

Research Library Issues

RLI 264 June 2009

A Bimonthly Report from ARL, CNI, and SPARC

**ARL Encourages Members to Refrain from Signing
Nondisclosure or Confidentiality Clauses 1–2**

**The Case for Regulating Google
and the Proposed Book Rights Registry 3–6**

**Learning and Research Spaces in ARL Libraries:
Snapshots of Installations and Experiments 7–18**

Crit Stuart, Former Director of Research, Teaching & Learning, ARL

**A Different Kind of Conversation: The Sparky Awards
and Fresh Views on Change in Scholarly Communication 19–21**

Jennifer McLennan, Director of Communications, SPARC

**ARL Selects Research Library
Leadership Fellows for 2009–10 22–23**

News & Calendar 24–26

ARL Encourages Members to Refrain from Signing Nondisclosure or Confidentiality Clauses

The ARL Board of Directors voted in support of a resolution introduced by its Scholarly Communication Steering Committee to strongly encourage ARL member libraries to refrain from signing agreements with publishers or vendors, either individually or through consortia, that include nondisclosure or confidentiality clauses. In addition, the Board encourages ARL members to share upon request from other libraries information contained in these agreements (save for trade secrets or proprietary technical details) for licensing content, licensing software or other tools, and for digitization contracts with third-party vendors.

The Board adopted this position at the ARL Membership Meeting in Houston, Texas, on May 22. The resolution was prepared in response to the concerns of membership that, as the amount of licensed content has increased, especially through packages of publications, nondisclosure or confidentiality

clauses have had a negative impact on effective negotiations. The Scholarly Communication Steering Committee took the position that an open market will result in better licensing terms. In their

discussions, the committee also noted the value of encouraging research projects and other efforts to gather information about the current market and licensing terms, such as an initiative being undertaken by Ted Bergstrom, University of California, Santa Barbara, Paul Courant, University of Michigan, and Preston McAfee, Cal Tech, to acquire information on bundled site-license contracts. A panel session on collaboration held later in the Membership Meeting included informal polls of members and the results indicated high levels of agreement and a positive commitment for making this information public when possible.

“Openness, transparency, and collaborative action have been the hallmarks

For further developments in this arena, monitor the ARL Web page on licensing
<http://www.arl.org/sc/marketplace/license/>.

of the library profession and the scholarly community,” said Jim Neal, Columbia University, and Chair of the ARL Scholarly Communication Steering Committee. “It is incumbent upon us to share information about these major contracts we are signing on behalf of our library users.”

“While research libraries may have in the past tolerated these clauses in order to achieve a lower cost,” acknowledged Charles B. Lowry, ARL Executive Director, “the current economic crisis marks a fundamentally different circumstance in the relationship between libraries, publishers, and other vendors.” ARL will be establishing a mechanism by which its members can share information with one another about their agreements.

To cite this article: “ARL Encourages Members to Refrain from Signing Nondisclosure or Confidentiality Clauses.” *Research Library Issues: A Bimonthly Report from ARL, CNI, and SPARC*, no. 264 (June 2009): 1–2.
<http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/rli/>.

The Case for Regulating Google and the Proposed Book Rights Registry

On October 28, 2008, after several years of legal wrangling, Google, the Association of American Publishers, and the Authors Guild reached a settlement agreement concerning Google's scanning of copyrighted works. The scanning of these works has been performed in cooperation with research libraries throughout the United States. The settlement agreement requires court approval by the presiding judge in the US District Court in New York because the case was brought there as a class action suit on behalf of selected copyright owners.

In large part, the settlement focuses on in-copyright books that are not commercially available. Public-domain works fall outside of the settlement and owners of commercially available, in-copyright books created prior to January 5, 2009, may opt-out of the settlement or opt-in to other terms with Google. As a part of the settlement agreement, Google will fund the establishment of the Book Rights Registry. The registry, jointly run by authors and publishers, will collect and distribute royalties including an up-front payment by Google of \$45 million. Users will have several new opportunities to access scanned books, both free and fee-based, via public and university libraries and through institutional subscriptions for academic, corporate, and government libraries and organizations.

Although this is a private settlement, the result has very real implications for public policy and the way libraries of all types will operate. Many librarians have raised questions about the settlement's impact because of the complexity of the agreement, its potential long-term impact on libraries (thus user interests), and the enormity of the book collection involved. Members of the library community discussed the implications of the settlement in a meeting hosted on February 9, 2009, in Washington DC by ARL, the American Library Association (ALA) Washington Office, and the Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL). The meeting led to identification of the key concerns of the library community with the proposed settlement and a

decision to file a legal brief before the court that articulates those concerns.

On May 4, 2009, ARL, ALA, and ACRL filed comments with the US District



Listen to Kenneth D. Crews, Director, Copyright Advisory Office, Columbia University Libraries, on the Google Book Settlement (4:07 MP3)

<http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/rli-264-google.mp3>

Photo Credit: Sam Scott

Court for the Southern District of New York for the judge to consider in his ruling. Representing over 139,000 libraries and 350,000 librarians, the associations filed the brief as members of the plaintiff class because they are both authors and publishers of books. The associations asserted that, although the settlement has the potential to provide public access to millions of books, many of the features of the settlement, including the absence of competition for the new services, could compromise fundamental library values including **equity of access to information, patron privacy, and intellectual freedom**. The court can mitigate these possible negative effects by regulating the conduct of Google and the Book Rights Registry that the settlement establishes.

The library associations are not asking the judge to reject the settlement. Instead, they are requesting the judge to carefully monitor the parties' behavior once the settlement takes effect.

Excerpts from the Library Associations' Brief

The Library Associations do not oppose approval of the Settlement. The Settlement has the potential to provide unprecedented public access to a digital library containing millions of books. Thus, the Settlement could advance the core mission of the Library Associations and their members: providing patrons with access to information in all forms, including books. However, the digital library enabled by the Settlement will be under the control of Google and the Book Rights Registry. Moreover, the cost of creating such a library and Google's significant lead time advantage suggest that no other entity will create a competing digital library for the foreseeable future.

The Settlement, therefore, will likely have a significant and lasting impact on libraries and the public, including authors and publishers. But in the absence of competition for the services enabled by the Settlement, this impact may

not be entirely positive. The Settlement could compromise fundamental library values such as equity of access to information, patron privacy, and intellectual freedom. In order to mitigate the possible negative effects the Settlement may have on libraries and the public at large, the Library Associations request that this Court vigorously exercise its jurisdiction over the interpretation and implementation of the Settlement. Indeed, in its order approving the Settlement, the Court should make clear that it intends to oversee the Settlement closely.

The Library Associations urge the Court to exercise this authority vigorously to ensure the broadest possible public benefit from the services the Settlement enables.

In particular:

- Any library or other possible institutional subscriber must have the ability to request this Court to review the pricing of an institutional subscription. The Court's standard of review should be whether the price meets the economic objectives set forth in the Settlement, *i.e.*, "(1) the realization of revenue at market rates for each Book and license on behalf of Rightsholders and (2) the realization of broad access to the Books by the public, including institutions of higher education."¹
- Any entity must have the ability to request this Court to review the Registry's refusal to license copyrights to books on the same terms available to Google.
- Any class member must have the ability to request this Court to review the procedures by which the Registry selects members of its board of directors, and to evaluate whether the Registry properly considers the interests of all class members in its decision-making.
- Any user must have the ability to request this Court to direct Google to provide the user with a list of books excluded from any of its services for editorial or non-editorial reasons, and an explanation of why it was excluded. Google already must provide the Registry with a list of books excluded for editorial reasons.²
- Any researcher must have the ability to request this Court to review the reasonableness of a Research Corpus host site's refusal to allow the researcher to conduct a research project at the host site.

- Any user must have the ability to request this Court to direct Google and the Registry to disclose their policies for collecting, retaining, disseminating, and protecting personally identifiable information. Additionally, any user must have the ability to request this Court to review whether Google and the Registry are complying with their privacy policies.

In these comments, the Library Associations have identified certain foreseeable problems that may require this Court's intervention in the future. The Settlement, however, is potentially so far-reaching that its full implications are unknowable at this time. While the Settlement's impact might be limited to the creation of a research tool of use only to serious scholars, the Settlement might also lead to a restructuring of the publishing industry and a dramatic change to the nature of libraries. The Court should be prepared to exercise whatever oversight is necessary, for as long as necessary, to maximize the public benefit from the services enabled by the Settlement.

¹ Settlement Agreement at § 4.1(a)(i). The proposed Book Rights Registry is similar to two organizations that collectively manage performance rights: the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers (ASCAP) and Broadcast Music, Inc. (BMI). Both ASCAP and BMI are subject to consent decrees resolving antitrust actions brought by the U.S. Department of Justice. The ASCAP consent decree has existed, with modifications, since 1941; and the BMI consent decree since 1966. Under the consent decrees, ASCAP and BMI must grant, on a non-discriminatory basis, either a blanket license to their entire catalogue, or a license for the performance of a particular work. A court in this district has continuing jurisdiction over the consent decrees, and has established a rate court to resolve disputes concerning license fees. In proceedings before the rate court, ASCAP and BMI have the burden of proving the reasonableness of the rates they seek. Establishment of a rate court in this case is premature. However, this Court has the authority to adopt the procedures necessary to ensure the fairness of the price of the institutional subscription.

² Settlement Agreement at § 3.7(e)(i). The Settlement requires Google and the Registry to compile a variety of databases. *See, e.g., id.* at §§ 3.1(b)(ii), 6.6(c). These database will have many uses, including assisting in finding the owners of orphan works. Accordingly, Google and the Registry should make these databases publicly available.

ARL and ALA have also released "A Guide for the Perplexed: Libraries and the Google Library Project Settlement," by Jonathan Band, JD. The guide is designed to help the library community better understand the terms and conditions of the proposed settlement agreement by outlining the settlement provisions that apply directly to libraries. The guide, along with the full text of the brief, and related materials are available from the ARL Web site at <http://www.arl.org/pp/ppcopyright/google/>.

To cite this article: "The Case for Regulating Google and the Proposed Book Rights Registry." *Research Library Issues: A Bimonthly Report from ARL, CNI, and SPARC*, no. 264 (June 2009): 3–6. <http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/rli/>.

Learning and Research Spaces in ARL Libraries: Snapshots of Installations and Experiments

Crit Stuart

Learning commons and other spaces to support individual and group productivity have emerged in the majority of ARL libraries in the past decade. Respondents to a survey conducted by ARL during the late winter and early spring of 2008 described their work to provide learning and research spaces for their constituents.

The survey invited all ARL libraries to describe innovative and noteworthy experiments in three areas: instructional programs, virtual resource development, and space initiatives. Of the 123 member libraries, 77 participated in the survey, for a response rate of 63%. Responses to the first two elements of the survey (instructional programs and virtual resource development) were summarized in an earlier article with accompanying database.¹

Innovations and noteworthy experiments were defined in the survey as either “a new service for the library” or “unique in academic librarianship.” Respondents briefly described the initiatives, provided supporting documents and URLs, and offered assessment data where it existed. What is new or innovative for one library may be a standard and long-practiced approach to space development and programming at another institution. Whatever one’s perspective, considerable transformation of physical spaces has occurred, with interest remaining high for ongoing renovations of existing spaces, and for expanding support to constituents not served in the first iterations.

Libraries demonstrate a strong interest in supplying well-articulated spaces and services for undergraduate endeavors, and for faculty and graduate research enterprises. The preponderance of innovative learning spaces in ARL libraries are for undergraduate students. This may be due to the influence of the first learning

commons that arose in the mid-to-late '90s. These early examples focused on the undergraduate, and were characterized by improved furnishings and aesthetics coupled with computer workstations arranged in an open landscape. Service points were tailored to provide information and technology assistance to undergraduates. Many of the learning commons reported in the survey are scarcely different from the first models. The majority reported that they were strongly influenced by pre-existing undergraduate installations found elsewhere. A minority of libraries reported modeling their innovative learning spaces on user-derived data, interviews, and insights.

Assessment of built learning and research spaces is sporadic and often anecdotal.

In the last few years, graduate students and faculty have asked libraries to provide complementary spaces and services for their research, publication, and social needs. Libraries have been challenged to consider what these components

should be. The most successful iterations of these research-oriented facilities are predicated on a deep understanding of the client, informed by careful pre-programming assessment that engages

the library, partners, faculty, and graduate students in discovery and insight. Some targets for these installations are teaching and technology skills; discipline-focused digital centers; research methodologies and tools; convening grounds for social interactions, lectures, and exhibits; and support for scholarly communication.

Assessment of built learning and research spaces is sporadic and often anecdotal. Many libraries report that the most salient statistics are found in the numbers of individuals who visit and work in these arenas. Formal mission and vision statements are sometimes lacking. Perhaps the most telling omission is the dearth of identified learning outcomes that meet faculty aspirations for students coupled with a nuanced understanding of the principal hurdles faced by students in their major disciplines.

The following summary of the innovative space initiatives described by survey respondents is organized around themes that emerged in the responses:

- Collaborations with Campus Partners
- Multimedia
- Digital centers
- Faculty and Graduate Student Spaces
- Branch and Subject Libraries

- Flexible, User-Influenced Spaces
- Classrooms, Workshops, Instruction
- Galleries, Art, Exhibits, Performances, Events
- Tutoring and Peer Support
- Cafés and Refreshment
- Presentation Practice Facilities

Collaborations with Campus Partners

A considerable number of survey respondents alluded to having campus partners in their learning-space enterprises. Library partners are chosen for their capacity to deliver valued services and support within or adjacent to the convening ground. Collaborators come from campus IT units, tutoring services, advisement, writing and multimedia support, academic departments in the case of specialized or subject libraries, and education technologists. Digital centers are staffed with subject and data specialists who may come from other campus units.

A pair of student and faculty commons sharing a large space in **Ohio University's** Alden Library rely on support from the Center for Academic Technology, the undergraduate college, Dining Services, the Center for Teaching Excellence, the Center for Writing Excellence, and the Office of the Provost. These spaces and the services they contain continue to evolve as the partners gain insight and experience over time.

<http://www.library.ohiou.edu/serv/lc/index.html>

<http://www.library.ohiou.edu/fc/>

University of Pennsylvania Libraries' Weigle Commons is sponsored jointly by the libraries, the School of Arts and Sciences, and the Office of the Provost. "Central to the Commons' mission are support services provided by the Program Partners, a group of administratively disparate services that have joined forces to collaboratively support undergraduate education. Here students and faculty benefit from various campus specialists and units that provide support for writing, presentations and public speaking, multimedia creations, project management, research methodologies, and technology training for faculty to support new forms of pedagogy." An ambitious and richly varied training series separately targeting students and faculty is synched to their needs for upcoming projects and improved instruction.

<http://wic.library.upenn.edu/>

University of British Columbia's Irving K. Barber Learning Centre capitalizes on the confluence of several campus units to supplement library staffing. Services include writing and research, study skills, multimedia creation, and course tutoring, as well as labs and offices for the Centre for Teaching and Academic Group and the School of Library, Archival, and Information Studies.

<http://www.ikebarberlearningcentre.ubc.ca/>

Multimedia

The focus on providing facilities for multimedia production is a recent phenomenon in ARL libraries, paralleling the rapidly increasing use of these media in faculty instruction and in student responses to classroom assignments. Specialized facilities in libraries tend to offer a vast array of equipment and software to use in-house. The software and equipment platforms supporting multimedia creation often impose a considerable learning curve that neither faculty nor students can easily master. The most robust, and therefore successful, multimedia centers are infused with skilled staff, excellent equipment, and well-considered training and user-support models.

The Weigle Commons multimedia center at the **University of Pennsylvania's** Van Pelt-Dietrich Library Center is probably the most influential model among ARL libraries for multimedia programming. The center is run as both production facility and training space, and it attempts to train both students and faculty in new forms of multimedia. Center staff have learned that student multimedia production gets a boost when faculty have insight into technical capacities and limitations, storyboarding, editing, continuity, logic, etc., so that faculty are better equipped to assess and grade these new and important forms of expression.

The Digital Media Lab at the **University of North Carolina** "offers an array of audio and video editing software and hardware to assist faculty and students with projects ranging from the integration of bird calls into an online course to the development of a documentary short film." Assistance is available via trained staff.

<http://www.lib.unc.edu/house/mrc/pages/mediaLab/>

The Faculty Exploratory at the **University of Miami** exposes faculty to options for incorporating new media into their course instruction. As an incentive to encourage faculty to use the program, the library funds new media teaching fellowships.

<http://merrick.library.miami.edu/digitalprojects/digitalprojects.html>

Digital Centers

Digital data centers in libraries provide a particularly useful service to scholars and students. The strongest examples go beyond collecting and providing access to data and digital content by bringing together subject specialists, statisticians, and digital media experts to support a spectrum of services and expertise. This centralized service helps to accelerate the use of content and discovery, and the creation of new forms of scholarship.

The **Johns Hopkins** Center for Educational Resources, of which the libraries are a partner, provides impetus “away from print-based repositories to electronic collaboratories that enable application of digital collections and networked services to new approaches in instructional and scholarly communication.”

<http://www.cer.jhu.edu/>

The Alderman and Clemons Libraries at the **University of Virginia** support a scholars’ lab catering to the digital research and scholarly analysis needs of faculty and advanced students in social sciences and humanities. The lab combines software applications for data analysis, geographic information systems, visual presentations, scanning, and text encoding.

<http://www.lib.virginia.edu/scholarslab/about/index.html>

And **Columbia University** has launched two digital centers: one for social sciences and a second for humanities that will open in 2010. The Digital Social Science Center (DSSC), located in Lehman Library and operated jointly by the Libraries & Columbia University Information Technology, provides a wide range of information and technology assistance for students and faculty.

<http://www.columbia.edu/cu/lweb/indiv/dssc/index.html>

Faculty and Graduate Student Spaces

Faculty and graduate students have begun to look to their libraries to provide customized spaces for scholarship, training, quiet concentration, and socializing. A growing number of libraries are working with these constituents to define and deliver targeted responses.

The **University of Washington’s** Health Sciences Library has partnered with dentistry, nursing, medicine, pharmacy, and public health to provide a learning commons for graduate and professional students. Among the amenities are specialized classrooms, a drop-in computer lab providing specialized software and expert assistance with presentations and special projects, and liberalized food and drink policies.

<http://healthlinks.washington.edu/hsl/commons/>

The new library commons at the **University of California, Berkeley's** Institute for Research on Labor and Employment is a comprehensive renovation with new areas for student and faculty engagement, presentations, group meetings, and accommodations for visiting scholars.

<http://www.irl.berkeley.edu/library/index.php?page=7>

Branch and Subject Libraries

These satellite, specialized entities are undergoing change in one of two ways—either to be absorbed by a larger campus library or to be invigorated in new ways. Libraries choosing to invigorate branch or subject libraries usually do so with partners who share a vision of enhanced services and support for study and research.

The Research Computing Lab at **University of Virginia's** Brown Science and Engineering Library “provides a convenient space for faculty and students to work on innovative projects with specialists from the library and the campus IT group. Here they get support for instruction and research in the science and engineering disciplines.” Consultation services are offered for high-performance and research computing, complemented by training sessions and “boot camps.”

<http://www2.lib.virginia.edu/science/rescomp/index.html>

The new and privately funded C. V. Starr East Asian Library at the **University of California, Berkeley** features a rare-book facility; consolidated print collections of 400,000 volumes; various flavors of group and individual spaces; faculty support for digitization and course development; and a multi-purpose media center with advanced imaging, satellite, and media equipment.

<http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/EAL/>

The newly renovated Fine Arts Library Reading Room at the **University of Texas**, a funding and staffing collaboration with the College of Fine Arts, features multimedia workstations, an array of specialty production equipment, and with capacity to host donor receptions and other functions.

<http://www.lib.utexas.edu/fal/index.html>

Flexible, User-influenced Spaces

A handful of libraries have turned to their constituents to influence space and programming outcomes. As a result of these informative engagements, libraries report the outcomes exceed what they might have created working in isolation.

Cornell University librarians worked with students and faculty from the departments of communication and design & experimental analysis to develop

the Bissett Collaborative Space and the Graduate Study Area in the Mann Library. Constituents were engaged from initial research and design ideas to ongoing post-occupancy evaluation. Mobility and malleability are key ingredients that contribute to students creating “customized learning moments.” <http://mannlib.cornell.edu/equipmentandrooms/bissett.cfm>

For the renovation of the first floor of **Florida State University’s** Strozier Library, staff applied many of the user-centered assessment techniques championed by the University of Rochester and the University of Minnesota.² “Our space, services, staffing will all be shaped by what users tell us—not by what we assume or by what we want to give users. In this way, we will never be finished building this space; it will be a dynamic, (r)evolutionary space.”

The learning spaces in **University of Rochester’s** Gleason Library are designed for undergraduate collaborative learning. All aspects of the space programming were influenced by student users through various anthropologist-overseen discovery techniques and assessment.

http://docushare.lib.rochester.edu/docushare/dsweb/Get/Document-27280/chapter_four.pdf

Classrooms, Workshops, Instruction

Increasingly, campus pedagogy is shifting to actively engage students in the learning process. Rows of forward-facing desks in lecture hall arrangement are being replaced by technology and furnishings that allow for a range of configurations to support the particular learning moment. As noted in the companion report to this one published in the ARL Bimonthly Report, no. 261 (December 2008), many libraries are pursuing agendas to develop students’ information fluencies beyond the needs of a single assignment or course. The programming of new and renovated learning spaces frequently features literacy instruction.

The **University of Chicago’s** Zar Reading Room is glassed-in, and with custom shades to reduce glare during presentations. Tables and chairs are easily reconfigurable, screens and whiteboards are added to peripheral walls, and mobile projector carts with flat-panel displays provide multiple viewing options. The room carries several functions: instruction, training, speaker series, and informal group study for students in the evening.

The **University of Western Ontario Libraries**, in collaboration with the Centre for Faculty and Graduate Student Development, have created two teaching support centers on campus that feature exemplary classrooms.

These spaces showcase instructional innovations like SMART Board and Sympodium technology, and are used for faculty and graduate development programs and initiatives, as well as for literacy instruction.

<http://www.uwo.ca/tsc/>

The library instruction room at **Arizona State University** has been renovated with new projectors on either end of the room; mobile and reconfigurable furniture; “nest” or pod arrangements of desks; and new computers. Students now have “equal access to their instructional materials and their instructors.”

McGill University’s Cyberthèque facility sports an “e-classroom” for information literacy instruction.

<http://www.mcgill.ca/hssl/facilities/computers/cybertheque/>

Galleries, Art, Exhibits, Performances, Events

Many responding libraries mention art, lectures, displays, and performances as being important assets to the spaces they are creating. These properties showcase the intellectual outpouring of the university and celebrate the creative mind. Many of these spaces serve other purposes, and “transform” into their special properties as needed.

The Mann Library’s new Mann Gallery is a highly visible “community display space” showcasing artwork and multimedia creations by **Cornell University** students that arise from coursework across the curricula. The gallery is easily adapted to a wide range of media, suffused with natural light, and heavily booked by the Cornell University community. It was the brainchild of “two forward-thinking undergraduates as part of their collaborative senior-year project.” Campus faculty “show high enthusiasm,” in part because the gallery has as its mission to showcase some of the “outside-the-box thinking that Cornell students and researchers are known for.”

<http://gallery.mannlib.cornell.edu/>

The new gallery in the Harlan Hatcher Graduate Library at the **University of Michigan** “improves access to the unique and remarkable treasures held in the library.” The gallery was formerly home to a portion of the library’s technical services operation. It mounts local and traveling exhibits, hosts lectures and presentations, and will soon feature displays from special collections. As the gallery becomes known across campus, other units approach the library for use of the space, often in collaboration with the library.

<http://www.lib.umich.edu/gallery/>

Tutoring and Peer Support

Students benefit from the availability of tutors in their preferred productivity spaces. Learning commons frequently feature student tutors, or staff tutors, or a mix of the two. Hours of service are gradually lengthening into the evening when students are most in need of assistance. Key skills required in writing, math, computing, and foundation courses are supported.

The **University of Massachusetts Amherst** Learning Commons features peer tutors who are available over extended hours.

<http://www.umass.edu/learningcommons/>

Full-time staff and peer tutors have offices in the Weigle Commons at the **University of Pennsylvania's** Van Pelt-Dietrich Library.

<http://wic.library.upenn.edu/>

The Learning Commons at **University of Guelph's** McLaughlin Library "offers a wide range of peer helper programs, with students helping students through writing assistance, study workshops, supported learning group sessions, and one-on-one teaching of IT skills."

http://www.learningcommons.uoguelph.ca/contact_us.html

Cafés and Refreshment

Libraries have been inspired by the refreshment centers in commercial bookstores. Today most libraries have relaxed food-and-drink rules to permit refreshment throughout all or most areas of library space. Ready access to good food and drink serves to keep constituents in libraries for long stretches of time, and forms a cornerstone of most new learning spaces.

The café at **Georgia Tech** Library has helped to double library attendance. At certain times of the day, the café bristles with laptops and flipcharts that are dragged in from nearby study areas, and serves as a communing ground for students and faculty.

<http://librarycommons.gatech.edu/lec/jazzmans.php>

Bookends Café in the Parks Library of **Iowa State University** is an anchor for the Learning Connections Center, and "immensely popular" with students.

The extensive Friedman Café occupies a substantial footprint of the **Brown University** Friedman Study Center, offering a mix of standard and relaxed seating, and with vending machines available to customers when the café closes.

http://www.brown.edu/Student_Services/Food_Services/eateries/friedman.php

Presentation Practice Facilities

Practice spaces for individual and group rehearsal of presentations are a logical asset to embed in comprehensive learning spaces. They have emerged in the past five years as an important complement to commons, outfitted with projectors and large-screen monitors, recording devices, playback options for critiquing personal performance, and occasionally with experts at hand who can provide useful feedback.

A varied selection can be found at the following libraries:

- **University of Georgia's Student Learning Center**
<http://slc.uga.edu/facility.html>
- **University of Tennessee's The Commons**
<http://commons.utk.edu/>
- **Georgia Tech's Presentation Rehearsal Studio**
<http://www.library.gatech.edu/news/rehearsal.php>
- **University of Washington's Odegaard Library Digital Presentation Studio**
http://catalyst.washington.edu/learning_spaces/digital_presentation_studio.html
- **University of Pennsylvania's Van Pelt-Dietrich Library Weigle Commons practice venues (with expert assistance)**
<http://www.sas.upenn.edu/cwic/faq.html>

In Summary

Exceptional progress has been made to transform research libraries into popular destinations for productivity and learning. Surveys suggest that libraries are seen as the logical providers of primary learning spaces on campus. Today the undergraduate learning commons is a celebrated success on most ARL campuses.

Many of these enterprises are virtually identical in the assets and assistance they provide. This is due in large part to the influence of early pioneers in the learning-commons arena. Today some libraries are demonstrating new models of programming and support that suggest the next wave of enhancements. The best of these facilities are informed by user-centered studies that tap into the genuine needs of undergraduates and the faculty who teach them. These leading-edge spaces also provide opportunities to showcase student art and projects, hear intriguing lectures from local and visiting personalities, and find ample opportunities for social engagement.

Exemplary library-space programming is attuned to student learning cycles, timed to deliver skills and assistance when students most need them, and continually informed by student and faculty feedback.

Exemplary library-space programming is attuned to student learning cycles, timed to deliver skills and assistance when students most need them, and continually informed by student and faculty feedback. The library's information literacy and fluency agendas should be tied to faculty expectations for student learning outcomes, and to complementary skills like research methodologies, information synthesis, and multimedia production. The trend to embed information literacy into foundation courses and across curricula will increase, in turn creating new opportunities for libraries to contribute to curriculum development, support research methodologies, and promote library resources and services.

Faculty and graduate students are becoming more outspoken in their expectations that libraries should address their research and contemplative needs via physical space solutions. There is no consensus on what these responses should be. New forms of support and accommodation are being offered to graduate and professional students in branch and subject libraries. Subject-based digital centers offer a supporting cast of experts to assist faculty and graduate students with new forms of research and scholarship in appealing settings. And contemplative spaces with attractive amenities are being designed for scholars who require a quiet setting, sometimes with print and digital materials close at hand. These constituents also have a need for technology exposure and training, practice with new pedagogies, and the opportunity to mix and socialize with peers from across campus. Experiments in providing space for faculty and graduate students typically bring in campus partners to embellish and complete their offerings.

Some lingering or unresolved questions are:

- How might more libraries benefit from user-centered assessment applied to the design and programming phases of new learning spaces?
- How will critical student learning outcomes be identified and realized in these learning spaces?
- What new staff roles provided by both the library and campus partners are required to support and deliver the agenda of these spaces?
- How will libraries create and improve learning spaces to address the specific needs of local constituents without falling into the trap of simply emulating

what others have done, thus missing an opportunity for the library to engage the larger learning and research agendas of the institution?

- How will the information mission of the library be complemented and informed by these learning spaces?

We can expect to see libraries sustain the transformation of spaces afforded by shrinking on-site collections. The learning and research agendas of students and faculty may become more influential in these spaces. Pioneering libraries will continue to suggest the most promising responses.

Note: This article was written prior to Crit Stuart's spring 2009 retirement as Director of the ARL Research, Teaching & Learning Program. He may continue to be reached at crit@arl.org.

¹ Crit Stuart, "Virtual Resources and Instructional Initiatives: Snapshots of Library Experiments," *ARL: A Bimonthly Report*, no. 261 (December 2008): 5–8, <http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/arl-br-261-vrii.pdf>.

² See Nancy Fried Foster and Susan Gibbons, eds., *Studying Students: The Undergraduate Research Project at the University of Rochester* (Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 2007), <http://docushare.lib.rochester.edu/docushare/dsweb/View/Collection-4436>; and University of Minnesota Libraries, "A Multi-Dimensional Framework for Academic Support: A Final Report," June 2006, <http://conservancy.umn.edu/handle/5540>.

Comprehensive Survey Results

In early 2008, all ARL libraries were invited to describe innovative and noteworthy experiments in physical space programming and design. Responses are summarized in the accompanying article and, in order to encourage wide sharing of experiences, all survey responses are available on the ARL Web site. See <http://www.arl.org/rtl/space/2008study/>.

To cite this article: Crit Stuart. "Learning and Research Spaces in ARL Libraries: Snapshots of Installations and Experiments." *Research Library Issues: A Bimonthly Report from ARL, CNI, and SPARC*, no. 264 (June 2009): 7–18.

<http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/rli/>.

A Different Kind of Conversation: The Sparky Awards and Fresh Views on Change in Scholarly Communication

Jennifer McLennan, Director of Communications, SPARC

Campus rivalries, we know, are not only about football. This year, though, campuses may go head-to-head for the first time over something totally new: the number of students who speak out about their right to research.

As campuses take up the call to syndicate the Sparky Awards (SPARC's now-annual student video contest), digital commons, libraries, and student groups are coming up with creative ways to make the contest their own and bring more students into the conversation on access to research. A southwestern library may challenge their football rival to take up the Sparky Awards contest, and a northeastern digital commons has already started a three-way partnership with the university television station and the school of communications to support it.

The Sparky Awards is a contest that recognizes the best new short videos on the value of sharing information, and aims to broaden the discussion of access to scholarly research by inviting students to express their views creatively. The student voice brings freshness and energy to this ongoing conversation, highlighting that students are not only the stewards of new and social technologies, but also that they have the potential to reshape scholarly communication entirely—simply by holding fast to the sharing practices now a part of their daily lives.

The 2007 grand prize winner, Habib Yazdi's voiceless illustration of Pac-Man-like figures growing bigger and stronger through sharing information, is about as explicit and compelling a case as can be made.

The grand prize winners for 2008, from the University of Illinois at Chicago Honors College, point to the basic fact that sharing critical research findings has made advances in engineering possible—from the wheel to the rocket. (See “To Infinity and Beyond,” By Danaya Panya, Sebastian Rivera, Hemanth Sirandas, Uriel Rotstein, and Jaymeni Patel, <http://urliek.blogspot.com/2009/01/sparky-awards-entry.html>. To view all available past entries, visit <http://www.sparkyawards.org/entries/>.)


Through basic or intricate arguments in Sparky Awards entries, students have advocated energetically for wider access to research—giving us valuable tools for opening and broadening conversations with other students, faculty, and administrators.

The Sparky Awards is a great start to a different kind of conversation, and an opportunity to promote library services—including the information commons or media services—and underscore that the library is a key part of everyone’s learning experience. The library can be the place to edit video, browse media, work collaboratively, and learn about citations and copyright.

This year, building on initiatives by University of Pennsylvania, Brigham Young University (BYU), and Dartmouth College in 2008, SPARC is calling on libraries to syndicate the contest, so that students might

submit their entries to local contests as well as the national one. Randy Olsen, University Librarian at BYU, reports from last year:

At BYU...the experience was remarkable. Although our contest was open for less than a month, we received seven submissions prepared by 58 students. The night we screened the entries I invited the video producers to introduce their works. In every case the students spoke articulately, even passionately, about open access and it was obvious that they had become conversant with all of the issues we as librarians care so much about. By the end of the evening I felt that our investment in the awards—an iTouch and two \$50 checks—was money well spent.



2007 Sparky Awards Grand Prize Winner, “Share,”
by Habib Yazdi, University of North Carolina at
Chapel Hill, <http://blip.tv/file/488550/>

It's simple to host your own Sparky Awards. Make the national contest your template; all the fine print is done. Set a deadline that works for you, sometime in advance of the national deadline on December 6, 2009; name a panel of judges who will help attract attention on your campus; and offer your own prizes—such as video cameras or iPods. More details on the contest, past winners, and how to syndicate are at <http://www.sparkyawards.org/>.

Working with students, through the Sparky Awards, the SPARC “Right to Research” campaign, other forthcoming projects, and the SPARC summer intern program has brought welcome energy and fresh perspective on creating change in scholarly communication—at SPARC, but also on campuses. Adopting the 2009 Sparky Awards is but one more opportunity students have helped inspire to take the conversation ahead, and we look forward to learning where they will take us next.

Anu Vedantham at University of Pennsylvania Libraries and Barbara DeFelice at Dartmouth College Library contributed to the text adapted here.

To cite this article: Jennifer McLennan. “A Different Kind of Conversation: The Sparky Awards and Fresh Views on Change in Scholarly Communication.” *Research Library Issues: A Bimonthly Report from ARL, CNI, and SPARC*, no. 264 (June 2009): 19–21. <http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/rli/>.

ARL Selects Research Library Leadership Fellows for 2009–10

ARL has selected 21 individuals to participate in the 2009–10 ARL Research Library Leadership Fellows (RLLF) Program. This executive leadership program meets the increasing demands for succession planning for research libraries with a new approach to preparing the next generation of deans and directors.

This third offering of the RLLF Program is being designed and sponsored by seven ARL member libraries: Brigham Young University, University of Florida, Georgia Institute of Technology, University of Houston, University of Michigan, University of Utah, and University of Western Ontario.

The program began with an orientation session May 18–19 in Houston, Texas, prior to the ARL Membership Meeting. The 2009–10 fellows subsequently attended the Membership Meeting, where each fellow was hosted by a current ARL library director.

The 2009–10 RLLF applicant pool was highly competitive. The selection committee, composed of the ARL directors sponsoring the program, chose 21 fellows representing a broad array of backgrounds and experiences and from multiple ARL institutions. The 2009–10 fellows are:

Rick Anderson, University of Utah

Jeffrey Belliston, Brigham Young University

Diane Bruxvoort, University of Houston

Catherine Davidson, York University

Robert Fox, Georgia Tech

Robert Gerrity, Boston College

Chris Hives, University of British Columbia

John Lehner, University of Houston

Greg Raschke, North Carolina State University

Patrick Reakes, University of Florida
Bryan Skib, University of Michigan
Ann Snowman, Pennsylvania State University
Catherine Soehner, University of Michigan
Catherine Steeves, University of Guelph
Thomas Teper, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Ann Thornton, New York Public Library
Ben Walker, University of Florida
Tyler Walters, Georgia Tech
Jennifer Ward, University of Washington
Arlene Weismantel, Michigan State University
Catherine Wilkins, University of Western Ontario

For more information about the Research Library Leadership Fellows Program, see <http://www.arl.org/leadership/rllf/>.

To cite this article: “ARL Selects Research Library Leadership Fellows for 2009–10.” *Research Library Issues: A Bimonthly Report from ARL, CNI, and SPARC*, no. 264 (June 2009): 22-23. <http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/rli/>.

News

ARL Membership Convenes in Houston

On May 20–22 in Houston, 102 ARL member library representatives participated in the 154th Membership Meeting. Attendees engaged with speakers and one another, primarily regarding strategies to keep research libraries moving forward in innovative ways in the face of growing financial challenges.

The program theme of “Transformational Times” was addressed at several levels, including:

- “The Great Contraction” of our economy and historical lessons of economic theory that need to be heard in the public debate on recovery strategies (James Galbraith, Texas at Austin)
- The terms and scope of the Google Book Settlement (Kenny Crews, Columbia; Dan Clancy with Alex McGillivray, Google)
- The readiness of our community to redefine libraries as multi-institutional entities (Carole Moore, Toronto; Wendy Lougee, Minnesota; Anne Kenney, Cornell; Kevin Guthrie, Ithaka)
- Library leadership responses to disasters of Mother Nature’s making (Nancy Baker, Iowa; Paula Mochida, Hawaii; Lance Query, Tulane)
- Partnering with faculty and other constituencies to manage scientific data (Chris Greer, NITRD; Chuck Humphrey, Alberta; Clifford Lynch, CNI; Carol Tenopir, Tennessee)
- Consolidating and collaborating with other libraries for local delivery of services (Paula Kaufman, Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; Paul Courant, Michigan; Jim Michalko, RLG Programs/OCLC; Brian Schottlaender, California, San Diego; Jim Neal, Columbia; Anne Kenney, Cornell)
- Options for library discovery tools (Lynne O’Brien, Duke; Betsy Wilson and Jennifer Ward, Washington; and Bob Gerrity, Boston College)
- Research library roles in digital repository services (Carole Moore, Toronto)

Audio recordings and slides from speakers’ presentations are being posted on the ARL Web site as they become available. See

<http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/mmproceedings/154mm-proceedings.shtml>.

Transitions

National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH): President Obama has nominated former Congressman James Leach as Chairman of the NEH. Leach is currently the John L. Weinberg/Goldman Sachs and Co. Visiting Professor of Public and

International Affairs at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton. While serving as a member of the House for the state of Iowa, he founded and co-chaired the Congressional Humanities Caucus.

Urban Libraries Council: Susan Benton has been named President and CEO. She was previously Research,

Memorial

Edward Connery Lathem, 1926–2009

Edward Connery Lathem, Dartmouth College Librarian and Dean of the Libraries Emeritus, died unexpectedly on May 15, 2009, in his Dartmouth office at age 82. Lathem served as head librarian from 1968 to 1978. In 1973 he was accorded the rank of dean and he thereafter carried the dual title Librarian of the College and Dean of Libraries. Lathem was the editor or co-editor of several volumes of the poet Robert Frost’s work. While an ARL member representative, he was the Chairman of the Commission on Access to Resources (1973–74) and was elected to the ARL Board of Directors in 1975. He served as ARL President-Elect/Vice President in 1975–76 and President in 1976–77.

Development, and Strategic Partners Executive at the International City/County Management Association.

Grants

UCLA, Harvard, and Yale have been awarded \$5 million grants by Arcadia, a funding organization based in the UK whose mission is to protect endangered treasures of culture and nature. The grants provide flexible support for the libraries’ core functions.

North Carolina State’s Digital Library Initiatives, along with four partner organizations, have been awarded a \$2.18 million grant from the National Science Foundation to expand Dryad, a digital data repository. Dryad is designed to archive data that underlie published findings in evolutionary biology, ecology, and related fields.

Honors

Jim Neal (Columbia) was chosen to receive ALA’s 2009 Melvil Dewey Medal Award, which is given in recognition of creative leadership of high order. The 2009 Melvil Dewey Award will be presented at the ALA Award Ceremony and Reception on Tuesday, July 14, during the ALA Annual Conference in Chicago.

ARL Calendar 2009

<http://www.arl.org/events/calendar/>

July 9–15	ARL at ALA Annual Conference Chicago, Illinois
July 27–28	ARL Board Meeting Washington DC
August 17	LibQUAL+® at Northumbria International Conference on Performance Measurement Florence, Italy
October 13–15	ARL Board & Membership Meetings Washington DC
October 15–16	ARL-CNI Forum on Distinctive Collections in the Digital Age Washington DC
December 14–15	CNI Fall Task Force Meeting Washington DC

2010 Meetings

April 27–30, 2010	ARL Board & Membership Meetings Seattle, Washington <i>Note new dates</i>
July 12–14, 2010	National Diversity in Libraries Conference Princeton, New Jersey
October 12–15, 2010	ARL Board & Membership Meetings Washington DC
October 25–27, 2010	Library Assessment Conference Baltimore, Maryland
November 8–9, 2010	SPARC Digital Repositories Meeting Baltimore, Maryland

Research Library Issues

A Bimonthly Report from ARL, CNI, and SPARC

Research Library Issues is a freely available, online-only publication released six times per year by the Association of Research Libraries
21 Dupont Circle NW, Suite 800
Washington DC 20036
voice: 202-296-2296
fax: 202-872-0884
© 2009 Association of Research Libraries
ISSN 1947-4911

Executive Director: Charles B. Lowry
Editor: G. Jaia Barrett
Assistant Editor: Kaylyn Groves
Designer: Kevin Osborn, Research & Design Ltd., Arlington, Virginia

With issue no. 262 (February 2009), the name of this publication changed from *ARL: A Bimonthly Report on Research Library Issues and Actions from ARL, CNI, and SPARC* to *Research Library Issues: A Bimonthly Report from ARL, CNI, and SPARC*. Current and back issues are freely available on the ARL Web site.

The Web site is also where you may sign up for alerts of new releases of *Research Library Issues* and learn about submitting ideas for articles.

Visit <http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/rli/>.