy which is another journal and I'll say “which one of
these are journals are peer-reviewed journals which of these are not?” So you get a little bit of hands on work for that in class.

It was not always clear whether faculty thought of their role as information literacy instructors as being in addition to, or in lieu of, formal information literacy instruction by librarians. Though many faculty respondents reported sending individual students or classes to the library, there may be a need for more aggressive marketing of our willingness to conduct library instruction sessions, as well as greater flexibility in our approach to meeting instructors’ needs.

In addition to using class time to present information literacy lessons to students, many faculty described offering their students extensive one-on-one help with their research, both inside and outside of the classroom. One faculty member told a lower-level class: “every step of the way I'm there to hold your hand.”

A significant portion of the help that faculty report giving their students with their projects is devoted to assisting them in finding resources. First and foremost, faculty reported using their knowledge and experience as an expert in their field to direct students:

A big part of what we do is we have this reservoir in our brain and we see something and we say, ‘oh, you should go look at so-and-so or you should go get this book from the library or you should go watch this film.’

Some faculty members said that they often point students to topics they themselves are already familiar with, in order to be able to refer them to sources. They may also put together lists of topics for their students in order to save them time or frustration: “I'll kind of curate a list of topics that I then push out to students with a lot of different links about this or this or this or this, and links to what is sometimes a variety of different sources.”
When students become stuck while searching for sources, some faculty will search for articles with the student, or even for the student, in order to help them find resources. One faculty member told us about a typical interaction with her students: “they said that there's absolutely nothing on this topic. And so I'll say, ‘Well let's look,’ and playing around sometimes with the search words will help.” Clearly, faculty members are aware of how easily students might become overwhelmed by the universe of scholarly information, and are developing strategies to help steer them toward useful and relevant resources.

As noted above, many professors use a step-by-step approach to major research assignments in order to be able to guide students as their research progresses. In addition to reading and offering feedback on bibliographies and drafts, faculty spend a lot of time both inside and outside of class answering students’ questions and trouble-shooting problems they run into as they work on their projects. According to one faculty member, “my students Facebook me at midnight with problems on their projects and if I'm up and I'm willing to respond, I might actually even jump in and help them out or respond the next morning.” Even those who were more reserved about meeting students’ needs showed an openness to meeting beyond class time. One interviewee said: “I don't follow my students around to see if everything's going fine. I'm here. I get that message across and they do contact me if they think they need more help.”

One faculty member expressed frustration at how much help the students needed, citing it as one reason for changing from research assignments to practically-oriented assignments; “I felt like I was doing a lot of modeling and hand-holding,” she said. This comment suggests a potential need for more research instruction delivered at the library. While instructors understandably focus primarily on their courses’ content, librarians focus on guiding students through the research process in a systematic way.
**Referring Students to the Library and Librarians**

Though faculty members were overwhelmingly positive about their experiences using the library for their own research, responses were mixed as to whether they actively encourage their students to take advantage of the resources offered by the library and the librarians. A few interviewees said that they always direct their student to the library or to librarians. One faculty member said she tells her students:

> You need to be using these skills, and you need to be practicing these skills. You need to be in the library every day looking for things because the more familiar you are, then you know exactly where you need to go for a particular kind of thing you're looking for.

Another interviewee specifically mentioned encouraging all of her students to use Ask-a-Librarian, the email reference service.

Other faculty members seemed to imply that they refer students to the library or reference librarians only when their research is not going well. According to one participant: “I do send them to the library, and also I do ask them to speak to the librarian if they have any questions or if they’re having a hard time looking.” Another said: “I look at their drafts. I see where it looks as if they got on to a wrong article, and I tell them to contact the reference librarian to ask for something more appropriate…”

At least two interviewees said that they do not refer students to the library. One seemed to suggest that this was an oversight, rather than a reasoned decision: “Do I refer them to the reference librarians? No. I probably should be doing that when they've got a paper idea.”

Notably, she added, “I don't know the reference librarians anymore,” implying that she would be more likely to refer students if she knew the librarians. The other interviewee remarked that she
does not generally refer students to the library, and that when she does, she finds the students do not take her advice:

You know, I don't send them – students -- to the library… Of all the students that I've told ‘If you cannot figure out how to do that, go and ask a librarian’… my impression is just that they don't, that they wouldn't do that; they would rather just submit that incorrect.

Another faculty member who does promote the library with her students mentioned librarians’ accessibility as a particular reason for referring students:

In terms of writing and learning to write in a scholarly way, the library is very, very helpful in that regard, and also digging up great resources. My students do papers for some of my classes on choices that they make about what the issues in adolescence they want to pursue and to know more about. So they also use the library, and when they ask me questions which I don't know the answers for, I say “you can't ask me on Saturday and Sunday because I'm not available to you. But you can ask the library on Saturday and Sunday because they are available to you.”

Sometimes librarians become advisors on student research projects, as one faculty member described:

The MFA in creative writing has an interdisciplinary component in which students study other disciplines as a way to feed their writing, and often they're doing research for their novel, like if they're writing an historical novel about Brazilian Midwives. You know they have to kind of dig in and sort of learn about that, and sometimes librarians are their advisors, and I pair them up with people at Lesley and those have been some really fruitful collaborations where they will find they don't know where to look, they don't know really about archives and databases and libraries online these days, and so they get
a lot of that from the methodology -- where to look and stuff from the librarians here which is great.

Many faculty members mentioned the overabundance of information available to students as a sticking point for students trying to develop a research strategy. They acknowledged the need for faculty and librarians to teach students the skills necessary to discern reliable pertinent information from unsubstantiated content. One faculty member stated, “I think it’s a relationship between the research methods content in the undergraduate curriculum that could be partnering more fully with the research skill training that could happen at the library.”

A few faculty members mentioned that they try to integrate library instruction into their classes, though the approaches to doing so vary. Two professors said they brought their classes to the library during class time to find resources, but not for formal library instruction. One said that she did so because her students did not think they needed a formal library class, but she still wanted to them to find library resources for their assignments: I had suggested we do a library day with a librarian. And they all said to me, "No we don't need the librarian, because we know how to use the library." So, I said, "Fine. So let's go to the library. I'll be your reference piece.” And we all met in the Atrium and I sent them off and I stayed up there and got to read for something else and they came to me with their research things they found.”

One other faculty member reported taking a similar approach—an other way in which faculty members teach information literacy ad hoc.

Other faculty members said that they brought their students to the library for formal library instruction sessions conducted by a librarian. One interviewee remarked that “the writing class is 100% stronger when I have a collaborating librarian who is there to help students with
Another respondent said, “I say to students hey, we have a great library, they will help you because I think they’re [the students] sitting home you know over their computer not knowing what to do and, and that's why we try to do a training.”

Another faculty member asked about a “freshman experience” course that would include library use and training:

But I have a question. How do the students, if there is something like a freshman experience, a structured course as they have in other locations, universities, but what is the first opportunity for a student who's just coming into Lesley, and specifically Freshman class, so an undergrad, to go to physically to the library? Is there something structured if at all that will make them go or will encourage them to go or not?

One participant also mentioned her plan to have a librarian involved in her class beyond presenting a single library session: “I spoke with [named librarian], who’s the librarian for my division, and I really want her to be embedded in my courses and so … she’ll be able to help me get the students to focus their research, like meet with her for ten, fifteen minutes and have her give them more concrete guidance on where to find sources.”

One professor, however, specifically said that she did not ever work with the librarians: “I wish that I would do things like team up with librarians for instruction, because I can see how it would benefit both me and my students to be doing that.”

Though she did not elaborate on the reasons, it is clear that for her, and perhaps for other faculty, there are significant barriers to collaborating with librarians.

**Faculty assessment of student behavior and characteristics**

Faculty members were asked a variety of questions surrounding student research focusing on the teaching and development of research skills, evaluation of student research results and
faculty satisfaction with these results. Faculty comments covered a range of topics including student habits and preparedness, the influence of technology in the learning community, and the impact these have on the changing role of the research assignment and student learning.

**Student Research: From Papers to Practical Application**

As previously discussed, the standard research paper is under duress, according to statements from faculty members. Across both undergraduate and graduate programs, faculty are finding it difficult to find a meaningful role for this traditional assignment. Tweaking of the assignment ranges from rubric-driven, “handholding” approaches to abandoning it in favor of more “practical applications” or “personal reflections.”

Many faculty members post course content online for the students with separate links to assigned reading materials, which makes readings easily accessible. One respondent said, “I think this is a thing around the expectation that everything is served up on a plate. That when it's not, people start to panic and any ability to think, well, there's a whole library here with a whole library staff; maybe I could go and ask them. It goes out the window.”

A key factor driving this shift away from the research paper is described by one faculty member who summarized this trend as a reflection of our entire education system, stating:

I see a lot of my students who come to Lesley for a graduate degree and in some cases have been, I feel that they have been undereducated their whole lives. And so they don't have a deep keel in understanding how to do research. They don't have a deep keel in talking about texts and analyzing them and critiquing them and doing critical thinking. They don't necessarily know a lot about history of the field of education or the history of, you know, the world…”
An alternate view is presented by a respondent who disagreed, stating that students are right where they need to be in terms of research skills, “I think for most undergraduates especially, first and second year research is largely an academic exercise, which is fine, I mean it's a kind of staging for more meaningful research that they might do down the road.”

Faculty members see a link between the rubric driven learning environment in the K-12 schools, their focus on grades and test scores, and an increasing lack of student initiative, creativity and curiosity at the college level. One faculty member said, “Maybe it's because of the way they are brought up in school now with everything being about the test, but it's like they think one step at a time, and not kind of looking long and reflecting back.”

The concerns lead to discussions about writing skills and the relationship of writing to the structuring of the research process. One professor asserted, “There's this real interaction between their writing skills and their thinking skills … Is it just you're not putting that idea into the right words or can you not put it in the right words because you don't have the idea?” Several others supported the sentiment offered by another faculty member who observed:

Well, writing is a challenge for a lot of a students now, and that's not just my students; that seems to be across the university, and the other is critical thinking and I know that's not a research, I mean it's a skill they should have, especially as a graduate student. Their ability to be able to look at, to analyze data, they may understand what coding is or thematic analysis or something like that, but that doesn't necessarily mean they have the intellectual capacity to do it in an interesting way.”

Research is a key component in the visual arts as well. Faculty want to create life-long learners as well as life-long artists, but it seems the way the education system is designed in this
hierarchical pattern, students are seeing the end of a semester as a finish line, or commencement as THE finish line. One faculty member described this trend:

I have really good students who graduate and then just -- pfft, stop. And that to me says that they were really good at meeting the rubrics and really good at sort of the surface and they did -- they do all their research and they can make all the right images and say all the right words, but they hadn't developed a relationship with the depth of their interest in a way that -- I don't know, compelled them to keep going.

**Students’ Information Literacy**

Faculty assessment of student research strengths and weaknesses identifies serious deficits in information literacy. Students are often quite technologically savvy, and it is perhaps because of this that they feel confident in their ability to do research. Their confidence doesn’t necessarily match their skills, however. Many faculty mentioned that students do not thoroughly understand the difference between different kinds of sources and are therefore unable to evaluate what they find. One professor remarked, “I bet if I asked most of my students they wouldn't be able to articulate that there are web resources, books, journal articles, different kinds of journals, newspapers, databases.” Though students can find information, faculty are concerned about the quality of what they come up with; one professor said, “distinguishing between the good and bad source is the problem,” and another spoke of the struggle to get students to go “beyond the Wikipedia.” In spite of receiving library instruction, students’ understanding of the central concepts of information literacy is often superficial at best, as one faculty member explained:

They don't really understand what peer review is. They learned it in freshman English, and I said “what is peer review?” And they say, “It's been read by experts.” And I say, “What does that mean?” And they have no idea.
Digital Impacts: Research = Web Search

Discussions of student characteristics invariably involved technology – the “digital natives” and the way they relate to information, as one faculty member commented:

This generation is very different. And this generation seems to privilege speed over getting it right… So, unfortunately, we as educators now have to do something entirely different. When we say look it up, we know that they're going to hit the Internet. They're going to, in many cases, not know how to evaluate the information. And, our job is not just to teach them to do research, but to teach them how to evaluate and fact check the information that they are getting.

The Internet, social media, texting - these tools have significantly changed the way students receive and exchange information, personal and scholarly. Some faculty members see this speed of information exchange impacting students’ ability to gather, synthesize and present information.

Like writing and research … I think synthesis is hard for a lot of students. I've been teaching a long time and I definitely think it's gotten more difficult. And I wonder if it's because we live in such an age of rapid information. And if you're writing text messages, they're not sentences. I think they're very media savvy. They know how to find things. And if they're really interested in something they'll find a lot of it. You know, it may not be for their paper, but my God if they start talking about what they like, they'll find you everything there is to know about something that they found online…So, even if they ended up with B minuses, it's not because of the research, it's because of the synthesis. It was because they didn't get in the process of how you go from there to writing to argumentation.
The combination of student desire for a structured rubric and the wealth of resources can have a paralyzing effect of students. One faculty member related, “My students, I think, are afraid of [library research] because of its overwhelmingness. It's like walking into a candy store and not knowing what you want to walk home with.”

Because of this information overload, one faculty member mentioned the need for discernment when selecting sources, she said, “anyone can cut and paste anything from the web.” In addition, though students were comfortable in the online world, one faculty member mentioned that “they know less than I would hope they would. You know, they know how to get things off of the web. I mean that's exactly why we see so many web-based resources. They don't really know how to research books and journals. So, I think they just go immediately to the web.” Another faculty member reiterated the same sentiment and said, “students don’t know how to search,” then admitted that she probably didn’t know either; this faculty member did promote the “Ask-a-Librarian” service with students and said the librarians “know how to look” and know “what’s available.”

This kind of anxiety is exacerbated by the fact that research has become synonymous with web searching, with its inherent advantages and drawbacks. Faculty members commented that students go to the Internet first for any research assignment, and students feel that they are competent researchers because they use Google, Wikipedia, YouTube and other popular websites to gather information. One faculty member commented, “[Students] believe that they are a generation that has access to everything because they’ve got all their devices. But in many cases, it has never occurred to them there may be some more knowledge they’re missing.”

It seems counterintuitive that a group that is very comfortable with technology would struggle with searching databases and even with optimally searching the web, but this is exactly
what faculty told us. Many students have limited or no experience with online databases before coming to school here, so they may be at a loss as to where to begin looking for resources for assignments. According to one faculty member, many of her students initially “have no idea what JSTOR is. They've never heard of it. And they have no idea what Project Muse is, they've never heard of that either.” Many faculty members mentioned their students’ struggles with searching the databases. One interviewee described a typical encounter: “someone says, I can't find anything, it takes me literally four minutes to do my own little search and say, well, actually try this.” Faculty members suggested that students are much more likely to search for articles through Google, rather than through library resources. One interviewee described her students as being part of “the Google Culture;” another said that she knew her students were “all going to use Google despite my best efforts,” but that she was surprised to find that “they didn't know how a search engine worked. They didn't know how many search engines existed and they didn't know all of the short cuts.”

**The Wikipedia Debate and the Google Syndrome**

Most faculty expressed frustration with this “web first” approach. One faculty member said, “Well, certainly when I tell them, you know, go off and research this, and, I want a few sources, the only thing that comes back typically from 95% is online sources. It's usually web sites, right, say the Wikipedia article that I found, or the three Wikipedia articles I found that reference this, and other random web sites that I was able to find when I was Googling it.”

Some faculty members felt that Wikipedia is okay as a starting point, but “it’s not enough.” One respondent said, “Some people who have had very little background in academic stuff and who are young and maybe not that bright intellectually, I'll get a lot of Wikipedia.
Wikipedia or, you know, just random like I saw Bob's blog on whatever. I'm rarely pleasantly surprised by the Internet resources people turn up.”

Another faculty member kept noticing the same false description in many of her students’ papers and realized Wikipedia was the reason:

Last spring, I was teaching Ovid’s Metamorphoses; it was a weekend class and when you walk in the door on Friday late afternoon you have to have already written a three page analytical response to the text that's going to be discussed that week. And a whole bunch of people referred to Metamorphoses in this document that was due before class started. They referred to it as a ‘mock epic.’ And the first time I wrote ‘this isn't a mock epic.’ And then like the fourth time, I was like wait a minute. Why do all these people think that Ovid’s Metamorphoses is a mock epic? And I went to Wikipedia and Wikipedia said it was a mock epic. And so that's been my example that Wikipedia is often wrong.

One faculty member identified two “syndromes” that inhibit quality student research, the “but I Googled it” syndrome and the “ad populum” argument. She stated, “They [students] are reflexively trained to go to “The Google”. They are reflexively trained to just do the net search and whatever comes up, and going to that extra level of going on the databases at the library, wow that’s work.”

In addition, she added students believe that “if something’s popular, it must be true.” She said,

If I get 10,000 hits that say the president was born in Kenya, well there you go, okay. But I can say that the moon is made of green cheese… I can tweet that, I can get all my friends to say, I can get 50,000 hits in a minute that say the moon is made of green cheese. And guess what, the moon still isn’t made of green cheese.
Nuts and Bolts of Research: Citing

In nearly every interview, faculty members mentioned the importance of citing research information. They expressed surprise and frustration that their students fail to understand the importance of citing sources and avoiding plagiarism. One faculty member suggested that the ubiquity of information and the ease of accessing it means that students often fail to grasp that reusing others’ work without attribution is a serious academic offence: “Many students will look something up on Wikipedia or somewhere and they will copy and paste. And they will see that as ‘okay, well I wasn't doing that intentionally but I was just using this information that was publicly available.'”

Other faculty members expressed exasperation with their students’ inability to cite their sources properly. One commented that the APA citations in assignments she receives are “90 percent of the time, a complete disaster.” Another said that citations were a problem in spite of students’ knowledge of resources that are available to help them with citations. “It's MLA, come on,” one interviewee complained. “I give them the spot on your website where they get all the instructions. It still isn't happening.”

Some of the issues around citing include the difficulty of employing various citation formats such as MLA or APA, the inability of students to recognize the variety of formats that they are citing from, and the inability to effectively incorporate properly attributed quotes in a research paper. “One of the worst weaknesses [is] that especially beginning students think that to do research is to quote everybody else’s stuff.”

Faculty members require citing as a necessary tool to produce a well written research paper. In addition to the copyright implications of citing, faculty also mentioned citing as a way to help students identify what makes up their research paper. One faculty member mentions the
inexperience of freshmen and sophomores, and how little they really know as they enter college. She sees that,

They need to be educated by the faculty members in collaboration with libraries, the staff of the library, librarians and, perhaps the institutional review board, whatever is available so that they know what was just mentioned earlier, what plagiarism is, for instance. How easy it is for somebody to fall into such behavior without them knowing about it.

Citing helps students understand the variety of sources that contribute to the topic they are investigating – date of publication, journal article or blog entry, peer reviewed or Twitter feed – these can be clues to a source’s validity and appropriateness for a given assignment. Citations can help students recognize who wrote, owns, or created the material, and where and how the information was originally presented. Many faculty members mentioned how the web search obscures the source of the material – often students don’t know whether they are quoting from an article or a book. The citing process requires them to investigate beyond the Google search to recognize the source of the content that they are including in their work.

Courses across the academic departments, whether it is education, studio art or pastoral theology, are incorporating students’ practical experiences with research material provided by the instructors either through Blackboard, course texts, or other content sharing platforms. One respondent said, “Student strengths in my class have been the ability to really connect it [research] to practice and experience and to bring that into conversation with that experience. The biggest strengths in my classes are that people know how to use this material in very practical ways and they adopt it, they co-opt it for what they need and want.”

In one teacher’s dream scenario, students would respond knowledgably to the following question, “how do you take responsibility for your learning, but also just what does it mean to be
a curious thinking person who knows how to navigate all the tools available to us to find information?”

**Library Resources and Services**

The library offers essential materials and services to Episcopal Divinity School and Lesley University communities in support of teaching, learning, and faculty and student research. Survey questions posed to faculty assessed the following components: reference, collection development, resource sharing, and instruction. Among other questions, we asked faculty members if the library had the content they needed to teach their classes and to conduct research in their respective fields. We also wanted to know how they remedied the situation if the right content was not available. Complicating this picture for both librarians asking these questions and for respondents answering them is the blurring of lines between a resource and a service.

Responses covered a range of topics from the intricacies of developing a successful research strategy to the increasing flexibility offered by electronic books, journals, reserves and other resources. We learned more about how faculty accessed information in both physical and virtual environments, how librarians helped them along the way, and which resources and services they found to be valuable for research and for student success. We also learned that many faculty viewed library staff as a resource and that there were some much-appreciated synergies in collections from the merging of the collections of Episcopal Divinity School and Lesley University.

**Collection Development**

Collection development represented a significant strand in our discussion with faculty. Most faculty members found library resources sufficient for their teaching needs and, to a slightly lesser extent, for their research needs as well. For many, the purchase process for library
materials was somewhat opaque, as was the faculty’s role in this process. This fuzzy relationship leads to varying degrees of success for faculty trying to establish a strong link between course content and library research materials. Most successful were those who were routinely in touch with their library liaisons and shared suggestions for new titles, related topics, or gaps they have identified.

I just know that when I've asked for something it's usually accommodated. If there's a new book that will be great to have for our students or a journal, like a literary journal, it gets ordered. I feel it’s well supported.

These faculty members felt a close collaboration with librarians in the development of a collection that supported their areas interest for teaching and research:

But when I'm working on a course and I'm meeting with [the liaison], she'll say to me, I’ve got money to spend; I send her titles or I'll send titles to [liaison]. And whenever [liaison] is on a planning meeting with us, we're talking about content, she's looking for resources, and we're identifying and she's purchasing them. So I feel like there's never an issue about getting materials that I need to support my courses if we don't have them. So I feel really good about that.

Among faculty who had not yet established a relationship with their library liaison, those who were unaware of the process, and others who felt that their needs were unmet, a retooling of the collection development process would be welcome. An exchange between two faculty members highlights this divide:

First participant: I've been researching an area, environmental education research, and I'm wondering how you propose journals that you might not have in your database to be included?
Second participant: I think they have forms still at the desk or where you can fill out online about requests that you have for journals or texts or things like that. And they've been again very responsive in my experience.

One faculty member found fault with the library’s process for requesting materials and soliciting faculty input, telling the other focus group participants, “Our division has a very different relationship with the library. We've found it frustrating, and the lack of input we seem to have on things like book selection.” Several faculty offered suggestions to make the system more transparent and identified aspects that they found particularly useful. Some suggestions were as simple as, “it would be interesting if the library asked us, ‘What would you like to see in your field housed in the library?’"

**Resources in Support Of Instruction**

For some faculty, library services and resources played a part in every stage of curriculum development and instruction. Faculty noted the participation of librarians, sometimes beginning as early as the course creation process. As one respondent stated:

[Our library liaison] participates in every faculty planning meeting, and every curriculum design piece she's at the table with us. So while we're talking about what we want to see delivered in this course, she's sitting there with us helping us to think about the structural materials and resources that we can be actively building in. So it's really been this integral relationship which I think is perhaps not typical at a lot of libraries but has been, I think, what's been so unique about the way we built this specialization. It has really helped the students enormously as a result.

According to other respondents, the librarian presence on curriculum committees had many benefits. One faculty member said, “I actually sit on curriculum committee, and so one of
the library representatives who comes to curriculum committee every month gave us a handout of the library staff who work there as the point person for each division, and I thought that that was a great handout and something that I gave to my division.” Having librarians participate in the review of proposed courses was also valued: “they're [librarians] on the curriculum committee so any time a new course is proposed, they are there to review the references that we're proposing for this course and to either say ‘we have this’ or ‘how about this’ or ‘have you thought about this?’”

Some faculty used, or at least checked for, library resources in the syllabus development stage. For example, one faculty member commented that “I use the library for building my syllabi a bit, and I used to come into a library and look at the stacks and mostly looked at books rather than journals, and now it's just the opposite.” Several faculty members who used the library this way also commented that, in part, their motivation for finding library resources for students to use was based on textbook costs. One interviewee said

What I had been using is ebrary as much as possible, because there are some good resources there. And often I want them to look at one chapter in a book, so I don't want them to go and spend 30 dollars on a single book.

Another interviewee told this story:

I also had this student in class who, because of the luck of the Irish, is a student in my class but also works at the library, and so what she did is she got copies of the literature that we were reading for this class, which is voluminous. And she got the library to buy all the books so that when students are strapped financially, they can go to the library and get those books, and that's a valuable service. I remember being in college and having
books on reserve. That's just so helpful because some of the things they read, they're just outrageously expensive.

While this comment describes a positive experience with the library, it also highlights the fact that not all faculty members are aware that they have the option to make purchase requests themselves. It is important for faculty to know that they need not rely on the “luck of the Irish” to get course materials added to the library collection.

Even more faculty mentioned that they gave their finalized course syllabi to library liaisons. In addition to providing access to existing library resources, this also served to build specific sections of the collection over time. As one participant noted: “with a little curricular planning and research on my own, I can either make sure that I'm including things in the curriculum that are available, or request through the library that they purchase them so they can be available.” Another faculty member stated that her library liaison used the syllabi to purchase “complementary supporting materials.” The delivery of the syllabus to the library was often a trigger for making resources available on reserve, as one faculty member explained:

Three of us teach from the same syllabus, and it usually gets tweaked over the summer.

So we give them the new syllabus, and then they go through, and they either put digital course reserves or physical course reserves, everything that we can and if we're going to add anything to it, we will contact the library.

This endorsement of the reserves system was voiced by several other faculty members.

In addition to using the library’s reserve system, faculty also used course pages in the course management system to link out to articles available through library-acquired databases and online journal subscriptions.
A few faculty members also noted that they had used library resources in the classroom; specifically, they mentioned streaming video from library-acquired databases such as Films on Demand, and images either from slides or from image databases such as ARTSTOR. Some faculty members also used some of the library’s physical resources in class.

Many faculty members mentioned library resources that they use in student advising as well. In our interviews, faculty frequently cited Academic Search Complete, ATLA, JSTOR, Project Muse, PsychInfo and many others by name. One specific type of resource that was mentioned often by faculty was e-books. Most faculty members who specifically mentioned e-books had positive experiences, but not everyone is pleased with e-books. One interviewee said: “It's the way things are going now, which is making a printed book seem not so important. I don't agree with that, but this is where we're at.” Another interviewee complained: “I've heard that the library purchases e-copies now, we're trying to purchase fewer hard copy books and that's fine. I just don't know if students like reading those in the same manner.” Other faculty members were ambivalent, stating:

They can look at 60 pages, and they can print a section of that, and that's one complaint that one girl said. But I think the younger the students, the less they're interested in printing. They're more interested in reading online, because they're able to bring the computer to the classroom and work with it.

Still, many faculty members found a number of reasons to appreciate e-books. One participant said that she suggested e-books to students through her syllabus, another used e-reserve for individual chapters, and still another appreciated that more than one student could potentially use an e-book at any given time. These comments suggest that the library might need
to create more understanding and buy-in among faculty, as we increase the portion of our budget spent on electronic resources.

Faculty also used non-library Internet resources in teaching their classes. One interviewee mentioned YouTube videos:

So there are interactive Shakespeare additions, and there are Shakespeare apps, and there are lots of YouTube Shakespeare videos. I teach a lot about performance in Shakespeare, and one of my learning goals is that they realize that everyone has to be interpreted by the actor, whether on stage or screen; so they're not really talking about a written line. They're talking about a performed line that can be interpreted in a number of different ways. So, we use a lot of video clips to talk about that.

Other faculty mentioned asking their students to use physical collections of other libraries in the area to supplement resources available here. Several Harvard libraries such as Widener Library and Houghton Library were mentioned, as well as the Boston Public Library.

Non-library resources, both print and digital, were used occasionally when the library’s collection seemed to be inadequate. One specific area where the collection seemed to fall short is juvenile non-fiction. One faculty member said:

For our teachers who take the class, they very rarely use Sherrill Library for the books because there aren't enough nonfiction books. There aren't enough recent ones. And I know that's something in my conversations with [librarian]. I know that's been a priority for her, that she already noticed that right away, that there were a lot of holes in terms of award-winning nonfiction. I direct my students to the Minuteman System and to their public libraries because they serve children, and so they have bigger collections. And so I think that's a question for the university as a whole: to what extent does our collection
need to be as good as the local public libraries for our teachers? And to what extent does it not because those other library systems exist? And when I have a teacher who lives in a town that's not in the Minuteman System, they don't have the same access, they just don't.

Another participant from a different field of study spoke about the lack of resources in her subject area:

Lesley doesn't have any of this stuff. Lesley started doing a lot of the gathering databases in an era before there was a [subject] major or a [subject] program. So, we're kind of like the poor stepchild in that regard.

Large and well-funded majors at both the undergraduate and graduate level seemed to have material that is better suited to instructional needs, while collections relating to the smaller, newer, and less well-funded majors were sometimes found lacking.

**E-Resources and the Contemporary College Student**

Quite a few comments were made about the value of library e-resources for students who take classes on-campus. A typical comment was: “I just find that my students, because they're spread out on campuses and stuff, it's more accessible for them if it's online.” The primary reason given for the value of e-resources was to save students a trip to the library. As one faculty member said, “I am not going to ask my students to trek down here [Sherrill Library] when all they need to do is click a link and find something. I love that capability.” A few other respondents noted that electronic resources are simply easier to use than traditional print resources:

I recommend that they use the online database so that they can find an article that they like. It's just easier than just going through the library and sifting through all the hard copies of journals, which I think is important to learn that process, but for students right
now I think it's so much more accessible to go online from their dorm room or from their home and be able to navigate just on their own.

In addition, as mentioned earlier in this report, some respondents appreciated the potential for electronic resources to help students save money on textbooks.

For all that, some comments suggested that students themselves don’t grasp the value of these online resources:

Still [I] know that it’s a great privilege to have access to the system. I don't think that many of our students see it that way, because they live simply in a world where information is very easy to access, and research is not hard to do. So I think that it's hard for them, or I could imagine that it's hard for them to value a repository of information, because information is everywhere.

Faculty also expressed concern that their digital-native students might not appreciate, or be comfortable navigating a brick-and-mortar library:

I was saying to my students…we’ll be down in the library in Sherrill and they all looked at me like ‘where’s the library?’ These are not first semester students. These were like second-year students who said ‘I’ve never stepped foot inside the library.’ I was like, wow. I said, “okay, I get it, you're getting stuff online, you're getting book chapters online…” So unless there's something on reserve or unless they like to browse books, there's no reason for them to. I think it is limiting for all of them.

When it came to their students’ access to technology, faculty often expressed the sense that their students were more technologically advanced than their teachers. One faculty member noted that her students are “collaborating all the time,” using various forms of technology, even though she herself only felt comfortable using email as a tool for digital collaboration. Another
faculty member said, “I used to recommend Searchpath [Lesley’s online library tutorial], which is something they developed years ago as a requirement, and now it’s seeming like it’s almost not advanced enough for what students could do.” In the view of many faculty members, their students are not limited by the same lack of comfort and expertise that the faculty themselves sometimes experience. Faculty members seem to see their students as true digital natives.

At the same time, faculty members are concerned about the importance of simply “get[ting] [students] to the information.” In an era of information overload, faculty feel that their students’ time is limited, “so anything that would get them to fast information…would be helpful.” Even digital natives need instruction before they can perform effective database searches. If students don’t know how to locate library resources quickly and efficiently online, then they may turn to other, potentially less reliable sources that don’t require them to master a steep learning curve.

In addition to being valuable for traditional on-campus students, faculty emphasized that library e-resources are indispensable for distance students and classes. One faculty member said, “Well the library, I mean for us, has been one of the greatest assets at Lesley. I think it's what makes us able to do this doctoral program online; without it we couldn't do it.” This sentiment recurred a number of times in our data.

Nevertheless, some faculty members made comments indicating that e-resources are not a panacea for all access problems. One faculty respondent suggested that students may have Internet connectivity issues that prevent them from accessing online resources:

But getting to the library might not always be that easy. Sometimes it’s like they have a hard time with the wi-fi in the dorms, like they don't have enough bandwidth or I am not sure if that is their excuse for not doing their homework.
In other words, a mixture of legitimate technology problems, user errors, and dog-ate-my-homework excuses might all be at work when students struggle to access online resources.

**Resources in Support of Research**

When asked “Do you feel that the library has the content that you need to teach your classes and conduct your research?” one interviewee replied, “Those are two entirely separate questions.” Many faculty members are quite satisfied with the content options they have; others recognize that the library collections don’t have everything they need, but they still have convenient options for getting access to essential materials. A few faculty feel that their research needs are not met by the library and that this is problematic.

Among the satisfied faculty, one interviewee said,

The AIB library is very well stocked. I mean, one could always say there could be more of this or that and the other thing, but I have never really found a moment where I have not been able to find something that meets the needs of the moment.

Other faculty members also expressed an understanding that the collection has continued to grow over time. As one respondent commented “We have pretty much everything. When I first started working here we didn't, but the collection has built up so substantially; we have access to so many more journals now especially, through JSTOR and Project Muse.” Most of the faculty we spoke with recognized the value of content that has been made available digitally. One told us, “I think it's primarily the journal articles I go through, and the library now seems to have a number of subscription possibilities. So at least I'm able to read the abstract without any problem.”

Another respondent related this:

I've been recently looking at doctoral education because I'm trying to figure out what that is. Somebody sent me something, and I was like ‘oh’. So I went to the library, and I got
online, and I looked for articles, and I found some great resources just sitting in my office not even bothering to cross the street, just in the library.

The ease of access to digital content available through the library was noteworthy to several faculty members who said, “I do not need to come to the library so often because many of those journals, they are already available online and they are PDF files.”

Some respondents acknowledged that the merging of the collections of Episcopal Divinity School and Lesley University in one shared facility has helped to round out each separate collection. One member of the EDS faculty said,

It's the Lesley contribution to the library that has been enhancing for me, because of my interest in writing pedagogy, and not merely the theological resources. I occasionally miss the Weston Jesuit collection that was here before, but other bases can cover that. But it's been very convenient to have -- I mean, all of the spiritual direction resources that I needed were here and many, many -- and I mean, it was a perfect library for this last project that I was doing.

Likewise, a member of the Lesley faculty told us

Before we moved over to Sherrill I was a pretty heavy interlibrary loan user anyway, but I had to order what I consider basic stuff. And now, I mean all the hagiography, all the saint slides in Latin and English translation, we've got it.

Some participants found that the library does not have direct access to all that they need for their research, and have developed strategies to deal with this, including using other local libraries. One participant noted, “When I was doing my research, I would find about half of the books that I wanted to look at in the AIB library, and the other half I would need to go out to MassArt or another art school library.” Another said, “I use databases. There's a lot online.
There's a lot of surprising things online, but a lot of the things that I use have not been put online, so I still have to go into the Widener stacks to get them.” HOLLIS, Harvard’s online catalog, and Widener Library were frequently mentioned as options, but this can also be problematic; as one respondent told us,

I had started [research] on a sabbatical, and part of the sabbatical was that I had a library card to the Widener. And I spent basically the whole time at the Widener looking through things, looking for things and reformatting … But I tried to get another Widener pass, and I got one for another year, so I used it. And then it was over, and I tried again for a grant and I didn't get it. And it's very upsetting because I needed $750 [to buy another pass].

Another faculty member implied that not everything she needs is online, as she described not having access to materials she needs while working abroad:

I teach only one semester and the other semester I do my own research . . . the frustration is when I'm [out of the country], the materials are not necessarily available . . . so I have to Xerox or scan them as much as possible.

But even geographical proximity cannot guarantee full text access to everything, as not every citation in a database will have the full text available:

The greatest frustration probably is in terms of journals ….That even though with the technology [I] no longer now need to go downstairs physically to the basement to look at older bound periodicals . . . many of them I could do it from my office here, but knowing there seems to be an excellent article, but you don't have access to it.

Other faculty members seemed comfortable using interlibrary loan, and indicated that they used this as another strategy for dealing with the library’s limited resources. As one
participant said, “We have so many electronic resources now available, and what we can’t get here we get through interlibrary loan.” Another acknowledged,

I am grateful, for example, when the interlibrary loan is there. The library gives the loan for one month, but you have taken effort in my case once, twice or thrice, calling the other library and saying that the borrower wants more extension. And you got extra. So you’ve gone and worked with the other library loosening up their rules, and that had happened three, four times for me.

Another strategy that faculty mentioned for gaining access to material that the library does not have in its collection was requesting book purchases. One participant told us:

I've never had any problem ordering books as you know from what comes over your desk. They order it quickly, they come in, you know, as long as you are sensible. You can't expect something to be in tomorrow. But they are ordered in or got in a couple of journals that will be good for my research, you know, and, again, I was reasonable in my expectations. I didn't expect every journal to suddenly appear. I asked for the top two. So, I would say, theologically, this library is superb. In terms of immigration studies, we're building. It really didn't have anything. There aren't that many faculty really in this area or any tangentially. There was some stuff I'm guessing through the Lesley [Library].

In addition to making purchase requests through the library, some faculty simply purchase their own copies of materials they want:

And often when I needed book, I'll actually buy it because I like to have it. I'm so pleased to see how you can find even obscure scholarly books on Amazon because when I use a book, I like to write in it.
When one faculty member who had expressed dissatisfaction with the quality of the collection recognized that this remediation of requesting book purchases was available to her she said that “[in the past] there really wouldn't be books that I needed and then I was thinking it's probably the fault of our department for not demanding certain things and not letting people know.”

One respondent expressed frustration that the library collection was simply not up to the standards that were necessary for faculty to conduct research. She said:

As a culture, we really need to look at the digital divide and how it is effecting scholars because, I swear to you, if you don't come from an institution that has an established major in your field, you're going to get left behind when the databases get chosen. So, I would like to see a world where universities understand that we're scholars trying to find something new. We're trying to teach people stuff. We are setting up a scholarship system of haves versus have-nots. We're setting up a system where scholars who are trying to do research are at the mercy of their institutions and the budgets of those institutions, where, if their institution does not privilege their particular major, there's not a lot of databases for that major.

**Collection Access**

Research support and access to materials are important components of library service. One faculty member had several suggestions regarding circulation, interlibrary loan, and copyright policies, all aimed at increasing materials availability. Lengthening the checkout period to a full semester would allow faculty more time to make use of borrowed materials, as would automatic renewal of items over interim or vacation periods. This could eliminate the
need for multiple renewals and items could be recalled if other faculty or students wanted to use them.

Another suggestion regarded ways to increase print journal usage. Most print journals are available on shelf and many of these are not available in electronic format, so access is somewhat restricted. Short term loan for faculty, particularly for those with offices in the library, would be a wonderful service. Check out for a day or two would be helpful as those researching journal literature are often browsing and don’t need much time to scan contents, read abstracts, or even read an article. The respondent noted how handy it would be to, “just bring it [the journal volume] up [to the office] and type a few things up there into the computer.”

Copyright flexibility is another concern for faculty members and librarians. Electronic reserve items, and even print items, are subject to copyright that can seem restrictive.

The discussion surrounding digital access and its implications for copyright, ownership, and pricing structures is lively. These issues in conjunction with the “open access” of many materials on the web, and the growing belief that information should be freely available is pitting authors, publishers and vendors against information seekers of all stripes. As students and faculty require easy access to materials, both on or off campus, resource sharing is a high priority.

In discussing collection access, the topic of distance learning looms large. Student populations at Lesley and EDS mirror the changing trends in higher education. In addition to the traditional full-time resident student, colleges are striving to meet a variety of needs: multiple campuses, worldwide distance learning programs, hybrid distance/on campus programs, part-time students, an increase in students who are the first in the family to attend college and nontraditional students. Providing access for students and faculty regardless of location has become a necessity. One faculty member describes the difficulty for students in hybrid programs:
But then after that [weeklong on campus component], they're long distance. We do tell them about library services and asking librarians things and they can use that through myLesley, but they probably don't use it that much.

The distance factor creates a demand for services that reach across the campus and across the world. Lesley’s low-residency programs and EDS’s distributed learning program offer students a blend of on and off-campus learning. Library instruction and orientation can take place during the in-residence portion of these programs, and further assistance and outreach is accomplished electronically. According to one faculty member:

Librarians actually do come into the classes and really--in the research one and in another course, I forget which one, they come in and they really teach the students how to use the databases and how to do because so much all the follow-up my students do is off campus. They've been doing it all at a distance so it's really helpful to have them come in and do that and that's a really important part.

Faculty had numerous suggestions for ways to further assist distance students: online webinars, study carrels for research when on campus, acquisition of more ebooks and ejournals, expansion of electronic access to dissertations, and broadening of ILL copyright restrictions.

Another population with hopes for better access to library resources is alumni. After graduation library access is limited, and this affects a graduate’s ability to continue to do research. It can also have an impact on how graduates feel about their schools. As one alumna and current faculty member told us:

When I was a graduate student I got to use it [the library] as much as I wanted, and when I graduated, all of a sudden I did not have access to it. So I went to the alumni relations
office, and they let me get books again, and that led to this whole wonderful sense of connection with the alumni relations office.

Borrowing print books is one thing, but one complaint was that the library does not provide online access to resources for students after they graduate:

One of the things I really try to do in my assignments to students is to encourage them to think of themselves as lifelong learners and in this day and age there's so much that we can learn online that they don't need to learn directly from me or anybody else … However, I do think it's limited by the fact that they can't access our databases after they leave us.

This perception is not entirely accurate, as some library resources have been made available to alumni through a partnership with the Alumni Office. Providing electronic access to all library resources for alumni would be prohibitively expensive for the library to undertake alone, and would require a consistent partnership beyond the library.

One respondent spoke about a potential role for faculty in working to expand the library's budget for collections:

If there’s a way for us to advocate for more money for the library, I don’t know what that will take but I think that there’s probably more money that can be used. So that should continue to be an important priority for the faculty and especially for faculty to advocate for; that would be something I’d like to see.

**Non-Library Resources**

Elsewhere in this report we have discussed faculty use of non-library resources. In evaluating these resources, faculty frequently expressed ambivalence. One participant said, “I think for my students, and frankly for myself, Wikipedia is a very easy answer to a lot of
questions, and even though I take it off limits for my students, they're often quite unclear as to why.” Another faculty member gave this explanation of the qualitative difference between library and non-library resources:

You can go to a website of, for example… the Center of Migration and Policies, or you can go to the Refugee Study Center in Oxford, and there are a whole load of decent resources -- but they're academically verified by being on the website -- and I sometimes use those kinds of papers. I should have mentioned that there will be links to the working papers that these institutes have published, or slightly more popular stuff, but still, I use it because it's gone through an institution that I trust. Rather than being Bob’s … he's got a blog up on whatever, and I have no idea who Bob is -- whether he has any background in this at all.

Implicit in this discussion is that library content generally has been “academically verified”. It seems important to note that with all that we heard from faculty about what is good and what needs improvement, no one questioned the authority of library-supplied content.

**Library Instruction and Research Support**

Library instruction is offered in numerous venues at the Sherrill Library. Traditional instruction is scheduled with librarians who walk students through the research process from start to finish, including formation of the research query, identifying, locating and evaluating resources, and proper citation formats. One faculty member describes how her division values library instruction,

I know that many of the faculty in our division continue to invite [the librarian] to come to their class to basically present a module or section on how to do library research, and [the librarian] has been wonderful in terms of our orientation course, which is the
gateway course for all of our incoming students, has essentially created the pathway for
doing the research project, Searchpath [online library tutorial], not to mention the
handout that [the librarian] very generously consistently provides us with updates on
every year as we do because things change in the library, and [the librarian] kind of
makes sure that we are always up to date with what is most current at the time. So I think
we feel that we benefit mightily from [the librarian’s] expertise.

Librarians bridge the distance divide with a variety of formats. The “Ask a Librarian” e-
mail service is a popular way for faculty and students to submit questions to a librarian without
having to enter the physical library. Practical questions such as library hours or quick citation
clarifications are intermingled with in depth research related queries. One frequent user states, “I
love their response time on the Ask-a-Librarian because I'm working at 3 in the morning and …
it's been wonderful to come back at 9:00 and there's your answer always.”

Classroom visits, “embedded” librarians, and online tutorials ensure that help is only a
click or a call away. As one participant said,

The instructional modules which we’ve designed some years ago, I think really benefitted
our students a lot. This is where students go to the library, they're introduced, they learn
how to go on the databases, make judgments about what might be worth using, what
might not be worth using, but they learn more about what plagiarism is and isn't, and it’s
very user-friendly.

Librarians as Resources

At the end of each interview we asked faculty members what they thought of the library,
and the answers they gave us were overwhelmingly positive. Many responses consisted of praise
for the library’s staff as well as for its resources and services, but some faculty described the library staff members themselves as resources. One interviewee had this to say:

I think the most important thing about libraries are human beings; we have tremendous librarians and I think that is … one of the gems of Lesley. And we have incredible resources, human resources in our library and social capital and the wealth of knowledge that is there isn't just for our students….

Others said “if there's a need, that need will be met with our library staff and facilities…we have a tremendous amount of resources available and the spirit of the library is so giving and generative.” We heard from another faculty member, who said that “every single person I've come in contact with has been eager to help me and …without exception people are patient, and I feel like people are here to serve the students and the faculty, to give us what we need and whatever way we need it.”

While many faculty members place a high value on the accessibility that e-resources can provide, there was also a concern that effectively navigating them might require the assistance of a librarian. One faculty member mentioned a preference for accessing e-resources from within the library building,

because when I get stuck with [an] abstract [then] I could run to one of you and see whether I can access [it]. Occasionally the library staff and [librarian] have helped me in logging in to one of the library things. And then look at the journal, whether somewhere else it’s available.

Addressing the issue of helping students use e-resources effectively, some faculty highlighted the importance of library instruction, especially for those students who live at a distance from campus and have to rely on e-resources. One interviewee mentioned that
in the PhD program, librarians actually do come into the classes ... they come in and they
really teach the students how to use the databases . . . because so much of the follow-up
my students do is off campus. They've been doing it all at a distance so it's really helpful
to have them come in and do that and that's a really important part. They [librarians]
actually do that for us we don't teach them that.

Faculty described some experiences in which the library staff took the lead, or a
librarian’s knowledge proved particularly helpful:

Our library was way ahead on the cutting edge of bringing it all in, and in creating
resources for us that we needed before we even knew we needed them, this library staff
was incredibly intelligent, dedicated and responsive people. [They] clearly leveraged [our
minimal resources] to huge capabilities for us.

In many instances, librarians are seen as collaborators and experts. In the words of one
participant,

I think it's a real partnership and that's made a huge difference. And I don't think it's like
this at other university libraries, I really don't. But I've just never worked with people
who are so responsive and actually ahead of the rest of us many times. They're teaching
new things.

While some faculty members have made these strong connections with librarians as
resources, others seemed unsure about exactly who to go to:

There should be somebody I can come to over here and put all my needs on the table and
set up a trusting relationship with them. Not that I need to be pampered, but I need to
know somebody can help me.
Many respondents praised the responsiveness of librarians and library staff, but one faculty member mentioned that “I still expect the library to be pestering me to know what they can be doing for me.”

In one instance, we heard from one faculty who felt that our strength was not in her particular subject area. When asked what she thought of the library, she said “Iffy, and I say that kindly . . . I don't think they're experts in my subject area.” She added,

They've been wonderful to me any time I've ever asked them. I've had a couple of problems, but in general, I found them very sweet but not experts. They'll get it as the major is around longer. I'm sure if I asked a question about education or counseling or science, I'd get much more.

In exploring how faculty felt about the resources available to them through the library, we found that most of our interviewees are satisfied with what is available, many know how to ask for resources not immediately available, and some know how to use the larger metropolitan area libraries and broader Internet universe to supplement what is available here. In addition, many on the faculty see the library staff as a resource in and of itself. In a few cases, faculty members have judged content and librarians inadequate to meet the research needs in their particular fields of study.

**Technology in the Library**

As technology rapidly advances, Lesley and EDS faculty have a growing need for technology training and troubleshooting, especially since many face considerable time and distance constraints. The faculty survey generated a great deal of discussion about the difficulty of keeping abreast of technological products, services and skills, as well as who is responsible for helping faculty do so -- the library? eLIS? IT? colleagues? Interview responses also showed
that our faculties have a range of ability, desire, and interest in technology, and that technology affects their research habits in different ways. Faculty articulated a variety of issues they face in the integration of technology and scholarship.

**Approaches to Technology**

Faculty members have embraced technology, but mentioned only using the tools they felt were both beneficial and easy to master for their teaching, research, and collaboration needs. The most tech-savvy faculty felt they were ahead of the curve because their discipline required it. One faculty member said, “I get a lot of regular updates on new developments, and I take a look at ones that are interesting and see whether I can really integrate them into my life, coursework and research, or not.” Faculty appreciated that web tools allow for greater collaborative research, and they expressed a belief that the web will become “increasingly important” for research.

Many faculty members, however, admitted that the online environment is overwhelming because there is so much information out there, and that it was difficult to keep track of it. One faculty member said:

> We're bombarded with information like we never have been before, but I feel like there's so much that I'm not on top of because I don't have the time to read the articles, the books, or to watch the videos, and my students are missing out because of that.

A portion of the faculty was somewhat reluctant to embrace new technologies. They felt overwhelmed by the possibilities, unable to find the time to hone their skills, and doubtful that the time investment was worthwhile, given their time constraints. Some faculty members mentioned reasons for not learning or using new tech tools, including their lack of time, busy schedules, and need for help. More than one faculty member said that they learn new technologies only as necessary: “I learn when someone asks me to.”
Even faculty members who did not consider themselves tech savvy, however, mentioned using a variety of tools from email to social media and Skype. Some faculty members admitted that they learn from their students or their students’ suggestions. Many participants felt that their students are more comfortable with technology than they are but are not always sure of the value. For students’ scholarly products, tools used to create presentations and visuals seemed to have a limited place; one faculty member cautioned her students not to get too caught up with the “glossy-cuties” because something can be very “visually appealing,” yet “superficial” and “not based in solid scholarship.” Another faculty member said, “digital methods are tools to help you in learning, they don’t replace learning.”

Many respondents mentioned using email regularly, both as a tool to share articles and links with peers and as a means of regular communication. One faculty member mentioned the societal trends related to technology, saying face-to-face communication, and even phone communication, are “quite rare.” According to her, Skype and Facebook are replacing face-to-face interaction among her students and colleagues. She added, it is now “more common to email or text someone first.” Other faculty members who were aware of new web tools still relied mainly on email for sharing and MS Word for editing.

One faculty member said, “Skype is such a good way to work. There's something extra about seeing people and seeing each other.”

Some participants said they felt pressured to keep up with technology trends. They lamented the loss of familiar teaching and research strategies, recognizing that an outdated skill set can have a direct impact on their marketability. For many, keeping up with technology is a daunting task. One faculty member’s summation reflects the concern of many survey respondents,
All of the things that we've been involved with administratively in terms of outcomes and program planning and switching courses to an online format, what has been lost is an ability to stay abreast of things in any way. . . I don't know how much the library could solve that because that's just a systemic issue. But that's a barrier. I'm using the same videos only, and they're like from 2007 because I don't have a second.

To conduct research in an online environment, the majority of faculty members mentioned using library databases. One faculty member said, “If database research is where things are, then, by God, I'm going to be the best database researcher you ever saw because I want to model that for my students.”

Some faculty members felt they were skilled online researchers, meaning they could search effectively in various databases and could use a variety of web tools -- though they admitted that they could afford to learn to search more deeply or use new tools. Other faculty members said they knew enough to get by; one said it was “trial and error,” and she figured it out on her own, but would like a tutorial. Still others mentioned they needed help, but for various reasons they did not get help, including being afraid to ask questions or not knowing who to ask.

There were mentions that the online research environment was “overwhelming,” “random,” and “intimidating.” One faculty member said, “I'm sometimes concerned, as a need for myself, that there are so many things out there that it becomes confusing.” Another faculty member described it as random:

Because it ends up being to me when I actually access [it], it's a very random collection…I've tried to systematize my blog reading through things like Google Reader, and then I just get overwhelmed with things in Google Reader…when I see something I think is interesting, I think, ‘I should put this in my reader, and then I should read it, and I
want to read it.’ And I end up having 100,000 things there, and then I can't; then it becomes just as pointless as the entire Internet is.

Some participants mentioned that they did ask librarians to assist them in research. They were comfortable researching, but knew they could get help to search more effectively. Others said they wanted help learning how to use specific tools and expressed an interest in training and assistance from the library and possibly eLIS. They recognized the potential of the tools and resources, but were frustrated by the difficulty of efficiently searching. One faculty member said, “I know I could be using this library better -- the librarians and your electronic resources … Maybe you can put me in touch with somebody on how I can do that.”

There were some mentions of e-books; more than one faculty member felt concerned or uncomfortable about the progression towards online books. One said the layout often suffered, and on Kindles, page numbers were not retained. Another faculty member was afraid of losing information or being unable to access information if it was only available in a digital format. The other comments were from faculty members who had e-readers, though one did not like to read books electronically, and the other had not figured out how to download e-books from the library onto the iPad.

One faculty member said, “I like to have things digitally,” but she also admitted she’s “hopeless” at digital note-making and printed things out to edit. Other faculty members who did embrace technology admitted that they still preferred print books. “I'm not wild about e-books. I just don't really like reading books electronically. I don't purchase them on my iPad, I don't enjoy it but like touching the book.” Another example was a faculty member who preferred using the physical library art collection instead of the art image database:
I appreciate the online facet of it [the library], but I haven't investigated it enough to
know how to use it in my life yet, and I've been stumped a little bit by the sort of ‘not-
intuitiveness’ of certain things that I've used, and so, I tend to rely on the physical
because I can…it takes me an hour to go to ARTstor and pull the 80 some odd
images…or if I can walk to the library and grab it off the shelf. There’s the ease of use
factor there that I like.

There were some mentions of using online video clips, and more than one reference to
making online clips for classes. One faculty member who tried to make video clips was not as
successful as she could have been because she had to learn a few things to do it. She said, “With
all the library resources I use, the more you have to take some time to learn something, then the
less often I’m going to use it, or be successful with it.” Other faculty appreciated both streaming
videos and the tools that allow them to create short clips, post them and have students access
them outside of class time. “A model that I just discovered they have a lot of: their child
development videos that are available online now with, I can't remember which source they're
from, but with the capability that you can view the video and make your own clip and save the
clip so you can take a 10-minute segment that applies to something instead of having to watch or
scroll through in your class and waste time.”

Training and Support

In one interview, a faculty member wondered, “Who do you ask for support in accessing
or understanding any of these sorts of technological areas or futures?” Faculty specifically
mentioned online tutorials such as Searchpath as being helpful for both students and faculty:
“There are so many riches in myLibrary, and once the game begins students use Searchpath; it’s
wonderful. “
Beyond online tutorials, faculty mentioned the availability of individual librarians to provide one-on-one training; they also expressed the desire for scheduled training programs. As suggested here, availability extends to both faculty and students: “[The librarian] has started offering office hours on that [Blackboard Instant Messaging] which is instant messaging that you can use the white board in there at the same time.” The option for one-on-one training from a librarian was mentioned by another faculty member: “I know I can call [librarian] and ask for a private tour and she will do that.” While all of these opportunities exist already, some faculty members would like more. “It's like the library helps us [find resources] but then we don't have a way to create collective memory of them that we can refer back to. We're always starting over again.”

There were many different ways faculty suggested additional training could be created. Suggesting scheduled training sessions, one respondent said, “So I think if there were more frequent opportunities for me to schedule, like, a meeting, training—an advanced training, or a refresher training, I would do that because I would just treat it like an appointment rather than me sort of tinkering around on my own.”

Embedding training programs in larger faculty events was another suggestion:

I think if there's a way to do somehow more for faculty training, and what more means I don't exactly know. I sometimes feel frustrated that on Community of Scholars Day or Faculty Development Day the library gets a session but it's against something else. I want the library to have its own session that isn’t against something or if there's going to be a workshop on how to use the iPad for X technology, or an introduction to the new databases, or refresher on science index database.
Many faculty look to the library for support when the access to information requires using technology tools effectively. One faculty member looking for “brush up’ sessions at the library had this to say:

I think you guys should even do a workshop for professors …. It would be like brush up on the Sherrill Library website. Brush up on how you use the databases. I'd be here in a heartbeat. I would be because you do get new things [the librarian] sends them out. And then, you know, in the flurry of teaching and grading and life, they get stuck in the inbox, looked at once with a flag saying read again and then lost. Or even have it in the summer.

So, it's not like during school time. I would definitely come.

Technology services in support of off-campus and out-of-the-library users were also mentioned in interviews. In addition to BlackBoard Instant Messaging, respondents mentioned specific services such as electronic delivery of articles and streaming video delivery. They also mentioned “the value were there to be four-minute webinars, five-minute webinars that students could look at that spoke about searching for the journals.”

Web access is the common denominator for the college and university communities. Social media, databases, online collection and resource sharing create ways for the academic community to research, publish, learn, and share expertise. One role for the library and librarians in this universe is as “gatekeepers.” A respondent values this role:

Once I get an idea of what's out there, I like to contact librarians because they're the ones that know. They're like the gatekeepers. So I speak with a librarian, explain what I'm looking for, where I want to go and often I get new directions, new sources. So, you know, that's a really helpful tool in my research.
Additionally, as faculty and students strive to keep up with changing trends in technology and information sharing, they become, by default, lifelong learners. One respondent feels that the online environment encourages this pattern:

One of the things I really try to do in my assignments to students is to encourage them to think of themselves as lifelong learners. And in this day and age there's so much that we can learn online that they don't need to learn directly from me or anybody else.

The powerful pairing of web resources and librarians’ expertise in guiding students and faculty in their use creates a dynamic learning opportunity for the EDS and Lesley communities.

**Social Media and Communication**

Love them or hate them, social media technologies have become part of the scholarly landscape. The majority of faculty members were familiar with tools such as Facebook and Twitter, though for some they were more of a distraction than a help. Some participants mentioned using Facebook with students for a specific class, including creating a Facebook page for the class. More than one faculty member said that they used it to share articles and to collaborate with peers; one faculty member said she used it to publicize her book. Several other faculty members said they did not use Facebook, and gave reasons ranging from hating it to being too busy to use it. One faculty member said, “I hate Facebook. I’m not recommending it, but the students read it.” Some faculty members have accounts but do not use them. In addition, there were several mentions of Twitter, which more than one faculty member said they used; one used it for “following others’ research.” By contrast, one faculty said of Twitter, “I can't even go there because I'll lose my mind or get completely obsessed with it, and my mind will be reduced to a certain number of characters.”
While there were faculty members with accounts who did not use them frequently, others used social media for specific classes, to find shared articles, or to collaborate on research. Some commenters mentioned the need for caution when using social media because it was “more personal” and there were “weird things” out there. Another faculty member said she discouraged it because “it behooves teachers not to be in a situation where they can be compromised,” and there was no clear boundary with social media, in addition, you “can’t ascertain the psychic sophistication of the student.”

Many faculty members belonged to listservs; they frequently used some version of videoconferencing such as Skype or iChat. Other faculty members enjoyed voice-recording capabilities such as Voice Thread and voice recording/messaging through Blackboard, in addition to cloud computing.

I definitely use Cloud computing, for example, my book that I edited with [a colleague]. We did it all over Dropbox and Wiki, since we weren't in the same country. In my class, I use a lot of what's on myLesley as a complement for teaching, so this semester, my students have blogs. We use Twitter in my social media class. I use Diigo, it's sort of a collaborative bookmarking website, in my...class.

Skype was mentioned by several different faculty members, all in a positive sense; they used it for meetings and for working with students. One said, “I think that Skype has been really helpful, and e-mail has been really helpful to me for research collaborations.” There were several mentions of blogs; some faculty members used blogs in their classes; one mentioned reading blogs. On the other hand, one faculty member commented that she purposely did not use blogs; she only used “peer-reviewed things.” There were some references to wikis; one faculty member used wikis in the doctoral classes and another used a wiki to collaborate with a peer on a book as
previously mentioned. Another faculty member said she attempted to use a wiki and Google docs to share documents, but it did not work very well in her experience. Some faculty members said they did not use social media such as Facebook and Twitter at all.

Another faculty member, speaking more broadly, theorized that she might be limited by her lack of technological expertise:

I know there are all kinds of ways to do that, you know, electronically and I like to share things, but I’m not that sophisticated a tech person so I would just either save the link or save the article in a file and then I would just sent it by email to people.

In this instance, the speaker seemed concerned about various technologies that she may not be aware of; at the same time, even as she said that she was “not that sophisticated” when it comes to technology, she made it clear that many of her collaborative efforts happen digitally, with the technologies that she knew well, such as saving links and files, and e-mailing. At least one other faculty member also cited e-mail as an accessible tool for faculty collaboration.

Clearly, faculty members do see technological tools as key elements of their research and collaboration, even if some don’t consider themselves particularly expert or adept with computer technology in general.

**Facilities**

Faculty members were initially asked what they think of the library without defining the meaning of “library.” Their responses suggested that libraries are both physical and digital. Because the physical libraries and library centers of both Episcopal Divinity School and Lesley University have undergone so many changes recently, we also wanted to understand why faculty did or did not visit the physical library, and what they did when they came to the buildings that house the physical collections and staff. We wanted to know if and how faculty members used
our physical library spaces. We heard from faculty who expressed an intangible attachment to the physical aspect of the library as an institution. They spoke also about the fragmentation of the campus and the impact of and on library locations. In addition, faculty had many comments about how they used the facilities and how they encouraged their students to use them.

**The “Library as Place”**

Faculty respondents in our interviews were most eloquent when they spoke about what the physical library meant to them. Words like “home” and “safe space” were used as in this sample:

I'm very fond of it. It feels like home. It is a very safe space, but it's also a space that I feel I have access to in a way that is very constructive to the work that I'm doing, both as a teacher, faculty member and in my own modest research areas. It has changed over the years, but it remains a hospitable space and place for me.

Faculty associated spending time in the library with their core personalities when they said, “To me, it’s essential to life, like I can't live without a library I mean literally it's just part of the weave of who I am; I have to go a certain amount of times a week.” and “I probably come to the library most for wanting to see what's new and just to get my fix.”

Some participants have linked their physical presence in the building with physical and visceral reactions. One faculty member commented:

There's the tactile experience, and so that for me it’s very important about a physical library. I get crazy when you start talking about ‘oh libraries can be a thing of past; the physical books are going to be worthless.’ That just makes me insane. I love being in those texts, I would miss it. I love walking into the children's room and just sitting there. So I really appreciated all of that about our library.
We found it interesting that at least three separate faculty members commented on the actual smell of books when they said: “I like the library. I like the physical part of the library. I like the smell of books. It's great to curl up in the winter here, like to come and just read and grade papers.” One of these respondents expressed it this way:

And it may just seem like, in the scheme of things, these considerations might seem less important, the smell of the book, the musky library, the fact that you open up a book, and yes, someone did write in it, but its faded and the book was maybe published in 1940 and you think ‘gee, this looks like it's been here forever’ and it has, you think, ‘that's kind of cool.’ You know someone probably read this in the 50's. And it just gives you a sense of being part of a tradition. Something on going, so it connects you with that in time. And these are subtle things admittedly, but I think, I think there is something to that.

This olfactory experience was a reminder for some faculty of the difference between the virtual world and this more tangible world:

I tend to like this a lot, and I think it's a good thing to maintain: to not just see the library as a building where you don't really need to be because you have the Internet, but rather see it as a place where there's all this information, and you can have tangible information. So you can actually hold on to something and sometimes, you know, the books smell a certain way which is very valuable. I try to relate that to the students so that this generation, which is not far away from mine, but it's still quite different will appreciate the fact that we do have libraries, and we'll still have libraries even if technology advances more and more.
Library Locations

Change is not easy, and adjusting to the changes of relocating Lesley’s library was difficult for some faculty members who taught on the Doble Campus and at University Hall on the Porter Campus. In addition, faculty at the Art Institute of Boston will be moving from Boston to the Porter Campus in January 2015. Amidst all these changes, some have found a fragmented and decentralized university life while others have come to appreciate new locations and new facilities.

Among the faculty who saw the campus as decentralized and the library as fragmented, one respondent said she wished that all service centers were in the same place and found it awkward that the Kresge Library Media Center and Sherrill Library’s main physical collections are in separate locations. This was illustrated in one exchange between an interviewer and a respondent:

Faculty: And sometimes I call Kresge because it's not all, you know, print, and I find that a little awkward, it's not the same. I wish everything was in the same place, but because it's not, right, it moves around.

Interviewer: Well, when we moved here [Sherrill Library], Kresge moved to Porter, so there has been, there is a physical separation, but Kresge is still part of the library.

Faculty: Right, right. I guess that's just a personal thing.

One faculty member mentioned the problem of being "silied" here at Lesley, and another summarized the situation this way: “I think the biggest challenge is that we're a decentralized campus in every way. And that we’ve got the four different local campuses as well as an off-campus program, you know, and I teach a lot in the off-campus program.”
For AIB faculty, “the library is the heart of the building.” In addition, they told us, “My job would be difficult, bordering on impossible if the library weren't actually in the building.” They are pleased with the design of the new AIB space on the Porter Campus, saying “I'm quite happy that AIB is keeping the library in the new building. It's our own AIB library in the new building. And I just wanted to say that out loud because I think that connects up some -- the proximity thing, especially for the people who are more visually oriented, the ability to just put it in front of them.”

A few Lesley faculty members found the new campus and the new library location to be positive. One faculty member said,

I like this campus a lot. I find it beautiful. I love the big old buildings, it's spooky. It has all that great college-type thing. And then also when you want to get away, Harvard Square's ten minutes away, you get lost then in all the noise and the people -- then come back. I'm envious that people have their offices on this campus.

Some acknowledged the distance, but didn’t find it problematic; as one faculty member noted, “I love going over to Brattle. If it’s cold and raining, I don't love going over to Brattle, but usually it's nice to walk over there, and you guys have the best food on campus, too, at Washburn [Hall].” Faculty members who have moved their offices to the Brattle Campus also found the location suited them: “The proximity for us now is so great and to be able to, you know, our cars are parked here, the library is right across from our office. I find that a great luxury.”

Lesley faculty who had offices and taught on other campuses felt the separation from their library. They have told us:
I just want to say I miss, even though the library does not compare to the old one, I do miss it as I went into the library every single day so I used it a lot. I just don't have the opportunity to get there very often. But I do love it.

Another said:

I think I share some feelings about the library that I'm sure you've heard before. The geographical thing is very difficult, and it's made me lose contact with my live wires over here. And I feel badly about that. I'd like to improve on that, but … All my traffic is up to Porter and I'm hustling like crazy just to keep that traffic pattern manageable.

Respondents have said that the new location of the library on the Brattle Campus is difficult for several reasons. The shuttle schedule, the lack of parking and the amount of time it took to travel between campuses were all issues that caused faculty to stay away from the building. One participant said:

When the library was here like on the Doble Campus, I just about lived there. I was there on a regular basis. Now that they've moved over to Sherrill, it's really hard for me to get there. The shuttles do not run very often. Parking over there is just absolutely brutal. I do go over there sometimes. But by and large, I live on the databases.

Faculty also voiced concerns about part-time students trying to fit education into their busy lives:

My students don't use it because this [Porter Campus] is where they can park and they have trouble getting to a 4 o'clock class because they're teaching. So then they get to a 4 o'clock class. They may be staying for another class; they may not, but they've been at school since 7 in the morning, and there's no parking over there, so to wait for the shuttle bus to go over, to come back, again, it's just not realistic in their lives either. And if we
had more full-time students it would be, but in the Graduate School of Education most of our students are part-time and they're working full-time and they have families.

One faculty member had an interesting perspective on why so many faculty members were disenchanted with the library’s new location. She said:

I think, you know, people have complained about it being so out of the way, but you know I think it's what you're used to. When it was here, they could slip in, but we're getting to be a bigger place now and you just have to walk. You know, in a bigger place, you just have to walk 10 or 15 minutes to go to the library. It's not as convenient as coming downstairs . . . I understand that is because it's a shock from what they're used to. It's kind of a sign of a bigger Lesley, and I think new people who come don't give it a second thought, so I think it was painful in the beginning. I'm not sure it's painful now.

Another interviewee proposed the idea of holding faculty seminars at the library, . . . or people giving papers and writing articles could make a presentation on their work. That would be really raising the bar here about what's going on. This should be a center of intellectual activity. Not just processing stuff--a center of intellectual vitality. The library should do that. And we have a little bit of a problem because of the geography. So we're going to have to work on that.

**Library Facilities**

Still, faculty used the building for its library collections and services and for its classroom. Some faculty members had a list of reasons for coming to the building like this: “I come here to select specific books . . . to browse through the educational materials in the children's area, the Finnegan section. I come here sometimes just to come here and use the computer to do a search” or this:
I come to the library for books. I come to the library to use, for teaching and for my own research. I come to the library to use the classroom in the lower level and using Mac laptops. I come to the library to use the antique books in the archive.

High on the list of reasons that faculty came to the building was peace and quiet. For example, one faculty member said

I think sometimes I will come here just to get out of my office where I know the phone won't ring. Literally, I can read this article in my office or come over here and find a chair some place and no one will know I'm here. Just kind of, okay, I need to be able to concentrate on this, so having access to that kind of space for that reason is wonderful.

Very often, the peace and quiet afforded faculty a place to get work done, as one faculty indicated,

I do come to the library and I do work there down in the basement area because it's a really quiet, it's nice and clean and I like spending time down there and I usually just bring my own laptop and do my work down there. And I'll browse through their materials, and access a lot of things online for me.

Faculty members have also discovered study carrels, as this faculty told us:

So I like to use one of the little cubicles, the carrels that you have on the second and third floors. When I know that I can concentrate, you know, and nobody will be just walking by all the time. I will be a little bit more remote from other people.

Sometimes the peace and quiet was valued for the opportunity to reflect, as another faculty member noted,
Personally, I like being at the library, even if I'm not really going to the stacks, but at least being at the library and knowing that this is where I'm going to do some thinking -- some reflection and then proceed with whatever the research is.

Another reason that many respondents said they came to the library was the browsability of the physical environment that seems to be missing in the online environment. One faculty member said:

I also have this thing about serendipity. I feel like one of the things that the Internet is removing is serendipity. And for example, if I'm looking for books on a certain topic, I'll find the call number for that area, and then I go to that bookshelf. And I just kind of browse, because you never know; there might be some really great book that will jump out at you that wasn't on your list during your research. And that can be very serendipitous. And with the -- as you do all your research online, you don't set yourself up for that type of discovery.

The difference between wandering the stacks and searching online was also noted by one faculty member who said:

We're in the digital age; you can get anything you want, like really, you can just sit here. But I have to know what it is I want, and I'm so often in a space where I need to be led. What I love about going to the physical space is I think I'm looking for this, but then right next to that is this. So, looking in the dictionary and then you are sort of seeing all these connections that I can't make alone; I can't be sitting alone knowing every little thing that I need to look for, and I actually find that really burdensome sometimes. It's the reason I love bookstores too, especially like messy second hand ones because it's all the
happenstance and the serendipity that I love that leads me to, you know, all the connections that I make and discoveries. So it's essential for discovery.

Faculty members also recommended this approach to students, saying, “Browsing the stacks is a technique I've always told students to do. You know, if your topic is here, look here or here, and look up and look up and down because who knows.” In fact, faculty had many things to say about getting their students to visit the physical library. Regardless of location, distance, or other factors, most faculty members realized the benefits for students who use the physical library, including getting in-person reference assistance, discovering the invaluable in the stacks, working in groups with peers, and unplugging from the outside world. The challenge was getting students to the library.

One faculty member encouraged her students to visit the library, telling them to treat it as “some adventurous journey.” Several faculty members shared this sentiment; another said, “It’s just that the more ways we can bring students in there [into the library] and to connect them to the resources, the better.” Another respondent wanted to see her students in the library, and said, “I realize I'm just old fashioned, but I'd like to see these students over here more sitting, reading, using the computers.”

There was an interesting discussion during one focus group about requiring ID cards for swipe access to the library. Currently, the building is open-access. One respondent said students can be trained to always have their ID cards with them, so it would not be a problem, and said “it doesn't have to do necessarily with the size [of the school] that much, but rather the habit [of teaching students to carry their IDs].” In addition, it is a “privilege.” This faculty member thought if library access was exclusive, then perhaps more students would visit to take advantage of this privilege; however, many students do not carry their ID cards; some do not even get ID
cards. Implementing swipe access could be very problematic, especially for those who are accessing the building to attend class.

This discussion, however, led to questions about library usage overall. One faculty member asked, “What I'd like to know is if there are statistics here, since the library moved [to Brattle]. Is it getting more or less use than when it was here [at Doble]?” Library personnel agreed that the library may be getting less traffic overall, but it is difficult to measure precisely because both the current and former buildings also housed classrooms.

Also important to faculty were the teaching spaces both in the library itself and in the building. One faculty member commented, “Having these good alternate learning spaces that are in proximity of the librarians themselves, and in our case are in proximity of the classrooms that we use, that really is very wonderful.” The opportunity to conduct classes in close proximity to scholarly resources was important also, as another faculty member noted, “I'm teaching research methods in the fall, and I'm trying to get a classroom here, because it just seems so logical to have a research methods class in the library where the research is.” Finally, some respondents commented that the library has exhibits and events that are well worth coming to see and participate in.

**Traditional Library / Nontraditional Campus**

The college learning community is continually evolving with its combination of resident students with digital access, distance and distributed programs with infrequent campus presence, and online classes. Technology enables student research and learning across these venues but also presents challenges. Many faculty members cited the increasing number of part-time students and increased time constraints as important factors influencing the ability to shape and direct learning and research skills.
Demographic trends will have an increasing impact on the makeup of the student population. Birthrates are declining; the need for an educated population is rising and lifelong learning is becoming the norm. Universities will have to craft educational programs and services to meet the needs of these “nontraditional” student populations in the coming years. The need for part-time learning, distance learning, online learning, and intermittent learning opportunities will require higher education to meet these needs with flexible education opportunities and environments. The nature of research and the application of student learning in the workplace will have a direct impact on student teaching and learning and research in the years ahead.
Key Issues and Implications

While this study has explored faculty information needs from their perspective, it has given us a stronger picture of where the library meets these needs and where we can improve. More broadly, the library can share this information with other campus units that will be able to find opportunities to develop new and better services.

Resources

While many were satisfied with the resources and resource options that the library provides, this is not universally true. Building new subject area collections is more expensive than maintaining existing areas. The library could explore possible additional sources of funding from other administrative units for resources in new and underserved majors.

Because lifelong learning is so strongly endorsed by the faculty, alumni access to library resources has been mentioned frequently. In many cases, providing this access is prohibitively expensive and partnering with other campus units to identify appropriate alumni resources and provide access or access options should be revisited.

There was a lack of clarity among faculty over how resources are selected for the library’s collection and how faculty members can have input. The library needs to create a more transparent collection development policy and document and disseminate procedures for receiving faculty input.

Services

The most successful and satisfied faculty members were those who knew and had established a relationship with their library liaisons. Until very recently, liaison responsibility was exclusively focused on monograph selection. We are beginning to broaden liaison
responsibilities and need to create more visibility as well as a service menu that we can provide to faculty and tailor to individual needs.

We need to make sure that any faculty member or student who wants to work with a librarian knows how they can make a connection. Creating a connection can be as simple as sending an e-mail to our Ask a Librarian service—but, even though this service is well used, perhaps there is a barrier that prevents some from trying.

There was some discussion of rubrics that faculty members use in evaluating student research projects. Working with faculty members to identify the library element in these rubrics would help the library create the collections and services that will support student learning.

From a library point-of-view, we may worry about too much pestering, and filling inboxes with e-mails that never get a response, but we need to keep the information flowing steadily, so that the library does come to mind at a point-of-need. The library should use every opportunity to broadcast information about services and resources. Use of the curriculum committees to receive as well as disseminate information should be encouraged.

Some mention was made of librarians not necessarily having subject expertise. We would like to encourage faculty support to help librarians develop this subject expertise.

A common complaint among faculty members dealt with the continuing flood of information. Also mentioned was the difficulty of sharing information among faculty members with common interests. One faculty suggestion was to harness larger community resources to create information alerting and filtering capabilities. While no obvious solutions are immediately apparent, this would be an interesting task for the library to monitor.
New faculty have asked questions in the course of our interviews and focus groups that suggest that library orientation should be more fully developed and should be administered by each library liaison.

Some comments pointed to the potential value of more detailed library instruction for faculty. One interviewee described her frustration with an image search in ArtSTOR, and mentioned that she had better search results using Google. A small typing mistake might have distorted the search results in this instance; helping faculty and students become more confident about searching in the library’s databases might encourage them to persevere when using them, instead of turning to Google.

A variety of different models for training were suggested by faculty members. Some suggested that learning at the point of need worked best for them. Others were hoping for regularly scheduled programs on a broad range of library issues. Webinars and how-to videos also had some support. Our most successful approach to the variety of training options is to be coordinated in identifying and advertising opportunities.

**Technology**

Some of the training the library needs to orchestrate is focused on how to use library resources and tools. Much of the use of our library resources and tools is dependent on a broader set of technologies. In addition, faculty said they were often confused about whom to call for help. Partnering across campus with a group of technology providers such as eLIS and IT would provide great value for faculty.

Faculty members said that they used Google Scholar and that their students used Google Scholar. We can guess that the expedience of one simple search across many data sources was
one of the desirable features. Technology services that match Google scholar but apply to library resources exclusively would go far to help bring users back into the universe of library content.

**Issues in scholarly communication**

Conversations with faculty members gave rise to questions on topics that library science professionals have explored in scholarly ways that are akin to our faculty colleagues. These are areas of discussion where the library can lead and / or participate in dialogue and would demonstrate value both in educating faculty and creating a collegial relationship. Some of these topics include open access publishing, copyright law, the use of Wikipedia, and the nature of research.

We also see varying strategies among faculty for teaching information literacy and correct citation usage and there is value in having a conversation with faculty around who is responsible for this citation training and information literacy and how librarians can collaborate in designing options for this student training.

**Future research**

Following on this study, we can imagine a more comprehensive analysis of student behaviors including writing and research, and the use of technology to study, research, create, store and share students work.

We are also beginning to see faculty choose alternatives to the traditional research paper and we would like to partner with the faculty to explore evaluation methods beyond that kind of assignment, and the library’s role in providing appropriate resources and services.
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Appendix I: Source Materials

Association of Theological Schools Standard, Section 4

4 Library and information resources

The library is a central resource for theological scholarship and education. It is integral to the purpose of the school through its contribution to teaching, learning, and research, and it functions collaboratively in curriculum development and implementation. The library’s educational effectiveness depends on the quality of its information resources, staff, and administrative vision. To accomplish its mission, the library requires appropriate financial, technological, and physical resources, as well as a sufficient number of personnel. Its mission and complement of resources should align with the school’s mission and be congruent with the character and composition of the student body.

4.1 Library collections

4.1.1 Theological study requires extensive encounter with historical and contemporary texts. While theological education is informed by many resources, the textual tradition is central to theological inquiry. Texts provide a point of entry to theological subject matter as well as a place of encounter with it. Theological libraries serve the church by preserving its textual tradition for the current and future needs of faculty, students, and researchers.

4.1.2 To ensure effective growth of the collection, schools shall have an appropriate collection development policy. Collections in a theological school shall hold materials of importance for theological study and the practice of ministry, and they shall represent the historical breadth and confessional diversity of Christian thought and life. The collection shall include relevant materials from cognate disciplines and basic texts from other religious traditions.
and demonstrate sensitivity to issues of diversity, inclusiveness, and globalization to ensure access to the variety of voices that speak to theological subjects.

4.1.3 Because libraries seek to preserve the textual tradition of the church, they may choose to build unique special collections, such as institutional, regional, or denominational archives.

4.1.4 In addition to print materials, collections shall include other media and electronic resources as appropriate to the curriculum and provide access to relevant remote databases.

4.1.5 The library should promote coordinated collection development with other schools to provide stronger overall library collections.

4.2 Contribution to learning, teaching, and research

4.2.1 The library accomplishes its teaching responsibilities by meeting the bibliographic needs of the library’s patrons; offering appropriate reference services; providing assistance and training in using information resources and communication technologies; and teaching information literacy, including research practices of effectively and ethically accessing, evaluating, and using information. The library should collaborate with faculty to develop reflective research practices throughout the curriculum and help to serve the information needs of faculty, students, and researchers.

4.2.2 The library promotes theological learning by providing instructional programs and resources that encourage students and graduates to develop reflective and critical research and communication practices that prepare them to engage in lifelong learning.

4.2.3 Theological research is supported through collection development and information technology and by helping faculty and students develop research skills.
4.2.4 The library should provide physical and online environments conducive to learning and scholarly interaction.

4.3 Partnership in curriculum development

4.3.1 The library collaborates in the school’s curriculum by providing collections and services that reflect the institution’s educational goals.

4.3.2 Teaching faculty should consult with library staff to ensure that the library supports the current curriculum and the research needs of faculty and students. Library staff should participate in long-range curriculum planning and anticipate future intellectual and technological developments that might affect the library.

4.4 Administration and leadership

4.4.1 In freestanding theological schools, the chief library administrator has overall responsibility for library administration, collection development, and effective educational collaboration. The chief administrator of the library should participate in the formation of institutional policy regarding long-range educational and financial planning and should ordinarily be a voting member of the faculty. Normally, this person should possess graduate degrees in library science and in theological studies or another pertinent discipline.

4.4.2 When a theological library is part of a larger institutional library, a theological librarian should provide leadership in theological collection development, ensure effective educational collaboration with the faculty and students in the institution’s theological school, and ordinarily be a voting member of the theological faculty.

4.4.3 The library administrator should exercise responsibility for regular and ongoing evaluation of the collection, the patterns of use, services provided by the library, and library personnel.
4.4.4 Schools shall provide structured opportunities to theological librarians for professional development and, as appropriate, contribute to the development of theological librarianship.

4.5 Resources

4.5.1 Each school shall have the resources necessary for the operation of an adequate library program. These include financial, technological, and physical resources and sufficient personnel.

4.5.2 The professional and support staff shall be of such number and quality as are needed to provide the necessary services, commensurate with the size and character of the institution. Professional staff shall possess the skills necessary for information technology, collection development and maintenance, and public service. Insofar as possible, staff shall be appointed with a view toward diversity in race, ethnicity, and gender. Where appropriate, other qualified members of the professional staff may also have faculty status. Institutions shall affirm the freedom of inquiry necessary for the role of professional librarians in theological scholarship.

4.5.3 An adequate portion of the annual institutional educational and general budget shall be devoted to the support of the library. Adequacy will be evaluated in comparison with other similar institutions as well as by the library's achievement of its own objectives as defined by its collection development policy.

4.5.4 Adequate facilities include sufficient space for readers and staff, adequate shelving for the book collection, appropriate space for nonprint media, adequate and flexible space for information technology, and climate control for all materials, especially rare books. Collections should be easily accessible and protected from deterioration, theft, and other threats.
4.5.5 Adequacy of library collections may be attained through institutional self-sufficiency or cooperative arrangements. In the latter instance, fully adequate collections or electronic resources are not required of individual member schools, but each school shall demonstrate contracted and reliable availability and actual use.

4.5.6 In its collaborative relationships with other institutions, a school remains accountable for the quality of library resources available to its students and faculty.
Lesley University Library Mission

Mission

The Lesley University Library provides high quality collections and information services in support of the University's research mission as well as the integration of academic and field-based learning. To fulfill its mission, the Library will develop collections of sufficient quality, size, and diversity to support the teaching and research requirements of the academic community. This requires materials that embrace the full spectrum of information media. The library will anticipate collection needs and establish collection strength to support graduate and undergraduate programs in education, expressive therapies, human services, psychology, the visual arts, as well as the liberal arts and sciences, in a broad range of formats. It will facilitate access to collections owned by other institutions and serve as a gateway to global networked information resources.

The library will collaborate with faculty to teach the research skills necessary for students to utilize information resources independently, critically, and efficiently using both traditional and new information technologies. Through information literacy programs and informal assistance, the Library provides an avenue to professional achievement and lifelong learning for individuals in the university community. The library will provide a staff that possesses and continually reinforces the specialized skills and knowledge necessary for the Library to function in a diverse, global, and increasingly complex information environment.

Values

The Library is of central importance to the University. A dynamic combination of people, collections, and facilities, its purpose is to assist users in the process of transforming information into knowledge. Our core principle is excellent service to our community. In all of our activities we seek to meet or exceed our users' expectations. We set high standards for the contribution we make to the University's pursuit of knowledge and educational excellence. We value diversity of perspectives and unfettered access to information. We value the privacy of every patron. To meet future challenges, our staff will endeavor to be resourceful, innovative, and flexible professionals. We recognize the critical contribution we make to the effectiveness of the Library. We believe that these values are central to realizing the University's vision.

Vision

Lesley University Library, in partnership with students and faculty, will create information-rich environments that empower and inspire the Lesley Community for teaching and learning. A dynamic, student-centered library will provide opportunities to access and evaluate information and to effectively and ethically communicate learning through discussion, print, media and the arts.

Scholarship
The Lesley Library is the intellectual center of scholarship for the University. It provides the services, resources and environments appropriate to support the mission of a far-reaching university that is a national leader in education, offering innovative programs through the Art Institute of Boston, the Graduate School of Arts and Social Sciences, Lesley College, and the School of Education.

As a primary source of support for the academic pursuits of the University, the library provides the expertise of its staff to teach information literacies to faculty and students, guiding the search, evaluation, and use of information. Students and faculty use the Library’s considerable resources through both physical and virtual environments. The Library holds a vision that all students, staff and faculty will have universal access to the services and resources necessary for their academic work, consistent with diverse learning styles, abilities, and locations.

Staff

Library personnel build close personal connections with students and faculty, locally and at a distance, to guide the programs, collections, and goals of the library as it transforms for the 21st century. Library staff members reach out to students on and off-campus through services such as Interlibrary Loan, Electronic Reserves, Ask-A-Librarian, and other instructional and consultative services. Library professionals provide expertise and leadership in the creation, management, and delivery of information services and resources. They guide students, faculty, and staff in their use of increasingly complex information, and create teaching resources that inspire and enable student learning. In the information age, librarians play a primary role in the development of information-fluent citizens, capable of academic excellence and life-long learning.

Collections

The Library develops digital and physical collections that enhance the undergraduate experience, enable graduate students to prosper, and assure that the teaching and research interests of faculty and Ph.D. candidates be supported. Library collections support students in their research with resources that mirror the wide-ranging intellectual endeavors of Lesley University, guided by consultation with faculty. Electronic databases identify physical materials, and deliver digital resources such as journal articles, e-books, images and multi-media to student and faculty desktops.

Where quality, access, technologies, and network capabilities meet the needs of Lesley populations, digital resources will be the preferred choice in collection development. The Library will continue to collect physical resources, including print books and journals, multimedia and curriculum materials, and art resources, where the physical experience of the medium is primary to learning or where digitization rights are not available. Students and faculty will enjoy universal access to collections through local use, networked environments, resource-sharing with consortial partners, and interlibrary loan, as appropriate to need and location. Physical materials will be digitized and delivered electronically where feasible and in compliance with the intellectual property policies of the University.

Virtual Environments
Students and faculty will enjoy seamless access to the expanding world of digitized information through secure single sign-in authentication. Robust networks will empower students, faculty and librarians to research, collaborate, and share new learning, through communication tools and media. The Library will continue to build interactive online services to reach out to students and faculty through reference, instruction, and resource sharing. The virtual library environment will evolve as information technologies change and institutional needs expand.

**Physical Environments**

The physical library is a building where members of the Lesley community come to share academic life and to interact in teaching and learning. Students residing on-campus will find an environment supportive of study and individual learning styles. Commuting students will enjoy a common space where they can collaborate on group work with peers living across the region. Faculty and advanced graduate students will discover quiet areas for reflective study and consultation. All community members will have choices of accessible and welcoming spaces that are flexible, active and interactive – designed to encourage collaboration with library professionals, collections and tools.

The Library reaches out to all of Lesley’s communities, local and remote, through innovative services developed and managed from the library facilities. The physical plant accommodates preparation, preservation, and access to collections, from circulating materials to archival and special collections, in a variety of media and formats. The Library will continue to employ creative alternatives to house materials, including remote storage, digitization, and online delivery.

**Partnerships**

The Library builds strong partnerships across the University – with students to shape library experiences that enhance lifelong learning; with faculty to align collections and services with curriculum and pedagogy; with University Technology to develop robust and dynamic technology environments; with Disabilities Services to create accessible spaces and resources; and with other University-wide programs to serve the Lesley communities. The Library participates with external networks, consortia and other partners, to maximize access to the world of information and to build resources for a growing University.

The Lesley University Library will provide leadership in the University community to support academic excellence through research and scholarship in the information environments of the future.
Appendix II: Questions

Focus Group Questions

1. How do you find and evaluate materials in your subject area? How are librarians included in this process? If not, why not?

2. How do you share your research?

3. How do you find and evaluate materials used for teaching? How are librarians included in this process? If not, why not?

4. How do you teach and develop research skills student need to complete your assignments?

5. What do students need to know about doing research? What do students already know about doing research?

6. How does delivery format (off campus, online learning, and intensive residency) change your expectations for the library?

7. When you think about the library as a physical space, why do you think people go to the library?

Interview Questions

Can you tell me about your current areas of research/interest?

1. When you are beginning research for a new class, project or area of interest, how do you begin? What do you do first? Who helps you get started?

2. How do you access scholarly and academic resources in a way that supports your learning style, disabilities and/or location? How do you stay current with technologies, research databases, and field or area studies? Who do you ask for support in understanding what information is available and how to get to it?
3. Does the library have the content you need to teach your classes and conduct research in your field? If not, what do you do? Whom do you communicate with when you have suggestions for new content?

4. How do you keep pace with new methods of scholarly communication: portals, e-portfolios, social media, web/cloud based platforms?

5. To what extent are you collaborating with peers in your research? What is the nature of your collaboration? What methods, software, platforms, or other mechanisms do you use to collaborate?

6. Describe a recent interaction with a student about a research assignment he/she is working on. How do you guide students in their research?

7. Do you have a process in place to guide students toward course/assignment related material? If so, what is it?

8. How do you evaluate student products that require research results? What weaknesses do you observe in student research? What are the strengths?

9. List the library resources and services you use. Which do you do online and which do you come to the library for?

10. In a few sentences, what do you think of the library?

11. That concludes the questions we had. Is there anything we didn’t ask that you’d like us to know?