

Self Study Report
Technology Group
Terri Muraski
Nerissa Nelson
Rob Clint, Dave Timm

Name of reporting unit
Name of coordinator - Systems
Name of coordinator - Web
Name of other staff involved

1) Description of supporting service or function:

1. Provide administration, security, training and technical support for all library systems.
2. Administer and support staff and public workstations.
3. Provide technical support for library classroom technology.
4. Design, support and maintain extensive, heavily used library web site and library tab on university portal.

Systems support

1. Voyager – local system, full support, training, customized webvoyage interface and support for Portage County Public Library installation.
 - a. Includes Circulation, Acquisitions, Serials, Media Scheduling, Reporter, System Administration modules
 - b. Support two databases, all clients workstation clients at both the University library and PCPL
2. Ex Libris SFX link resolver & Metalib federated search system – shared server housed in Madison, support for local implementation, interface, metalib management, access to indexes and administration of access to native interfaces.
3. Illiad – offsite server, provide clients, system administration, troubleshooting and web based forms.
4. Web – server administration and security, design and administration of library website with support from UWSP web design department. Provide design and database support for web based forms for book orders, library instruction requests, and a number of other web-based forms.
5. Provide support for wireless network access throughout the building.
6. Local database development – E-reserves, Obituary & Cemetery Indexes, Acquisitions, and Archives.

Server support – 2 servers – a web server with the library’s website and the Voyager server for the catalog.

Workstation support – specialized loads for 79 staff and student employee workstations, 15 public workstations that are supported by the library IT staff. There are an additional 44 public workstations that run a campus load and are supported by campus IT personnel.

Classroom support – 3 teaching workstations, 5 additional monitors, 4 presentation projectors, 24 laptops housed in portable cabinets. All are supported by library IT staff.

Training – primarily troubleshooting and individualized training and assistance with new software and client upgrades.

Other equipment – setup and provide support for scanners in Access services and Archives, assistive technology equipment, microfilm digitizers in Archives, iPods and MP3 audio players, Digital cameras and video cameras in the IMC and a variety of adaptive technologies for students with disabilities.

2) **Who is served?** All staff and patrons, including users in the building and via the website.

3) **Staffing**

- a. 2 faculty – Information Systems Librarian and Webmaster. The Systems Librarian also has teaching and reference responsibilities. The Foundation Librarian is the Library Webmaster and this position has teaching and reference responsibilities.
- b. 2 academic staff, 1 full time library position (Information Processing Consultant) and one position (Senior Information Processing Consultant) assigned from the campus Information Technology department to provide support for library technology.
- c. Sufficient? No – there is little time for planning, development. All staff time is consumed through daily maintenance and troubleshooting.
- d. Well-qualified and trained? Yes, but it is very difficult to find the time and opportunity to keep up with new technology. There are few on-campus technology training opportunities.

4) **Facilities** – office space for technology staff is sufficient, but there is a need for additional workspace. The most pressing need is an area for working on equipment. The staff offices are not large enough to perform this function.

The library facility is fully wireless. The age of the building does at time limit the placement of public computers because of limited network and electrical connections.

5) **Technology** – the technology staff is basically supported at the same level as the rest of the library staff, even though their use of and need for the most up-to-date equipment goes beyond that of most of the staff.

Computer upgrades for faculty are funded through a university program, but not for academic staff. Technology staff also has a need to regularly access the system when away from the library and are not supplied with the equipment to do so.

6) **Supporting statistics** – not applicable.

7) **Assessment Activities** – LibQual Survey in 2004 identified problems with remote access to licensed resources. Since the survey, access has changed from using Virtual Private Networking (VPN), which required setup by the user to using EZProxy, which only requires a login using the campus username/password.

The student survey completed in February 2008 included a number of questions related to technology.

1. Only 7% of students disagreed with the statement “The Library provides easy off-campus access to electronic resources”.
2. A majority of students agreed that the library has a sufficient number of computers. It is important to note that the comments reflect that the students perceive the 110 Computer Lab as a part of the library. When asked why they visited the library, 60% responded “to use a computer.”
3. Nearly all students, 92%, have used the library’s website.

8) Special projects underway or major changes being implemented

1. Voyager ILS implemented in 1996 – continual upgrades scheduled on an annual or semi-annual basis.
2. SFX link resolver implemented in 2003-2004, annual upgrades and continuous monthly additions
3. Metalib federated search system implemented in 2004, annual upgrades and continuous monthly additions.
4. The library website was redesigned in 2006 and another redesign is currently underway.
5. EZ proxy remote access was implemented in 2007.
6. Iliad interlibrary loan system implemented in 2003.
7. Wireless access was added throughout the building in stages from 2003-2006.
8. Two sets of laptops for library instruction were added in 2004 and 2006.

9) Goals or desired directions of the unit

1. Enhance technology available for teaching in the library, including the classrooms and other presentation facilities.
2. Provide support for office technology, including maintaining computers with up-to-date software.
3. Increase training sessions offered to library faculty and staff.
4. Foster library involvement in digitization projects, in the library and in collaboration with other UWSP departments or other UW System institutions.
5. Enhance student and faculty access to library resources through improvements in technology.
6. Work cooperatively with UW System and UWSP information technology personnel.

10) Other

- 11) **SWOT analysis of the area** – see attachment.



Department: **Technology**

Participants: **Terri Muraski, Nerissa Nelson, Dave Timm, Rob Clint**

S.W.O.T. Analysis

<p style="text-align: center;">STRENGTHS (Internal)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to online resources (off and on campus) • Knowledgeable staff/local support • UW Library System initiatives & support • Network infrastructure 	<p style="text-align: center;">WEAKNESSES (Internal)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centralization of system - limitations • Outdated/slow/gaps - technology • Library budget allocation for technology • Need for constant training and adaptation for staff
<p style="text-align: center;">OPPORTUNITIES (External)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative funding sources • New delivery methods • Professional development • Participation in UW Library System initiatives 	<p style="text-align: center;">THREATS (External)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centralization at system level • Rapid changes in technology • Consolidation of library vendors • Uncertainty of budget

Strengths:

Access to library resources both on and off campus is rather seamless through our library homepage. Our off campus access has greatly improved since the implementation of an EZproxy server last spring.

The Library is fortunate to have two information technology staff to support our many needs with systems, programming and networking. We also have the support of Information Technology on campus for server needs and for maintenance of our reference room computers.

UW Library System support makes it possible for us to accomplish important projects, such as system upgrades for our Voyager system, which we would never be able to afford with our current budget.

Network infrastructure, such as wireless access throughout the Library, makes it possible for patrons with laptops to access our resources from anywhere within the building.

Weaknesses:

Centralization of systems, such as Voyager and Metalib, creates limitations for us since control of these systems and certain decisions are made at the UW Library System level. Our current Metalib system is established through the UW Library System and the performance function of this system is through UW-Madison’s server. This slows down the load time and creates a longer wait time for users to access our databases.

Certain departments and units have technology that is too outdated or slow for what their work function is, such as ILL and Reserve.

The Library budget allocation for technology is minimal and does not allow us to purchase or consider new resources. Our only means of upgrading workstations comes from money outside of the Library budget.

The rapid change in technology creates anxiety for some of our staff. For many of us, the time it takes to keep up with these changes adds to the stress that an already busy schedule brings with it.

Opportunities:

Since budget concerns are uncertain from year to year, considering alternative funding sources would be an opportunity for us. Some ideas for alternative funding may be through student tech fees or lab modernization money.

New web tools, such as wikis or blogs, and the digitization of resources, would allow us to deliver information to our patrons in new and innovative ways.

The Library could make greater use of professional development opportunities, such as workshops and conferences, where staff could learn more about technology trends in our field, and could come back with new ideas and possibilities for adapting and implementing those changes.

Participation in system initiatives offers us wide access to many resources at a reduced cost. While we already participate in these consortial agreements, there may be other opportunities to increase our resources, decrease our cost and provide additional support.

Threats:

As mentioned before, as we enter into more partnerships and agreements at the UW System level, this reduces our autonomy. This results in owning fewer resources and providing access to these resources remotely. We are currently not part of what is called the UW System “hub,” although many of our sister campuses are. Our library provides the platform and support for the local public library’s Voyager system, and moving to the UW System “hub” would eliminate this community partnership.

It is difficult for staff to keep up with technological changes. There is a tendency to operate in a “need at the moment” fashion because there is little time for reflection and future technology planning. The management of electronic resources is far more complex and time consuming than it was even a few years ago.

The consolidation of library vendors could potentially make it more difficult to bargain for a better pricing structure since there will be fewer choices and higher costs are likely.

The uncertainty of the budget may lead to the inability to keep up with new technology. Budget reductions could also lead to more centralized UW System decision making if we could no longer maintain systems or keep up with current changes.