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Introduction to University of Windsor

The year 2013 marked the University of Windsor's 50th anniversary as a public institution, but the story of our university actually began with its founding in September of 1857, when the first students arrived to study at its predecessor, Assumption College.

In the more than 150 years that have since past, the small, liberal arts college has grown into today's non-denominational, comprehensive, teaching and learning university. Approximately 16,000 students attend the University of Windsor today and its alumni family is more than 110,000 strong, with 35,000 living in the Windsor-Essex region.

Our students enroll in more than 140 undergraduate and graduate programs including several professional schools organized in nine faculties. The University of Windsor is located next to North America’s busiest international border crossing, where Ontario’s highway 401 and Michigan’s I-75 meet, and facing one of Canada’s most beautiful waterfronts on the Detroit River. This location speaks to UWindsor’s greatness as an internationally oriented, multi-disciplined institution that actively enables a broad diversity of students, faculty and staff to make a better world through education, scholarship, research and engagement. From that diversity, the University fosters an atmosphere of close cooperation between faculty and students, creating a unifying atmosphere of excellence across all of its faculties to encourage lifelong learning, teaching, research and discovery. Its basic characteristics of openness, warmth and support make the University of Windsor an exceptionally welcoming community for students and faculty from Asia, Europe, and Africa — or from just down the street.

The UWindsor is a progressive institution that offers a purposeful and enriching experience. We take responsibility for delivering change in the community and the world that surrounds it. We are proud of our accomplishments and of providing the environment and support to develop our current students and future alumni to their full potential.

Our Questions for the External Reviewers

From the library administration perspective, these are the main questions we are seeking to have the external reviewers’ opinion on, for Leddy Library:

1. **Range of services and resourcing:** are we devoting resources efficiently and appropriately across services that we should be offering? Does Leddy Library have an appropriate mix of staff and collections budget?
2. **Organizational structure and work focus:** are our librarians and staff organized effectively and focusing on the right areas to meet campus needs?
3. **Given our digital initiatives activities,** what would you **suggest** is a **cohesive model to organize and integrate** these different areas?
4. **Could you comment and offer any suggestions on our provision of staff and librarian training and development** to meet the new skills demand in Leddy Library, **within the context of our unionized environment?**
Leddy Library Quick Facts

Some Leddy Library “Firsts” We’re Proud Of

1. Leddy Library was an early “opt out” of Access Copyright agreement with strong support across campus
2. Our librarians were key to establishing the Librarian Research Institute, now supported as a CARL programme
3. uWindsor is one of only a few institutions that has a Faculty Senate-approved Open Access institutional mandate
4. Second Canadian CARL library to migrate to cloud-based next-generation ILS/Discovery with Ex Libris Alma & Primo (uManitoba was the first)
5. Perhaps the most productive newspaper digitization programme in Canada, and one of the largest in North America

Some Quick Facts

• The Leddy Library serves as the main library for all disciplines at the University of Windsor, except for the Faculty of Law which independently administers the Paul Martin Law Library. The Law Library has 2 librarians
• The University of Windsor Library was renamed the Leddy Library in honour of former University President Dr. John Francis Leddy in 1977
• The Leddy Library is administered by the University Librarian, with support from two Associate University Librarians. There are 5 departments in all:
  o Administration
  o Access Services
  o Acquisitions & Bibliographic Services
  o Information Services
  o Systems
• The Leddy Library has 22 professional Librarians and 1 Academic Data Learning Specialist (Ancillary Academic Staff). There are 44 full and part time support staff
• West (1962) and Main (1971) buildings provide:
  o 275 public computers
  o Three teaching classrooms
  o Four designated group study rooms
  o Compact storage areas
  o Curriculum Resource Centre
  o Media collections
  o Academic Data Centre & StatsCan Research Data Centre
  o Special Needs Annex for Persons with Disabilities
  o Writing Support Centre
  o Over 20,000 square feet of public study space
  o Rare Books & Special Collections; University Archives
• Open 116 hrs/week during academic term (70% of week)
• Open 152 hrs/week during 3 weeks of exams (90% of week)
• During exams, our Library is open 24 hours/day for 5 days/week. Normal hours are until 2 a.m.
• The Library has an operating budget of $12.4 million (2015-2016)
• The Library is a member of:
  o Canadian Association of Research Libraries (CARL)
  o Canada Heritage Movable Cultural Property Directorate (MCP) Designated Category A organization under the Cultural Property Export and Import Act (Rare Books & Special Collections)
  o Ontario Council of University Libraries (OCUL)
Coalition for Networked Information (CNI)
Confederation of Open Access Repositories (COAR)
Library Publishing Coalition
National Information Standards Organization (NISO), Library Standards Alliance

Collections and Access to Content

- The Leddy Library, the University’s main campus library, houses a collection of 1,579,375 print volumes; 1,513,277 units of microform (microfilm and microfiche); 2,609 linear metres of manuscripts and archives; 5,870 audio items; and 7,310 items of film and video. The Library also provides access to 75,847 full-text online journals and 1,187,362 e-books.
- Library materials are selected on the basis of the needs of the curriculum as interpreted by faculty members and the liaison librarians responsible for respective subject areas. Librarians work with faculty to identify relevant library resources that are required for teaching and learning and also provide assistance with in-depth research needs.
- Now in its third year, the Scholarship at UWindsor institutional repository has had a 40% increase in the number of papers deposited resulting in an incredible 284% increase in downloads from readers around the globe over last year’s statistics. Currently, there are 8760 works including journal articles, conference proceedings, presentations, theses, dissertations and images that have been downloaded over 537,184 times by readers from around the world (October 2015).

User Services

- During the 2014 summer & fall and 2015 winter terms, librarians and library staff taught in 88 different Information Literacy sessions to 3,269 students. Information literacy, which also includes data literacy, continues across all faculties and departments as well as with specific user groups.
- The Library works hard to meet the needs of patrons who come into our buildings as well as those who come into our spaces through various virtual gateways. Some highlights include (from 2014/2015 Annual Report: Sept 2014-April 2015)
  o 3382 Questions asked in person at Reference Help Desk.
  o 907 Questions asked via email and Ask-A-Librarian chat service
  o 3,515 Print monographs catalogued
  o 6,956 Interlibrary Loans transactions processed
  o 380,341 Unique titles of digital content uploaded or made accessible
  o 58,176 Books loaned
  o 757,574 People entered Leddy Library (daily average: 3,293 during academic year)
  o 18,764 Questions asked at Circulation Desk
  o 1,792,230 Number of pages printed on library networked printers
  o 1,329,711 Page views of Leddy website
  o 92.98 Percent of users using a laptop or desktop to access Leddy website
  o 5.05 Percent of users using a mobile device to access Leddy website
  o 1.97 Percent of users using a tablet to access Leddy website
Figure 1: Leddy Library Organizational Structure, with FTE counts
Pascal Calarco, the current University Librarian, was recruited from University of Waterloo, and began his first five year term in April 2016.

He holds a Master of Library & Information Studies from McGill University (1995), and an Honours Bachelor degree in Political Science from University of Western Ontario (1991).

Previously to joining the University of Windsor, Mr. Calarco served as
• Associate University Librarian, Research & Digital Discovery Services, University of Waterloo, 2011-2016
• Head, Library Information Systems, Hesburgh Libraries of Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame, 2004-2011
• Head, Library Information Systems, Virginia Commonwealth University Libraries, 2000-2004
• Advanced Technologies Librarian, Virginia Commonwealth University Libraries, 1997-2000
• Epidemiology & Public Health Librarian, Yale University, 1996-1997
• IAIMS Assistant, Cushing/Whitney Medical Library, Yale University, 1995-1997

Internationally, Mr. Calarco has served on the Ex Libris Users of North America (ELUNA) Steering Committee, serving as Chair-elect and then Chair, 2008-2011, and as Secretary from 2013-2016. ELUNA represents over 2,100 libraries in North American that use library technology products from the Israeli firm, Ex Libris, a ProQuest Company. ELUNA organizes and holds an annual meeting that attracts 600 from across North America and typically another 12-15 countries from the Caribbean, Europe, Israel and Australia and New Zealand. He has also served in a number of roles in the European-based sister organization, the International Group of Ex Libris Users (IGeLU).

Mr. Calarco currently serves as a Topic Committee co-Chair with the National Information Standards Organization (NISO) since 2013. The NISO Discovery to Delivery Topic Committee articulates challenges in the finding and distribution of information by and to users, producing Recommended Practices and technical standards for use by the publishing, library and information industries.

Mr. Calarco has along long been involved with the Association for Information Science & Technology, as a member since 1996, and serving on the ASIST Board of Directors, 2003-2007. During this time, he has served in numerous committee roles and has served as a Program Committee member and proposals reviewer in various years since 2007.

Mr. Calarco currently chairs a Confederation of Open Access Repositories (COAR) workgroup on Librarian Competencies to support E-Research, with participation from the Association for Research Libraries (ARL), Canadian Association of Research Libraries (CARL) and the Ligue des Bibliothèques Europeennes de Recherche/Association of European Research Libraries (LIBER).
Cathy Maskell

Cathy began her career in Windsor in 1992 as Science Librarian and InterLibrary Loan Coordinator. She served as Department Head in Access Services (1992/1993 & 1994-2001) and will shortly complete her third term as Associate University Librarian (Jan 2001 to Dec 2016). In January 2017 Cathy will become Acting Department Head of Acquisitions & Bibliographic Services for a one year term.

Cathy has a 2 Bachelor of Science degrees from McMaster University and an MLIS and PhD in Library and Information Science from Western University.

Cathy served in a variety of roles as Associate University Librarian including Chair of the Steering Committee for the migration to Conifer and then again for the migration from Conifer to ALMA/PRIMO; Chair of the Renewal/Promotion/Permanence Committee for Librarians (2001 to 2015); and as administration lead for liaison with the Acquisitions/Bibliographic Services and Information Services Department.

Cathy also served on several OCUL and CARL committees and working groups including being a member of the CARL Statistics Revision working group, the OCUL Quality Assurance Template (QAT) Working Group, and the CARL Library Education Working Group. She was commissioned by OCUL to survey member libraries on last copy and low use print repositories and from that study OCUL crafted the Thunder Bay Las Copy Agreement. Cathy also represented the library at several CARL and OCUL meetings when the University Librarian could not attend.

Joan Dalton

Joan has been a librarian at the University of Windsor for 25 years, serving as the Associate University Librarian (AUL) since 2007 and as Acting University Librarian in the 2015/16 academic year. She holds an MA in English from the University of Windsor, and an MLIS from Western University, class of 1986.

In her role as AUL, Joan has led a number of key initiatives including as project lead (2014) for the Ithaka Local Faculty Survey, and as the lead for Leddy’s participation in the national CFI-funded Synergies Project (2004-2007) to build a distributed platform to host open access research in the Social Sciences and Humanities. Her interest in the open access movement began with research into the impact and evolution of Electronic Theses & Dissertations (ETDs) as early models of open publishing initiatives. She has published and presented widely on ETDs, as well as the impact of Canadian copyright law on user’s rights and on the practice of academic librarianship.

Joan has served several times as a member of University Senate, on numerous search committees within the library and across campus, as a member of administrative negotiating teams through several rounds of bargaining, and as an Equity Assessor for the Faculty of Law. Her service to the profession of Librarianship includes serving as a member of Executive Council, Canadian Association of College and University Libraries (CACUL), as a member of the Canadian Library Association (CLA) Copyright Committee, and as the inaugural Chair of the Ontario Library Associations (OLA) Copyright Committee for seven years (2008-2015).
Leddy Librarians contributed to this self study in the following areas:

- Student and Community Engagement
- Teaching and Learning
- Research, Scholarship and Creative Work
- Digital Initiatives
- Data services
Student and Community Engagement: A Leddy Profile

Student Engagement

*Strengths: On Campus*

- Information literacy sessions with depts. Including embedded librarians in online courses
- Active role with distance education courses in social work
- Staff have good rapport with students
- Good relationship with other services on campus (Writing support, Career office)
- **UWill Discover** Undergraduate Research conference
- **English Conversation Group**
- Public talks (Open Access, Zotero, Librarian Research series)
- Co-sponsored talks and reading events (**Humanities week**)
- **Leddy Book Challenge**, Bring home a book for Valentine’s Day, wrapped books for holidays
- **Food for Fines**, Book Sale / Student Appreciation Coffee
- Formal relationship with UWSA, the Peer Support Centre and Therapeutic Paws of Canada at the end of both academic terms to organize “**Paws Room**” events for the students

*Opportunities: On Campus*

- In person use is down (reference desk, website hits, turnstile stats)
- no great space for public events or readings within the library (except staff room)
- little engagement with the library via social media; library doesn’t engage actively online
- communicating with students through our webpages
- Need better outreach with students in general (eg. “I wish I knew about you sooner”)
- Disconnect between Leddy news and Daily News
- Displays don’t have digital equivalents
- Communication between PR committee and library
- Communication between web committee and library
- Do we know what students want? (lack of data, lack of interest in following user experience research and practice)
- Not sure if “student engagement” is seen as a priority

*Strengths: In the community*

- High School experience
- **Public History course** to engage local community with Leddy’s Special Collections
- **South Western Ontario Digital Archive** (SWODA)

*Opportunities: In the community*

- no partnering with immediate neighbourhood or Sandwich (where students live)
- Are we where the students need us to be?
Community Engagement

**Strengths: On Campus**

- Partner with the City of Windsor (eg. Data)
- Personal connections to local history organizations
- [Windsor Public Library](#), [Hackforge](#)
- Data and analysis to community groups eg. [Hiatus house](#)
- Data resource for local businesses looking for market data
- [Harding project](#) (creating links to [Chatham Sports Hall of Fame](#) and the school boards)
- Ad hoc support of [Campus Community Garden](#)

**Opportunities: On Campus**

- Little formal partnering with external community groups
- Need better outreach between Data center and external groups

**Strengths: In the community**

- Open to community – can use computers
- Can access databases/printing/photocopying from our building
- Partnerships with [WEST/YMCA](#)
- [South Western Ontario Digital Archive (SWODA)](#)
- [Windsor Bookfest](#)
- Members of [Windsor Essex Compassionate Community Initiative](#) (WECC) to assist with data needs
- Orientation sessions to field instructors at the [Windsor-Essex Children’s Aid Society](#) complete with online tutorials for these instructors
- Open communication with social workers in the area doing research
Leddy Librarians have a strong presence on campus, both in the classroom and in support of teaching and learning initiatives on campus. What follows is a brief synopsis of the strengths of librarian teaching support as well as some of the challenges faced.

Strengths and Successes:

- **Collaboration with Faculty and IL Sessions**: All Liaison Librarians work closely with their respective departmental faculty members and students to support learning inside and outside the classroom. Part of establishing any teaching and learning initiative involves building those close relationships within members of the departments and responding flexibly and innovatively to departments’ specific needs and disciplines. Leddy Librarians reach, on average, approximately 3500 students per year through information literacy sessions across all faculties, from first year to graduate level. These sessions range in length and focus but all of them give students an opportunity to connect with their departmental librarian and learn basic information literacy skills. Many sessions encourage students to follow up via one-on-one sessions with librarians for more focused research help.

- **Embedded Librarian**: In addition to general information literacy sessions, Leddy Librarians are also interacting with classes in more innovative ways. Various librarians are embedded into courses, either as a co-instructor (e.g. 02-43-397 History on the Web) or an integrated member of courses (e.g., 02-26-309 Literary Bibliography and Methods) or online courses (e.g. 01-01-210 Ways of Knowing) or a. Librarians also hold office hours in selected departments (e.g. Social Work, Human Kinetics, Dramatic Art) in order to connect with students where they are. Librarians are also active in the teaching activities connected with the Centre for Digital Scholarship (e.g., 02-43-397 and 02-43-497) and with the Archives and Special Collections.

- **Teaching Librarians**: Leddy Librarians have the opportunity to hold teaching positions in any department, as long as they have the credentials. The course Mentorship & Learning (01-01-400) had been taught by a librarian for ten years and is part of the larger Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences Mentor Program. The Medical librarian has taught a required course in the School of Medicine for several years as well. These types of opportunities give librarians a chance to understand campus teaching and learning issues from the perspective of teaching faculty members, and thus informs librarian and information literacy work.

- **Research Activities**: Pedagogy and teaching and learning are key areas of scholarly research among Leddy Librarians. In recent years, librarians have been published in a wide variety of edited collections, peer-review scholarly journals (e.g., *Library Trends, History Teacher, Reference and User Services, Communications in Information Literacy*), and presented their information literacy and teaching related research at conferences (e.g., STLHE, WILU, LILAC, CAPAL, CAIS, and others).

- **Campus and System Support**: Many librarians work closely with the Centre for Teaching and Learning, either taking courses or certificates in areas of teaching and learning, or facilitating workshops for faculty members in areas where librarians can support faculty teaching. Librarians have also begun working with the Office of Open Learning, in order to support the emerging area of online synchronous learning systems, such as Blackboard Collaborate. Librarians have been very involved in the campus Learning Management systems (Sakai and then Blackboard), having had seats on the LMS Selection, Steering, Review and Advisory committees, respectively.
• **High School Connections:** Leddy Library has also been active in supporting research and teaching for local high schools. Four local high schools visit Leddy Library and receive information literacy workshops and opportunities to engage with our scholarly resources. Roughly 200 students attend sessions throughout the year. Librarians are also active in workshops like the Windsor History Teacher’s Conference for local high school History teachers.

**Challenges**

• **Curriculum mapping and standardized instruction:** The liaison model used at Leddy Library provides librarians with tremendous opportunities to engage with their faculties/departments in useful ways. However, the autonomy held by librarians also makes it difficult to standardize the way that information literacy instruction occurs. All librarians bring different strengths, experience and understanding to their instruction, so the end product will always look different. This creates a challenge when wanting to standardize the teaching goals. This coupled with faculties/departments who also share vastly different understandings of and support for librarian integration into teaching, makes standardizing that librarian involvement difficult. The new ACRL Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education represents a possible solution. This framework was introduced to faculty at a recent campus Teaching and Learning workshop and there was overall excitement and interest in using the framework. The interdisciplinary and flexible nature of the framework could allow for librarian and faculty autonomy as well as a standardized focus. This is something to work on.

• **Balancing Workload and Liaison Responsibilities:** Many librarians have responsibilities in more than one department or faculty. While this is common across academic libraries, it does mean that there are times that not all departments and faculty get the same amount of attention. The distribution of subjects can be unbalanced. The generalist nature of Leddy Library, serving all faculties and departments with the exception of the Faculty of Law, also means that often librarians are asked to be liaison specialists in some areas and generalists in others. For example, one librarian might have responsibility for all the sciences, making it difficult for that librarian to be a specialist in all or make headway in the areas of teaching and learning support. Since teaching and learning initiatives takes a lot of time and collaboration with many faculty members, asking librarians to accomplish this in three, four or five departments is a challenge. All departments and faculties are unique and require an understanding not only of the curriculum but also the faculty members and students themselves, and that all takes time. The same issues of familiarization and specialization arise when librarians are switching liaison responsibilities each year, to accommodate retirements, sabbaticals and other librarian movement.
Librarian Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity

Increasingly, Canadian academic librarians are engaging in research and scholarship as a means to inform, improve, and enhance their professional practice. Librarians at Leddy Library have been encouraged to develop strong research capacity and engagement. In recent years, efforts put into increasing librarian's engagement in scholarship was in part to encourage and promote interactions and partnerships with teaching faculty on campus, as well as to strategically raise librarians’ standing and visibility as strong faculty members of the University of Windsor. Towards this end, librarians have become integral members of research teams across the Windsor campus including but not limited to collaborations with faculty from Human Kinetics, Social Work, Drama, History, English, Clinical Psychology, and the Centre for Teaching and Learning. Most librarians at Leddy Library have embraced the opportunity for and responsibility of scholarly engagement as evidenced by the listing of Leddy Librarian scholarship and creative activity for the period 2012-2016 in Appendix II. In addition to an impressive list of publications, Leddy Librarians have also been successful in attaining additional advanced degrees at both the Masters and Doctoral levels during their tenure at Leddy, as well as in receiving internal grants and external funding including CARL, HECQO, and Trillium grants.

While many have now embraced research as a component of their professional and academic role and as a means to inform their librarianship and day-to-day practice; because of the disparity in engagement across the cohort, some tension has emerged in regards to the proportion of a librarian's role that is devoted to research. There are some who prefer to concentrate fully on their professional practice or service roles.

Efforts to create a culture that supports the research endeavors of librarians have been made both at the administrative and grass roots levels. Towards this end, the Librarian Research Series was developed as a means to showcase the research of librarians. A strong cross section of librarians have participated drawing in audiences of up to 40 people. Further, Two librarians from Leddy (Selinda Berg, Heidi Jacobs) were key contributors and developers of CARL Librarians’ Research Institute, a successful, competitive, cohort model for providing academic librarians tools and a national support system for their own formal research growth and capacity.

### Librarian Research & Creative Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed articles published</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book chapters published</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edited journals/ books</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles and/or Papers presented</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly workshop facilitations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comprehensive bibliography of research, scholarship and creative work by Leddy librarians for the past five years is included as an Appendix.
Leddy Library’s Centre for Digital Scholarship (CDigS) was formally launched in spring of 2015. CDigS creates a visible and cohesive organization from which we can market and mobilize our expertise and facilities to diverse groups and needs. Our office space on the 4th floor of Leddy and in the Basement West provides work spaces for short and long-term projects, meeting spaces, and centralized locations for equipment and software.

CDigS brought several strong and existing digital initiatives at Leddy such as SWODA, open access, scholarly communication, digital research and pedagogy together under one strategic structure. By bringing these ventures together, CDigS leverages numerous strengths and opportunities and works together to address shared challenges. This report outlines the work we are currently doing in these areas.

**SWODA**

The Southwestern Ontario Digital Archive (SWODA) is home to online archival collections developed at the University of Windsor. As the major academic research institution in Southwestern Ontario, we are working closely with the campus and local community to make more of our primary source materials freely available on the web. These cover the region’s history, architecture, culture and social life, labour, agriculture, anti-slavery and underground railway history, manufacturing, industry, Great Lakes, and also Assumption College/University of Windsor resources. SWODA enables faculty, students, and other researchers to create new knowledge that engages users and better communicates our history and culture.

**SWODA Newspapers (INK)** is one of the largest and most comprehensive digital newspaper collections in Canada. It includes over 50 newspapers for a total of nearly 2 million pages and is searchable using optical character recognition technology. Many of
the titles, e.g. the *Amherstburg Echo*, the *Border Cities Star*, the *Windsor Evening Record*, the *Essex Free Press*, the *Voice of the Fugitive*, are extremely important primary sources for local history research. Many new titles such as the *Tecumseh Tribune* and the *Tecumseh Maple Leaf* continue to be added. INK averages 1500 unique visitors a day.

**SWODA Publications** currently contains Assumption College/University of Windsor monographs and serials such as the Ambassador Yearbooks and the student newspaper, the *Purple & White*. We have also made the City of Windsor Directories, 1913-1964, available online. By studying the directories over the decades, one can trace the growth and development of this region. Another 75 items of interest to local historians are in the process of being included in this database.

**SWODA Images** is a growing collection of almost 1,800 historical photographs, postcards, and ephemera of southwestern Ontario, primarily Windsor and Essex County. Most span the decades from the 1880s to the 1960s. All have extensive metadata, making them fully searchable and browse-able for research purposes.

- Opportunities for research and publishing are enhanced because there is easier and more sustainable access to: the information content of fragile resources; difficult format materials e.g., photographic negatives; rare materials that previously needed to be locked away for security reasons.
- In addition to assisting with providing users from around the world with limitless access to these materials, digitization also helps to preserve rare and fragile items for future generations.
- Provision of metadata enables faster and more effective information searching and retrieval.
- Supports the undergraduate learning experience by allowing students to more easily relate their studies back to their own local environment and community.
- Allows faculty and library staff to spend less time overcoming access issues and more time helping students and researchers with the interpretation of primary source material; enables more creative and original course design and delivery.
- Cooperation and collaboration with the campus and local community builds trust and good working relationships that allow for the continued growth of the Archive and other related projects.
- The process of digitization, which includes the review of collections, assessment of condition, and the creation/enhancement of metadata also results in better control and management of University resources and information content.
SWODA serves as a promotional and marketing tool for the University

Usage of all SWODA materials is high. The newspaper database is accessed millions of times per year. The image database has had close to 120,000 page views in the last 12 months.

New and interesting collections continue to be added to SWODA. A sample of the kind of materials includes: a private collection of local postcards and ephemera dating from the 1860s to the 1980s, a collection of black and white photographs of Windsor in the 1940s to the 1980s, the City of Windsor directories from 1913 to 1964, the Tecumseh Tribune, the Walkerville Times, the International Joint Commission Archival Collection, 1960 to 2000, and Assumption College/University of Windsor publications such as the Purple And White newspaper and the Ambassador Yearbooks.

Many excellent formal and informal relationships have been established between the library and individuals in the community, local history organizations, the Windsor Public Library, the Windsor Community Museum, Fort Malden, the City of Tecumseh, the International Joint Commission, the Ontario Community Newspapers Association, Walkerville Publishing, as well as internal University of Windsor groups such as the Lance Newspaper.

Marketing and knowledge mobilization of SWODA collections on campus and beyond

Funding for the appropriate staff, equipment and software upgrades, processing costs

Links

SWODA Newspapers: http://ink.ourdigitalworld.org
SWODA Publications: http://scholar.uwindsor.ca/swoda
SWODA Images: http://swoda.uwindsor.ca

Open Access and Scholarly Communication

Leddy Library is well positioned to provide open access (OA) to University of Windsor scholarship through gold open access publishing and green open access archiving. Both of these are essential given the recent federal open access mandate from Canada’s Tri-Agencies, the University of Windsor’s OA policy, and an increased need for public access to research. In addition, the Library’s systems and expertise enable us to be responsive to the
research dissemination needs of our campus and community through a variety of software platforms. Here are some of our major undertakings.

**Scholarship at UWindsor** is the institutional repository (IR) for the University of Windsor. It is home to our theses and dissertations collection, faculty journal publications, reports, published conference proceedings, and other unique digital collections related to our institution.

**Open Journal Systems**, hosted by Scholar's Portal, is the journal publishing platform for the University of Windsor. The library has been a supporter of the Public Knowledge Project (PKP) and active user of Open Journal Systems since 2007. The library supports several important disciplinary journals with managing editors on our campus and have continued to support journals whose editors have moved to other institutions.

PKP's **Open Monograph Press** (OMP) is used to publish OA monograph series for the University of Windsor. The University of Windsor was one of the earliest adopters of OMP. Partnering with former Provost Leo Groarke and the Centre for Research on Reasoning on Research, Argumentation and Rhetoric (CRRAR) we launched the Windsor Studies in Argumentation (WSIA) series. WSIA has now produced 3 volumes with more titles in development.

- Windsor’s IR enables researchers to easily comply with OA policies while providing detailed statistics that demonstrate impact for authors. Sites like ResearchGate and Academia.edu are not recognized as acceptable platforms for OA policy compliance while Scholarship at UWindsor is.
- Leddy Library is well positioned to ease the additional workload on faculty around OA policy compliance by offering mediated deposits. Leveraging existing staff expertise in copyright and metadata to ensure that the correct version of articles are posted along with complete metadata.
- SelectedWorks software enables authors to provide a personalized presentation the research that they host in our IR similar to other academic social networking platforms.
- The IR is an ideal home for unique Windsor publications. The IR provides us with the ability to be responsive to emerging digital distribution and preservation needs on our campus.
- IR plays a central role in the operations of highly visible projects on campus such as the UWill Discover undergraduate research conference and Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation Archive.
• The library has developed an expertise around open monograph publishing. Every title we produce is released in multiple formats including PDF, EPUB and print-on-demand through Amazon's CreateSpace service.
• The library has been able to leverage this expertise to support highly visible projects on campus such as the faculty edited and student co-written book Epigenetics in Society which was funded by the Universities Strategic Initiatives fund.
• The library recently joined CrossRef enabling us to assign DOIs to our digital content.
• Since launching 3 years ago the IR is approaching 11,000 items that have been downloaded over 850,000 times.
• Thousands of theses and dissertations from the University have been added to our IR leading to vastly increased exposure and readership to this excellent body of work.
• Coordinated outreach from Library Liaison’s successfully recruited faculty publications from departments across campus at the launch of the IR.
• University of Windsor Open Access Policy passed at senate in 2015.
• Many unique publications have been added to our IR providing online access for the first time to valuable research collections.
• The library has developed good relationships with external partners such as the Office of Research and Innovation Services (ORIS) and the Office of Open Learning around OA issues.
• Many faculty are still unsure of the variety of approaches to providing OA access to research and they have a variety of reservations about the open dissemination of their work.
• Lack of resources to support a gold OA author fund for author publication fees.
• While the Tri-Agency policy has improved OA awareness, it is still difficult for the library to gain traction and audience with researchers on these issues.
• OA requirements can increase the burden on faculty workload given the variety of systems they need to interact with. Finding ways to streamline these processes and push and pull information between systems would take some of the burden away from faculty.

Scholarship at UWindsor
Centre for Digital Scholarship (Central home for Publishing Collections & Digital Projects)
Open Access
Open Access Policies
Pedagogical and Research Initiatives

CDigS has also been active in developing connections with faculty in terms of research and teaching. We have or are currently partnering with faculty in Biological Science, Clinical Psychology, English, History, Drama, School of Creative Arts and campus groups such the UWill Discover Undergraduate Conference, Humanities Research Group, and Turtle Island Aboriginal Education Centre.

Some of our representative projects include:

**Epigenetics and Society:** Students in a 4th year class on Epigentics worked together to publish a new professionally reviewed book on the subject, *Epigenetics and Society*. Published digitally in Scholarship at UWindsor’s Emerging Scholars Press, this book is also available as print-on-demand.

**The Harding Project:** A joint collaboration between Leddy Library, the Department of History, and the Chatham Sports Hall of Fame, and descendants of the late Boomer Harding, the Harding Project is a multi-faceted digital historical project involving archival preservation, oral history collection, and a wide range of digital and non-digital knowledge mobilization plans aimed at K-12 students, the community-at-large and academic researchers. This project has received a $72,500 Trillium Grant and several campus research grants.

**The Great Lakes Journal of Undergraduate History:** Emerging from undergraduate History students’ aims to create and sustain a consistent outlet for top undergraduate history students from universities located within the Great Lakes region, this journal features their high quality, peer-reviewed research papers within the pages of a published academic journal. The *Great Lakes Journal of Undergraduate History* attempts to promote a new research culture among undergraduate history students in Ontario.

**43-397 History on the Web:** Team taught by Leddy’s History liaison and a History professor, this course encourages students to think critically about the increasingly digitized discipline of History; students engage with history on the web both theoretically and in hands-on participation. The instructors were awarded a Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences Teaching Innovation Award in 2016.
43-497 Public History: In this course, students work with librarians and archivists at Leddy to select and digitize selections from our Archives and Special Collections. Students then use Omeka software to develop a digital exhibition related to these documents and artifacts, using Omeka software.

- CDigS creates a visible and cohesive organization from which we can market and mobilize our expertise and facilities to diverse groups and needs. Our space on the 4th floor of Leddy provides work spaces for short and long-term projects, meeting spaces, and a centralized location for equipment and software.
- Provides space, equipment, software, and expertise to build digitization and online knowledge mobilization plans that allow researchers to reach a greater audience and more effectively engage users with their content.
- Offers campus and community members a destination for queries related to digital scholarship, digital preservation, and digital pedagogical projects
- Actively and effectively promotes the innovative research and teaching activities at Leddy Library and the University of Windsor around the world
- Draws upon expertise and strengths in the library such as archives, systems, user experience, Data Centre, information literacy to partners with groups across campus and the community
- Active partner in numerous SSHRC grants and applications

Strengths

- Funding for dedicated staff is limited and we are currently at capacity for projects we can take on
- Currently reliant upon grant funding to hire student workers and research assistance for both basic and complex projects
- SWODA and CDigS-related work is additional to librarians’ increasing duties and responsibilities as liaison librarians

Challenges

Links

Centre for Digital Scholarship
Epigenetics and Society
The Harding Project:
The Great Lakes Journal of Undergraduate History
43-497 Public History
Academic Data Centre

The Academic Data Centre consists of Data Librarian Kristi Thompson, Data Learning Specialist / Statistical Consultant Dan Edelstein, and Geospatial Analyst Carina Luo. In 2015-2016 we continued our work of providing support to expand the quality of research and teaching using quantitative sources and methods at the University of Windsor. We provide full support for all aspects of academic data use, which means statistical and methodological consulting, data reference, scraping web data, advice on survey development, teaching quantitative methods modules in courses, conducting software tutorials and helping with Research Ethics Boards reviews, and dealing with any consequent issues that arise. We continually innovate and revise our approach to accommodate professors and fit our services to the framework of their teaching and course formats. What we have is in essence a Data Studio model—“a user-centered model that focuses on patrons as creators and consumers of information—and by defining an academic data service as a public good that bridges the research and teaching and learning missions of an institution.”1

In the 2015-2016 academic year Dan and Kristi worked with faculty to support 25 classes using quantitative sources and methods, and Carina worked with 21 classes to support geospatial data and methods, for a total of 46 classes. Roughly half were at the graduate level with the rest being undergraduate. Many of these involved simple lectures or workshops followed by consultations with individual students as needed, while others included more in-depth support. For example, Carina worked with a group of MBA students to conduct customer profiling and site selection analysis for different types of retail stores in the Detroit area, from which they helped their clients (retailer companies) to identify the service gaps of existing stores and select appropriate locations for new stores. Dan and Kristi provided intensive support for over 40 students from a new, data-intensive concentration in the economics department, the Master of Applied Economics and Policy, speaking to one of their econometrics classes, helping them with the statistical package Stata, assisting them to find data for their projects, and coordinating software and support with their econometrics professor / program head.

Carina also provided an open workshop for Social Work faculty/graduate students, where she showed the participants how to use a free online mapping tool (Google Fusion Tables) to visualize social services and community data, and a civil engineering graduate workshop where she taught the students how to apply geospatial data and GIS tools for watershed modelling. Both received positive feedback.

We had a total of 1,071 consultations in the period August 2015-July 2016. Roughly 50% of these were with graduate students, 30% with undergraduates, and the remaining 20% with faculty. A few examples of consulting support for faculty and advanced graduate students from this year included Dan working with several Kinesiology faculty who knew the traditional technique repeated measures ANOVA, and teaching them the newer technique linear mixed models, which allowed them to use their data much more flexibly and usefully. He also helped a finance professor learn and implement in SPSS the cutting-edge statistical technique propensity score analysis. Dan and Kristi also worked with a graduate economics student to implement a pseudo-longitudinal analysis model (based on a description in an article), and to obtain correct marginal effects for logistical analysis with a squared term. These are examples of how the Academic Data Centre is the last resort on campus for assisting researchers with locating, implementing and interpreting recently developed or highly obscure statistical methods that are not implemented in statistical packages and may not have even been described in formally published literature.

The data centre has also worked extensively with community organizations. In August 2015, Carina became a formal member of the Windsor Essex Compassionate Community Initiative (WECC), an innovative project aimed to improve quality of life and reduce health inequities for elderly and vulnerable citizens in Windsor-Essex. By extracting and mapping Census demographic variables, Carina helped the research team to identify the target areas with large concentrations of priority populations. Later Kristi joined the research team to provide a full methodological review of survey protocols and questionnaires for the next part of the project. The results will be used to create a comprehensive website where people can find the help they need. Other community work included providing statistics and analysis for board members of Hiatus House looking at an expansion of services.

In addition, data librarian Kristi Thompson drew on her experience providing data support in the library while co-editing the book *Databrarianship: the Academic Data Librarian in Theory and Practice*, which came out in June 2016 from ACRL. Library Journal reviewed the book with the summation “Richly informative, this work will add depth and context to the work of anyone building data support services in libraries.”

**Research Data Centre**

The Research Data Centre, a secure lab for accessing confidential Statistics Canada data, is an integral part of the suite of data services offered by the library. Dan Edelstein is its Academic Director, and Kristi and Carina are both deemed employees, enabling them to enter the centre to provide support and assistance.

Last year the Windsor RDC had 15 active projects in which individual faculty and graduate students and teams of researchers investigated a wide range of topics for publication in scholarly journals, Ph.D. dissertations, and master’s theses. We provide assistance to applicants to the RDC, answering their questions and helping with their applications, and for successful applicants, we provide statistical assistance inside the RDC. As an example of one project that required a large amount of support, Kristi and Dan were co-investigators on a master’s thesis project that examined what Canadian communities were particularly attractive as retirement communities to older Canadians. We provided in-depth assistance to the student, including programming using the statistical software SPSS, using and understanding the metadata, applying the appropriate statistical methods, and interpreting the results.

In 2016 Dan in his role as Academic Director applied for Windsor’s share of a Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI) grant to all the RDCs across Canada to allow us to upgrade to a “thin client” system, which means that instead of storing data on local servers and desktops, researchers would access the data from a large central server in Ottawa, allowing access to extremely large data sets. National grant approval is in progress.

---

Historically, the Leddy and Law Library at uWindsor have been funded above some comparator peer CARL libraries in the comprehensive category in Ontario, but below levels in other provinces (see page insert from CARL 2014/2015 statistics). This support as a percentage of total university operating expenditures has been decreasing steadily since 2007, as uWindsor went through annual “realignments” (i.e. mandated budget reductions) following 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Operating</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>$6,982,722</td>
<td>$4,456,804</td>
<td>$41,489</td>
<td>$11,481,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>$7,262,935</td>
<td>$4,291,966</td>
<td>$184,758</td>
<td>$11,739,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>$7,033,270</td>
<td>$4,747,675</td>
<td>$411,341</td>
<td>$12,192,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>$7,145,311</td>
<td>$4,895,700</td>
<td>$412,273</td>
<td>$12,453,284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: University of Windsor Personnel, Materials and Operating Budget, 2012-2016

Collections Expenditures

Academic libraries across the country are experiencing significant challenges to their information resources budgets, and University of Windsor’s Leddy Library is no exception. The library has faced diminished purchasing power for its collections budgets over the past several years due to 3 main factors:

- No addition to the base materials budget since before 2006
- Several years of realignments to library budgets resulting in several cuts to the base acquisitions budget
- Inflationary costs charged by publishers in annual renewals with the average annual renewal increases between 2 and 5 percent
- Fluctuating US dollar exchange rate. Costs of the U.S. dollar in the past 2 years alone have increased our acquisitions costs by almost 30%. Since just over 80% of our acquisitions are from US vendors this exchange rate is a huge burden on our budget. The first twenty percent of currency fluctuations are expected to be absorbed by the Library budget, with central providing year-end funding to amounts in excess of a US dollar above 1.20, resulting in further purchasing power reduction.

Our consortial partnerships with the Ontario Council of University Libraries (OCUL) and with the Canadian Research Knowledge Network (CRKN) have provided savings to us over the years through leveraging our purchasing power through big deal and group purchasing. But these savings have been far overshadowed by the continuing inflation and exchange costs we face.

As a result, the Library is dealing with slightly over a 50% over-expenditure in its acquisitions funds, specifically in the Electronic fund which reflects the electronic resources we purchase and that comprise approximately $4.4 million of the $4.6 million we spend our acquisitions dollars on year over year. In past years, surpluses from the operating and salaries budgets were used at year end to balance budgets. This came to a head in 2015-2016, when year end surpluses could no longer make up acquisitions deficits, resulting in a real $900k structural deficit in May 2016, and this deficit will continue to rise. To begin to address this over-expenditure, Leddy Library began to systematically analyze collections usage, cost and trend data in Summer 2016. Over the next year, we are performing a baseline review of all existing materials budget items to assess their:

- Alignment with current academic program offerings
Table II – Ratio of material expenditures and library expenditures to university expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Total Material Expenditures</th>
<th>Total Library Expenditures</th>
<th>Total University General Operating Expenditures (in $1000's)</th>
<th>Ratio (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>$18,125,903</td>
<td>$44,254,225</td>
<td>$1,289,007k</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Fraser</td>
<td>$9,716,127</td>
<td>$23,144,153</td>
<td>$449,988k</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>$7,885,829</td>
<td>$18,246,601</td>
<td>$328,331k</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Material Expenditures/University Expenditures</th>
<th>Library Expenditures/University Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
<td>3.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Fraser</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
<td>5.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Provincial average | $11,909,286 | $28,547,993 | $689,109k | 1.73% | 4.14% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Total Material Expenditures</th>
<th>Total Library Expenditures</th>
<th>Total University General Operating Expenditures (in $1000's)</th>
<th>Ratio (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>$21,528,257</td>
<td>$44,319,792</td>
<td>$1,044,080k</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>$13,965,340</td>
<td>$35,262,228</td>
<td>$784,766k</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>$10,050,899</td>
<td>$27,334,221</td>
<td>$514,752k</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>$3,278,989</td>
<td>$9,102,484</td>
<td>$188,265k</td>
<td>1.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>$13,511,290</td>
<td>$26,456,023</td>
<td>$525,238k</td>
<td>2.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Material Expenditures/University Expenditures</th>
<th>Library Expenditures/University Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
<td>4.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
<td>4.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td>5.31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Provincial average | $12,466,955 | $28,494,950 | $611,420k | 2.04% | 4.66% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Total Material Expenditures</th>
<th>Total Library Expenditures</th>
<th>Total University General Operating Expenditures (in $1000's)</th>
<th>Ratio (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>$3,093,179</td>
<td>$8,146,829</td>
<td>$241,643k</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td>$5,500,255</td>
<td>$16,922,867</td>
<td>$373,012k</td>
<td>1.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph</td>
<td>$7,834,605</td>
<td>$18,809,202</td>
<td>$377,265k</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster</td>
<td>$10,425,242</td>
<td>$21,708,922</td>
<td>$661,445k</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>$15,165,566</td>
<td>$30,809,202</td>
<td>$734,146k</td>
<td>2.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen's</td>
<td>$9,828,515</td>
<td>$20,987,851</td>
<td>$462,211k</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryerson</td>
<td>$4,653,291</td>
<td>$13,665,310</td>
<td>$505,782k</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>$31,449,135</td>
<td>$83,490,006</td>
<td>$1,829,519k</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>$8,499,060</td>
<td>$20,319,005</td>
<td>$608,888k</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Ontario</td>
<td>$14,602,933</td>
<td>$27,630,371</td>
<td>$612,569k</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>$4,895,060</td>
<td>$12,453,248</td>
<td>$608,688k</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>$11,133,173</td>
<td>$29,870,212</td>
<td>$789,370k</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Material Expenditures/University Expenditures</th>
<th>Library Expenditures/University Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
<td>3.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td>1.47%</td>
<td>4.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>4.99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Provincial average | $10,590,055 | $26,272,487 | $620,629k | 1.71% | 4.23% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Total Material Expenditures</th>
<th>Total Library Expenditures</th>
<th>Total University General Operating Expenditures (in $1000's)</th>
<th>Ratio (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concordia</td>
<td>$5,971,119</td>
<td>$16,810,801</td>
<td>$410,114k</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laval</td>
<td>$12,633,669</td>
<td>$28,163,259</td>
<td>$585,486k</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill</td>
<td>$18,851,349</td>
<td>$44,109,498</td>
<td>$643,369k</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montréal</td>
<td>$10,264,944</td>
<td>$22,088,900</td>
<td>$696,586k</td>
<td>1.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherbrooke</td>
<td>$5,431,682</td>
<td>$11,350,887</td>
<td>$340,834k</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UQÀM</td>
<td>$5,182,306</td>
<td>$17,674,069</td>
<td>$414,405k</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Material Expenditures/University Expenditures</th>
<th>Library Expenditures/University Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concordia</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laval</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
<td>5.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Provincial average | $9,722,512 | $23,962,746 | $510,132k | 1.91% | 4.58% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Total Material Expenditures</th>
<th>Total Library Expenditures</th>
<th>Total University General Operating Expenditures (in $1000's)</th>
<th>Ratio (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dalhousie</td>
<td>$8,082,154</td>
<td>$18,266,912</td>
<td>$444,017k</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial</td>
<td>$9,351,174</td>
<td>$22,486,761</td>
<td>$494,370k</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>$4,134,803</td>
<td>$9,594,286</td>
<td>$227,876k</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Material Expenditures/University Expenditures</th>
<th>Library Expenditures/University Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dalhousie</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>4.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
<td>4.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Regional average | $7,189,377 | $16,782,653 | $388,754k | 1.85% | 4.32% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Total Material Expenditures</th>
<th>Total Library Expenditures</th>
<th>Total University General Operating Expenditures (in $1000's)</th>
<th>Ratio (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National average</td>
<td>$10,518,844</td>
<td>$25,308,586</td>
<td>$579,277k</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table I - Ratio of library personnel to university enrolment  
*Tableau I - Ratio d’employés de la bibliothèque comparé aux inscriptions universitaires*

Overview | Aperçu : Ratios 2014-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Total librarians</th>
<th>Total library personnel</th>
<th>Total (FTE) student enrolment</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nombre de bibliothécaires</td>
<td>Personnel de la bibliothèque</td>
<td>Étudiants inscrits (EPT)</td>
<td>Étudiants/bibliothécaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>317.7</td>
<td>52,343</td>
<td>601.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Fraser</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>187.1</td>
<td>26,232</td>
<td>518.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>137.8</td>
<td>18,367</td>
<td>592.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provincial average</strong></td>
<td><strong>56.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>204.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,314</strong></td>
<td><strong>574.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>206.0</td>
<td>38,681</td>
<td>586.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>236.6</td>
<td>28,443</td>
<td>526.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>187.0</td>
<td>23,861</td>
<td>378.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>11,821</td>
<td>562.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>138.2</td>
<td>19,178</td>
<td>452.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional average</strong></td>
<td><strong>49.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>167.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,397</strong></td>
<td><strong>495.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>17,217</td>
<td>860.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>137.8</td>
<td>25,459</td>
<td>890.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>125.0</td>
<td>20,907</td>
<td>774.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>130.4</td>
<td>28,155</td>
<td>1,224.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>162.0</td>
<td>37,862</td>
<td>823.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen's</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>128.0</td>
<td>30,375</td>
<td>759.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryerson</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>30,924</td>
<td>1,066.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>179.0</td>
<td>650.0</td>
<td>73,984</td>
<td>413.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>152.0</td>
<td>33,670</td>
<td>1,086.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Ontario</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>176.0</td>
<td>31,766</td>
<td>648.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>15,215</td>
<td>634.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>188.0</td>
<td>52,879</td>
<td>1,016.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provincial average</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>173.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,201</strong></td>
<td><strong>726.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>119.4</td>
<td>27,550</td>
<td>688.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laval</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>215.0</td>
<td>34,284</td>
<td>672.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>185.0</td>
<td>30,536</td>
<td>484.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montréal</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>266.0</td>
<td>39,717</td>
<td>456.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherbrooke</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>18,899</td>
<td>863.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UQÀM</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>164.5</td>
<td>28,357</td>
<td>601.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provincial average</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>171.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>29,891</strong></td>
<td><strong>578.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalhousie</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>129.0</td>
<td>16,279</td>
<td>602.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>177.1</td>
<td>15,180</td>
<td>341.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>7,836</td>
<td>398.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional average</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>132.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,098</strong></td>
<td><strong>431.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National average</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>170.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,827</strong></td>
<td><strong>612.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• cost per use calculations, for both journal packages and databases, for COUNTER-compliant resources
• assessment of use by Faculty, by capturing on-campus EZ Proxy usage (beginning August 2916), as well as off-campus EZ Proxy usage

In Fall 2016 Leddy Library implemented a cost reduction strategy to review our electronic resources collections and make cuts where it is advisable, based on initial analysis of resources that were up for renewal. It is clear that Leddy’s digital collections provide crucial support for research, teaching and learning. Supporting the university’s priorities in student learning and research is at the core of the library’s mission. While there are difficult decisions ahead, we will continue to be careful stewards of our collections and our acquisitions dollars. As we move through this process, we will continue to communicate and engage with our faculty and students. The core principles that guide our endeavors are:

• Maintain core resources for teaching, learning & research at the University of Windsor
• Maintain full-text e-journal, e-book and other primary source databases as much as possible.
• Reduce duplication of content across formats and providers
• Considering the multitude of means to ‘discover’ information and relevant research focus content discovery through a smaller portfolio of discovery and indexing tools
• Maintain access to owned content and content for which we have perpetual-access rights

Some of the factors used to evaluate resources will include:

• Low demonstrated demand and use
• Extent the resource(s) support particular programs or areas of study/research
• High or unjustified cost
• Duplication with content in another resources
• Problematic licensing terms
• Feedback from faculty regarding the value/importance of resource(s)

The first phase of the review in Fall 2016 aims to target $250,000 in cancellations and will primarily focus on discovery tools such as indexes and abstracts and on a few full-text resources previously identified as low use and therefore possible targets for cancellation.

The Library also engaged with 1science, a bibliometrics consulting firm in Montreal, to analyze University of Windsor scholarship and open access surrogate availability for published peer review articles indexed in Thomson Reuters’ Web of Science. Results from this analysis provide an evidence-based snapshot of where uWindsor faculty are publishing, and what titles they actually use for citation of the journal titles that the Library subscribes to.

In January 2017, requests for feedback for proposed cancellations will be announced and publicized, in conjunction with soliciting feedback from a CRKN journal usage study survey which asks faculty the titles which they use for research, teaching and learning.

The library will maintain a web page listing new information on the review project and on resources identified for cancellation, and the Library with engage with faculty at the Deans through individual faculty levels, and students via the undergraduate and graduate student governments.

Personnel

Leddy Library is currently organized into five departments, with a total FTE count of 66. Several positions are vacant due to early retirements and, where budgets permit and the need justified, will be recruited for in 2017 and 2018. As with our collections investments, as positions become vacant we will assess the need to rehire them and release positions as warranted to reduce the Library’s fiscal deficit. The greatest change over the past decade has been the reorganization and amalgamation of staff into fewer departments due to personnel cuts. Acquisitions, Bibliographic Services and Interlibrary Loan were reorganized into a single department in the late 1990s, and Serials Records and Preservation staff joined them
from what was a separate Collections department in 2006-2007. Reference and Collections librarians were merged into an Information Services department at the same time to articulate a unified liaison librarian model.

Breakdown of Library Staff by Union

All Library employees at Leddy Library are organized in union locals, excepting the University Librarian, Associate University Librarians, and one of the two Executive Assistants to the University Librarian.

There are three union locals, in four groups:

CUPE 1393: Computer Technicians (4), Geospatial & Data Analyst (1),
IT Desk Support (2)
UNIFOR 2458, Full time: Clerks, Secretary and Administrative Assistants (15),
Library Assistants (4) Cataloguing Assistants (2), Bookkeeper (1)
UNIFOR 2458, Part time: Shelvers (6), Clerks (8), Secretary (1)
Windsor University Faculty Association: Faculty Librarians and Ancillary Academic Staff (19)

Food service workers in the Library are also organized, but do not report up through the Library. Housekeeping staff are employees of ServiceMaster Canada, and are externally contracted with the University.
Staffing summary, 2000-2001 through 2015-2016:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT/PT Support Staff</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT/PT Support Staff</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8: Staffing summary, 2000--present

As shown in the chart above, the greatest reductions have come from the staff complement (22 positions), with library faculty losing one position from their highest point.

Staff reductions have come from Acquisitions/Cataloguing/Inter-library Loans (11 positions), Access Services (9 positions), Information Services (6 positions), Systems (1 position) and Administration (1 position). Over the same period, three staff positions were added to Systems, and 1 AUL to Administration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian (UL)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian (AUL)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookkeepers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ship/Rec Clerk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acq/Bib Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invoicing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT/PT Clerks</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Assistants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>FT/PT Support Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:**
- Librarians: 88
- FT/PT Support Staff: 66

Total: 91
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During the 2015.16 reporting year Leddy Library continued to be guided in its activities by the library’s five-year plan (2012-2017 – Appendix A) and the core values and strategic priorities of the University. Ms. Gwendolyn Ebbett (University Librarian 1994-2015) retired and Joan Dalton (Associate University Librarian) stepped in on an interim basis while the international search for a new UL was extended into 2016. The search reached a successful outcome with the arrival of Pascal Calarco, an Associate University Librarian from the University of Waterloo, in April of 2016.

One key accomplishment of the reporting year was the launch of the Centre for Digital Scholarship on the 4th floor of Leddy Library in Fall 2015. Within the first year it has proven to be a key hub for students, faculty and researchers through the creation of multiple digital initiatives that are gaining widespread attention on campus and beyond.1

Shifts in staffing levels continued with several librarians and clerical staff retiring during the reporting period, representing a combined 112 years of service to the University of Windsor. Over the next eighteen months these roles, along with several subsequent retirements, will be assessed, modified and recruited for in some fashion.

A key struggle in the reporting year was coping with the devalued Canadian dollar in the maintenance of subscriptions to digital resources that support teaching and research on campus. Approximately 80% of these are in US currency, so the library’s buying power was significantly impacted. This shortfall, combined with the realignment reductions over the past eight years mean that the materials budget is now 50% over-expended annually.

Addressing this fiscal situation will require a baseline review of digital resources in terms of affordability, usage, and program support in order to fashion a sustainable budget model for the future. Over the next year, the Library will be doing an inventory and assessment of evaluation data of our resources usage and budget to better inform “right sizing” academic program support starting in fiscal year 2017/2018. Evidence-based recommendations for prudent cancellations will be articulated out of this, and a sustainable model that fully covers the cost of inflation and currency fluctuations will be sought.

Pascal Calarco, University Librarian

entre for Digital Scholarship, Leddy Library (http://cdigs.uwindsor.ca/drupal/)

A. INTRODUCTION

Leddy Library plays a fundamental role in supporting the delivery of academic programs and research activities at the University of Windsor through the timely and ready access to the world’s knowledge, through the preservation of both print and digital collections, and through the provision an environment which fosters the pursuit and creation of knowledge.

B. GOALS & OBJECTIVES

1. Provide an exceptional undergraduate experience:
   a. Offer students the opportunity to engage in new media scholarship.
   b. Present opportunities for engagement in digital scholarship and publication processes;

2. Pursue strengths in research and graduate education:
   a. Lead the campus discussion on open access scholarship and publishing
   b. Provide core data and geospatial services in support of research and graduate education;

3. Recruit and retain the best faculty and staff
   a. Analyse and apply results from Ithaka Faculty Survey (Fall 2014)
   b. Liaise with campus units in developing online teaching & learning opportunities.
   c. Contribute to development of regional and national infrastructures to support research data management plans;

4. Engage and build the Windsor/Essex County community through partnerships
   a. Partner with regional agencies to bring history alive on the web and in multiple formats;
   b. Engage with local community-driven, not-for-profit agencies to develop technological tools, skills training opportunities and key data presentation and analysis for community use.

5. Promote International Engagement
   a. Welcomed faculty members from China to Leddy Library in conjunction with the International Faculty Development Program, hosted by CTL.
   b. Liaison Librarian assigned for International students on campus; Leddy hosts weekly English Conversation Groups throughout the academic year.
C. Successes

- Centre for Digital Scholarship: Launch (Fall 2015) and resulting initiatives
- University Librarian: Recruitment of Pascal Calarco (Spring 2016)
- Ithaka Faculty Survey: Analytic review of survey results to inform policy development and services

D. Challenges

- Library Acquisitions: Close to 80% of annual online subscriptions are paid in US dollars;
- Staffing: Meeting the challenges of retirements and skills development of current staff;
- Assessment: Need for a fully developed program of assessment in support of transparency and accountability

E. Future Actions/Initiatives

In the current reporting year, Leddy Library will pursue the following specific actions and initiatives

1. Undergo an External Review process;
2. Launch a Strategic Planning process;
3. Review and revise library acquisitions spending toward future sustainability;
4. Complete installation of Digital Wall project;
5. Investigate and plan for the establishment of outcomes-based assessment program.
The goals and objectives of Leddy Library for the reporting year (2014/16) are in alignment with the University’s values and key strategic initiatives, as outlined in this report. Leddy Library continues to be guided by its own strategic plan (Appendix A) in meeting those goals and objectives. More than just source for research collections, Leddy Library seeks to offer opportunities for growth, engagement and success through its services, collections and the dedication of its staff and librarians in sharing their knowledge and expertise.

1. Provide an exceptional undergraduate experience

a) Offer students the opportunity to engage in new media scholarship

The Centre for Digital Scholarship was launched in Fall 2015. Located in the 4th floor, Leddy Library main building, it has provided the space, equipment, and guidance of knowledgeable librarians needed to successfully support student engagement in numerous digital scholarship initiatives. The History Department’s Dr. Adam Pole, Dr. Rob Nelson and the Library’s Dr. Heidi Jacobs have successfully launched courses on Public History and History on the Web which have offered students the opportunity to engage with primary source material from the University’s and Archives and Special Collections and to connect with local organizations to develop online digital archives. Students are guided by librarians in the scanning of primary source materials then the editing and metadata creation for the resulting digital objects, and the design of a fully online digital presentation. By working with librarians in the Centre for Digital Scholarship, students are developing skills in digital communications and scholarship which reflect a shift away from the liner text-based research papers to more visually-oriented, deeply engaging digital research utilizing primary sources. Additionally, they were encouraged to think critically and creatively about how history is presented on the web.  

2 One key outcome included recognition by the University through several awards to students, librarians and faculty involved for achievements in student research and engagement and in teaching innovation.

2 Southwestern Ontario Digital History Project (http://cdigs.uwindsor.ca/omeka/)
b) Present opportunities to engage in digital scholarship and publication

The University’s institutional digital repository, Scholarship at uWindsor, offers hosting services, technical assistance and long-term preservation for digital publications at the University of Windsor. The Great Lakes Journal of Undergraduate History, an online open-access journal, provides history undergraduates a chance to edit, review, publish and contribute as authors to a refereed, scholarly journal featuring student contributions from both sides of the border. Faculty members such as Dr. Michael Crawford (Biology) have embraced the potential of open access publishing. Epigenetics in Society, is an open-access textbook produced by several of his senior students the students under his editorial direction. Hosted at Scholarship at uWindsor, the textbook has enjoyed over 500 downloads since its launch in October 2015. The Centre provides work and meeting space, equipment and the expertise of librarians who are available to support student learning in all aspects of online publishing initiatives.

2. Pursue strength in research and graduate education

a) Lead the campus discussion on Open Access scholarship and publishing;

In Spring 2015, Senate passed the University’s first open access policy, which generated a lot of discussion among faculty members around the viability of open access publishing as an alternative to the existing closed, increasingly expensive scholarly publishing ecosystem. Knowledge of the options offered by open access and the benefits of building an open scholarly ecosystem is growing among faculty and researchers worldwide, primarily due to librarian advocacy. Librarian outreach to faculty one-on-one, educational sessions with faculty colleagues and graduate students, and organized events during Open Access Week in October each year offer opportunities to learn about the changing nature of scholarly communications and its impact on the academy and individual researchers.
b) Provide core data and geospatial services in support of research and graduate education;

Librarians and data specialists at the Academic Data Centre and the Research Data Centre in Leddy Library continue to provide support to expand the quality of research and teaching on campus using quantitative sources and methods. They provide full support for all aspects of academic data use, which means statistical and methodological consulting, data reference, scraping web data, advice on survey development, teaching quantitative methods modules in courses, conducting software tutorials and helping with Research Ethics Boards reviews, and dealing with any consequent issues that arise. There were recorded a total of 1,071 consultations in the period August 2015-July 2016. Roughly half were with graduate students, a third with undergraduates, and the remaining with faculty members.

3. Recruit and retain best faculty and staff

a) University of Windsor Local Faculty Survey

A campus-wide faculty survey deployed Fall 2014 resulted a 21% response rate. “A key goal of the University of Windsor Local Faculty Survey was to provide evidence-based strategic insights into how faculty members perceive the role of the Leddy Library and identify areas of opportunity for growth. The analysis aims to identify how disciplinary differences drive and shape faculty members’ understanding of the role of library-provided content and support services. The results from the survey revealed the following strategically relevant high-level findings:

● University of Windsor or faculty members’ views of the role of the library and the library’s services are highly stratified by disciplinary affiliations.
● Arts and humanities faculty members at the University of Windsor highly value and recognize the library’s role in providing student support services related to the development of information literacy skills.
● A majority of faculty members support an institutional policy requiring that their peer-reviewed journal articles or conference proceedings be made open access or publically available via a repository;
● Across all major disciplinary categories, faculty members view the library’s spending on acquisitions and resources critical to their ability to conduct research.”

b) Liaise with campus units to develop online learning opportunities and initiatives

Leddy Librarians have liaison assignments across campus to ensure each department has a contact librarian for assisting faculty and students in their library needs. The success of this model of engagement led the Library to assign a librarian liaison to the Office of Open Learning (OOL) to explore synergies between units around online curriculum development and access to high-quality open educational resources (OERs).

This has proven to be a natural fit between two campus units focused on providing opportunities for faculty and students to engage with new technologies and the growing collection of high quality openly accessible teaching resources online. Librarians bring deep knowledge of digital copyright issues and open educational resources to the table in this important partnership that supporting a developing area.

c) Contribute to the infrastructure development for Research Data Management.

Leddy Librarians have contributed to key initiatives both regionally (OCUL – Ontario Council of University Libraries) and nationally (CARL – Canadian Association of Research Libraries) pertaining to developing the infrastructure needed to support researchers in the management and preservation of large data sets resulting from research. For years, these large data sets have sat precariously on desktop computers or obsolete storage devices.

Dataverse and the Ontario Library Research Cloud (OLRC) are services of OCUL available to University of Windsor researchers offering a storage service in a cloud network in an effort to provide an alternative to commercial cloud storage and to allow members to more closely control their costs and maintain control of their data. OLRC maps to institutional repositories, ties research deposit to data deposit for storage, preservation and future use. On a national level, the Portage Network, an initiative of CARL is dedicated to the shared stewardship of research data in Canada.

4. Engage and build the Windsor/Essex County community through partnerships

a) Partner with regional agencies to bring history alive on the web;

A partnership between Prof. Miriam Wright (History) and information literacy librarian Dr. Heidi Jacobs resulted in website and digital archive documenting the life of Wilfred “Boomer” Harding and the Chatham Coloured All-Stars in the 1930’s using family scrapbooks as a primary source. The collaboration expanded to include the Chatham Sports Hall of Fame, and was awarded Trillium Funding for continued development of the site. Jacobs and Wright have presented on their work, and plan to work with local school boards to create instructional materials for the
site that will be compatible with curriculum for kindergarten to grade 12. “The story of Wilfred “Boomer” Harding’s life is not just a story about sport, or race, but an intersectional narrative of human struggle, perseverance, and success.”

b) Engage with local organizations to bring technology to the broader community

Hackforge Windsor “... a shared space where creative technological minds come together to make things happen.”, has attracted the involvement of Leddy Librarians who have contributed to key initiatives designed to offer the community opportunities to engage with data and technology in meaningful ways in their daily lives. Open Data Windsor Essex is a special interest group of Hackforge, led by librarian Mita Williams, as is Maptime Windsor Essex, an interest group about teaching and learning about maps. In September 2015 the Hackforge Open Data Community Portal was launched. Other community partners include Pathway to Potential, Bike Windsor/Essex, Ford City Renewal and the Windsor International Film Festival.

5. Promote International Engagement

a) Engage with visiting faculty members from China

During the reporting year, and in conjunction with the International Faculty Development Program hosted by CTL, Leddy hosted Chinese Faculty from the Beijing Information Science and Technology University and the Shanghai University of Engineering Science. This included an afternoon program designed to give our guests a taste of how Canadian academic Librarians do their work. It consisted of a tour of the library, interactive group discussions about faculty and student needs of an academic library, and an awareness of what librarians at the University of Windsor do for our faculty and students. Resulting from this encounter, two librarians from Leddy (Shuzhen Zhao and Karen Pillon) will be visiting the University of Chinese Academy of Sciences in Beijing, China at the end of June 2017 where they will be invited into the classroom to conduct a lecture series for students on developing Information Literacy skills and writing academic papers.

b) Library services to University of Windsor international students.

In an effort to ensure an optimal academic experience for the campus international student population, Leddy Library appointed a liaison librarian as a key contact person in the library. The International Librarian is available for one-on-one reference assistance as well as offering group instruction.

4 Race, Athletics and Courage (Beta) http://cdigs.uwindsor.ca/harding/
through International Student Services. A key initiative started in 2013 is the library’s English Conversation Group. A weekly meeting led by a team of four librarians creates a space and opportunity for students to practice English and learn about Canadian culture and academics. This group has become extremely popular with international students, and the relationships forged between the attendees and the librarians have provided a positive and enriching experience for all the students who have attended.

B. Future Actions & Initiatives


1. Continue search for new University Librarian
2. Install and launch Digital Wall Project to innovatively highlight campus creative and scholarly works.
3. Investigate and launch a program of outcomes-based assessment practices
4. Use findings from the Ithaka Faculty Survey to identify new areas of service, support and partnerships for research, teaching and learning;
5. Develop partnerships with campus departments and groups to explore initiatives for the delivery of OER (Open Educational Resources) in support of online course development.

1. Successfully completed with the arrival of Pascal Calarco in April 2016
2. A delay in procurement and construction has moved the installation date into the current academic year (2016/17)
3. Progress made in the reporting year includes the collection, organization and analysis of data reflecting the use of digital collections.
4. Progress made in the reporting year includes new liaison librarian made appointments to underserviced departments. Further use will be made of during Strategic Planning in 2017.
5. Liaison Librarian assigned to the Office of Open Learning ensures deep collaborative opportunities.

In the current reporting year (2016/17) Leddy is pursuing the following specific actions and initiatives:

1. Undergo an External Review process;
2. Launch a Strategic Planning process;
3. Review and revise library acquisitions spending toward future sustainability;
4. Complete installation of Digital Wall project;
5. Investigate and plan for the establishment of outcomes-based assessment program
The annual *MacLean’s University Ranking* issue (Nov. 2016) saw Leddy Library move from 4th to 3rd in terms of institutional financial support among comprehensive universities; this reflects 5% of the overall university operating budget. The Library spent 38% of its budget for maintaining current subscriptions and to acquire new materials which earned it a rank of 8th place among 15 comparative institutions, down from 7th place in 2015. The library’s buying power has been severely diminished by the devalued Canadian dollar, coupled with several years of realignment and annual inflationary increases. In the *Globe and Mail*’s *Canadian University Report* (2016) for the second year in a row the Leddy Library per-student spending on resources was listed as “above average” in a provincial comparison.

### 2014.15  2015.16  %var

**A. Leddy Overall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014.15</th>
<th>2015.16</th>
<th>%var</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Librarians &amp; AAS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full and part-time support staff</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Librarian Research & Creative Work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014.15</th>
<th>2015.16</th>
<th>%var</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed articles published</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book chapters published</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edited journals/ books</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles and/or Papers presented</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly workshop facilitations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Information Services Department**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014.15</th>
<th>2015.16</th>
<th>%var</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference Questions asked at Reference Desk</td>
<td>3,382</td>
<td>2,463</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Questions asked online or by email</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Information Literacy interactions with students</td>
<td>3,269</td>
<td>2,105</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Acquisitions & Bibliographic Services Department**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014.15</th>
<th>2015.16</th>
<th>%var</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print monographs catalogued</td>
<td>3,515</td>
<td>2,317</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary Loans transactions processed</td>
<td>6,956</td>
<td>3,306</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique titles of digital content uploaded or made accessible</td>
<td>380,514</td>
<td>175,929</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E. Access Services Department**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014.15</th>
<th>2015.16</th>
<th>%var</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books loaned</td>
<td>58,176</td>
<td>56,554</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People entered Leddy Library</td>
<td>757,574</td>
<td>694,121</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People entered, daily average</td>
<td>3,293</td>
<td>3,005</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions asked at Circulation Desk</td>
<td>18,764</td>
<td>8,436</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2014.15

F. Systems Services Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>4%</th>
<th>Number of public computer workstations at Leddy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,792,230</td>
<td>1.6M</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of pages printed on library networked printers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613,537</td>
<td>644,145</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of user sessions initiated on Leddy Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,329,711</td>
<td>1.2M</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of page-views on Leddy Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Users using desktop or laptop to access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Users using mobile device to access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Users using tablet to access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Use of Scholarship at uWindsor Institutional Repository

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>9%</th>
<th>Number of items deposited into the IR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>1,958</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of downloads from around the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274,020</td>
<td>279,154</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of User Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,094</td>
<td>83,304</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59,487</td>
<td>64,899</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Page views</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selected Analysis / Commentary on “Leddy by the Numbers”

B Librarian Research and Creative Work increased on average by 33% overall.

C i, ii Reference interactions continue to decrease as user increasingly “Google” their questions .. in future, efforts will be made to capture data on the in-office library research consultations between students and their assigned Liaison Librarians.

D, iii Data for 2014/15 reflects the content loaded from the previous library system (Conifer) during the migration to the new library system (Alma/Primo) during the summer of 2014, which is reflected in a larger count.

E, i “books loaned” reflects the physical collection only. Work is required among academic libraries to reach consensus on the metric to measure ‘usage’ of e-books online.

E, iv Data for 2014/15 total reflects the period during migration to the new library catalogue and search system, perhaps an indication of the learning curve experience by users.

F, iii, iv “User sessions” increased while “page-views” decreased on Leddy webpages. It could be due to the introduction of one-stop-search in Primo where article-level indexing on the primary screen replaces the need for users to seek out specific disciplinary databases to search for articles.
Appendix A

Leddy Library Strategic Plan 2012-2017

Direction 1: Enable an inviting and successful library experience.

The Library will strategically provide services and space, both in-person and virtual, to anticipate user needs on a foundation of service excellence.

Goal 1.1 – Enhance and deliver in-person services and physical spaces to ensure our ongoing ability to meet the evolving needs of diverse user communities in a welcoming environment.

Goal 1.2 – Continue to develop and augment virtual services and support for new technologies to strengthen the experience of the mobile library for the campus community including those working off campus and through online education.

Goal 1.3 – Build on our accomplishments in providing in-depth research and curriculum support and mentorship in a revitalized liaison role.

Direction 2: Expand upon the Library’s role as a hub for research and learning activities.

The Library will grow as a vibrant focal point for the University and the local community.

Goal 2.1 – Build and maintain library collections that continue to support research and learning activities undertaken in both real and virtual space by the University campus community.

Goal 2.2 – Seek and foster opportunities for collaboration that utilize the Library’s interdisciplinary nature and its core role in both research and learning.

Goal 2.3 – Continue to cultivate a focus on acquiring and digitizing material of historic and cultural importance to the Windsor/Essex region, and further explore collaborative opportunities at provincial and national levels for more broadly conceived digitization activities.

Direction 3: Take a leadership role in scholarly communication.

The Library will lead on providing services, initiating policy development and building awareness on campus in support of evolving methods of scholarly communication.

Goal 3.1 – Develop a comprehensive scholarly communications plan.

Goal 3.2 – Augment support for Open Access publishing on campus through the provision of innovative tools for online collaboration and publication.
Goal 3.3 – Work to raise awareness of and participation in international Open Access, Open Source, and Open Data movements.

Goal 3.4 – Expand existing tools, infrastructures and strategies to curate, preserve, and expose the scholarly research, data and creative output of our faculty and students.

Goal 3.5 – Seek opportunities to contribute, participate and collaborate in open teaching and learning initiatives on campus.

Direction 4: Support a culture of lifelong learning, skills development and customer service excellence for all library personnel.

The Library will provide an environment that encourages the pursuit of excellence to meet the rapidly evolving needs of our user communities.

Goal 4.1 – Assess and implement strategies in support of ongoing personnel development and growth.

Goal 4.2 – Enhance and maintain a workplace culture of mutual respect and a desirable work environment.

Direction 5: Tell our Story

To further enhance the reputation of the University of Windsor, the Library will heighten awareness of its accomplishments, services and activities.

Goal 5.1 – Augment existing public-relations and marketing functions to develop new and vibrant ways to tell our story within the campus community, in the local community, provincially, nationally, and internationally.

Goal 5.2 – Build on existing assessment practices to focus on measurable goals that will guide future directions and ensure accountability.

Goal 5.3 – Explore community outreach activities to generate new relationships and strengthen existing community partnerships.
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Introduction

As part of the Library Review Self-Assessment process the following activities were undertaken:

1. Library Wide Meeting – Hopes & Fears activity
2. Departmental SWOT Analysis (5 sessions)
3. Web-based SWOT Survey

The above listed activities were facilitated by Marcela Ciampa, Manager, Employee Engagement and Development. This document includes a compilation and analysis of the information gathered through these activities.
Hopes & Fears Activity

On September 30, 2016 Leddy Library employees were engaged in a facilitated discussion designed to take stock of the greatest hopes and greatest fears associated with the Library Review process.

1. **Number of participants**: 35 employees (staff & librarians)

2. **Process**:
   - Individual reflection: As the Leddy Library embarks on this review process what are your greatest hopes and fears/concerns for the review process?
   - Small group activity to identify a maximum of 5 hopes and 5 fears to share with the rest of the group
   - Presentation of brainstorming and large group exercise (using dot stickers) to identify the greatest hopes and greatest fears

3. **Output from the discussion**:

The table below outlines the hopes and fears identified through this activity. Please note that the information is written verbatim. The number in parenthesis represents the number of “dot stickers” that the hopes/fears received through the prioritization exercise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hopes</th>
<th>Fears</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strength campus support and recognition for the Library (2)</td>
<td>Library and/or departments will be devalued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective organization of resources to needs (1)</td>
<td>Turf war potential (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space renovations (1)</td>
<td>Process will be divisive (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will improve morale</td>
<td>Results in cuts to staff and resources (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of direction (2)</td>
<td>Unattainable goals (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope for financial resources and support staff positions (1)</td>
<td>The process is window dressing for predetermined changes (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The success and work of employees are brought to the forefront (1)</td>
<td>Voices outside the Library will be valued greatest (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refocus collection management</td>
<td>We will not have enough money to make changes identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope we all get to know each other again</td>
<td>Findings will be misinterpreted in final report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New cool stuff (1)</td>
<td>Review will set the bar too high for existing staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation/affirmation of things we need (3)</td>
<td>It does not result in more positive outcomes for the Library (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the student experience (2)</td>
<td>Change not based on evidence or need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the Library image to the campus and the community (3)</td>
<td>IT services will be centralized (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage and empower staff (5)</td>
<td>Too much change too quickly (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify new areas of growth (1)</td>
<td>Not enough change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following are the greatest hopes and greatest fears emerging from the prioritization exercise:

**Hopes**
- Positive changes and benefits for everyone at Leddy
- Engage and empower staff
- Validation/affirmation of things we need

**Fears**
- The process is window dressing for pre-determined changes
- Results in cuts to staff and resources
- IT services will be centralized

**Photos of the output of the discussion**
4. Suggestions on how the Library can support staff/librarians as it undergoes the review process

This discussion was included in the agenda for the September 30th meeting. Due to time constraints, it was moved to the Departmental SWOT sessions. Below, please find a summary of the information gathered through the discussions.

Suggestions brought forward:
- Continue to engage staff during the process
- Provide regular communication including monthly updates not only on the review process but other issues impacting the Library
- Communicate the importance of taking time to carry out the work associated with the review
- Provide a detailed overview of the process (steps) and highlight the opportunities for staff engagement
- Ensure transparency
- Share the self-assessment report that is sent to the reviewers

Questions brought forward:
- Will the external reviewers conduct the review based on “today” or based on future forecasts/trends?
- What vision will guide the review process?
- What opportunities will be available for student engagement?
Current Realities – SWOT Analysis

The SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities & Threats) analysis framework was used to carry out the self-assessment component of the Leddy Library review. A SWOT analysis includes an assessment of the current realities of the Leddy Library as well as the analysis of the environment within which the Library operates. This process can reveal areas for improvement, trends, limitations and opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths – Internal</th>
<th>Weaknesses – Internal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Areas that the Library performs well, capabilities, assets.</td>
<td>Areas for improvement. Things that prevent/limit the Library from achieving its purpose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities – External</th>
<th>Threats – External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External factors that could contribute to the success of the Library.</td>
<td>Challenges/problems/risks caused by external factors that could negatively impact the Library.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. SWOT Sessions Held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 3, 2016</td>
<td>Access Services</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 5, 2016</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 5, 2016</td>
<td>Information Services</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 6, 2016</td>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>7 (includes one student employee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 7, 2016</td>
<td>Acquisitions/Bibliographic Services</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Process

The following process was followed in each of the sessions:

- Participants were divided into small groups/triads.
- Self-reflection activity to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the Leddy Library/department, and the opportunities and threats present in the environment within which the Library operates.
- Small group discussion to identify 5 strengths, 5 weaknesses, 5 opportunities and 5 threats to bring forward to the larger group.
- Large group exercise with “dot stickers” to identify the greatest weaknesses, opportunities and threats (prioritization exercise). Participants were asked not to place any stickers on the strengths based on the premise that the Leddy Library will utilize all of its strengths to address weaknesses, capitalize on opportunities and minimize the impact of threats.
Emerging Themes from the SWOT Sessions

A “thematic analysis” of the information gathered through the five (5) SWOT sessions was conducted. As part of this process, broad categories/themes were identified. The strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats were summarized and grouped by theme.

1. Emerging Themes – Strengths of the Leddy Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging Theme</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Services provided to the campus community           | • High quality services provided and great customer service  
• Technology available to students including specialized software  
• Tailored services for specialized groups such as ADC, Liaison and ESL  
• Size and scope of the print and digital collections  
• Course reserves  
• Open access resources  
• Efforts made to make the Library more welcoming to patrons |
| The people who work at the Library, their roles and the work environment | • Level of experience and expertise of employees  
• Willingness to learn and respond to customer feedback  
• Diversity of opinions and approaches to work including librarianship  
• Engagement of librarians in research and the profession  
• Dedication and commitment to helping others  
• Teamwork within departments and shared values  
• Job/role satisfaction  
• Positive recent shifts in the work culture |
| Hours of operation                                  | • Generous hours of operation and extended hours during exams                                                                           |
| Study areas for students                            | • Diversity of study and collaborative spaces including comfortable seating areas, tables, spaces for group work and quiet areas         |
| Collaborations/partnerships across campus           | • Positive relationships and collaborations with faculty/researchers                                                                  |
2. Emerging themes – Weaknesses of the Leddy Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging Theme</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Services provided to the campus community | • Not sufficient textbooks for students to access, particularly as the cost of textbooks rise  
• Outdated Library collection and resources  
• Unavailability of many Library services in the evening/weekends  
• Inconsistencies in the provision of service and application of policies  
• Imbalance between core and emerging services  
• Declining usage statistics (desk, website and borrowing) and no assessment/evaluation strategy  
• No coherent direction                                                                                                                                 |
| The work environment                  | • Not enough training/professional development opportunities, including opportunities for cross-training  
• Communication silos between departments and employee groups  
• Internal conflicts negatively impacting collaboration and teamwork  
• Low staff morale and mistrust of administration  
• Downsizing through attrition. Not enough employees to carry out the work.  
• Many employees feel disengaged, unmotivated, tired and burnt-out  
• Lack of team building opportunities including opportunities for team members to learn about respective areas of expertise  
• Centralization of work  
• Decision making and conflict resolution processes                                                                                                                                                     |
| Financial resources                   | • Insufficient financial resources to meet needs  
• Allocation of resources within the Library                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| Facilities and infrastructure        | • Dated building and infrastructure impacting safety, security and the student experience  
• Lack of technological integration with the rest of the campus  
• Lack of customization of the Library software  
• Allocation/configuration of spaces. Librarians are not highly visible  
• Not sufficient comfortable study rooms/areas                                                                                                                                                            |
| Outreach, promotion and collaboration | • Insufficient outreach and promotion strategies  
• Library is not visible/accessible to all students  
• Disengagement with the rest of the campus                                                                                                                                                              |
The “thematic analysis” of the weaknesses was followed by a review of the number of “dot stickers” the weaknesses received through the prioritization exercise. Based on this analysis, from the participant’s perspective, the following have been identified as the most critical weaknesses of the Library:

- Not enough training/professional development opportunities, including opportunities for cross-training (25 dot stickers)
- Communication silos between departments and employee groups (13 dot stickers)
- Downsizing through attrition. Not enough employees to carry out the work (8 dot stickers)
- Outdated Library collection and resources (8 dot stickers)

3. Emerging themes – opportunities that the Leddy Library could pursue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging Theme</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Services to students, campus and the community | • Expand open access role and digitization projects
• Explore opportunities for embedding Library use in the curriculum
• Take advantage of new technologies. Look for opportunities to introduce specialized labs, other electronic platforms and services such as 3D printing and virtual reality
• Capitalize on social trends. Explore opportunities for making the Library a social hub
• Engage students in the identification of needed services |
| Promotion, outreach and partnerships | • Expand use of social media for outreach
• Explore opportunities to expand high school outreach
• Expand/establish partnerships with local libraries, Detroit Library, colleges, hospitals and community organizations
• Expand partnerships with OCUL
• Expand partnerships/collaboration on campus with the Law Library, other departments as well as with faculty and researchers
• Establish a partnership with UWSA and other student groups |
| Financial resources | • Explore external funding sources and fundraising opportunities to support new initiatives |

The “thematic analysis” of the opportunities was followed by a review of the number of “dot stickers” the opportunities received through the prioritization exercise. Based on this analysis, from the participant’s perspective, the following have been identified as the most critical opportunities that the Library could pursue:

- Expand/establish partnerships with local libraries, Detroit Library, colleges, hospitals and community organizations and on campus with the Law Library, other departments as well as with faculty and researchers (15 dots)
- Engage students in the identification of needed services (6 dots)
4. Emerging themes – Threats that could negatively impact the Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging Theme</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources</td>
<td>• Cuts to the Leddy Library budget resulting from the introduction of Activity Based Budgeting, decrease in student enrolment and/or changes in the Provincial government’s funding formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Trend towards performance based funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased competition for resources on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cost of digital access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Library debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace challenges</td>
<td>• Challenges and constraints associated with working in a highly unionized environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of institutional knowledge resulting from retirements and bumping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Centralization of IT services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New technologies and electronic/digital platforms</td>
<td>• New technologies (impacting on job functions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Changes to Primo, Alma software support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased availability of resources in electronic/digital format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased usage of Google and Wikipedia for information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Outsourcing of services to groups such as Ex Libris, Pro Quest, EBSCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students ability to access illegal electronic copies of resources faster than through inter-library loans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>• Ontario Council of University Libraries (OCUL) consolidation of services at a local level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of trust of University administration and values misalignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Restrictions placed by Publishers and other external companies impacting the Library’s ability to move into emerging areas of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public perception of libraries as obsolete/irrelevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The “thematic analysis” of the threats was followed by a review of the number of “dot stickers” the threats received through the prioritization exercise. Based on this analysis, from the participant’s perspective, the following have been identified as the most critical threats that could negatively impact the Library:

- Cuts to the Leddy Library budget resulting from the introduction of Activity Based Budgeting, decrease in student enrolment and or changes in the Provincial government’s funding formula (34 dot stickers)
- Increased availability of resources in electronic/digital format (14 dot stickers)
Web-based SWOT Survey

At the completion of the SWOT sessions, employees were advised that employees who were unable to attend the sessions and/or wanted to provide additional feedback would have an opportunity to bring forth their perspectives through a SWOT web-based survey.

Ten (10) employees completed the survey by the October 17, 2016 deadline.

The survey included an optional response to identify the primary departments of the individuals who completed the survey. Three (3) employees identified Access Services as their primary department and three (3) employees identified their primary department as Systems. Four (4) employees did not answer this question.

Information gathered through the survey

Please note that the information found in this section of the report is written verbatim. To assist with the analysis, similar items were combined and duplicate items were deleted.

Strengths

- Access/diversity of materials (both physical and online), some excellent collections
- Customer service (work is progressing but has been much improvement in the last few years). Service with a smile 99% of the time.
- Dedicated and experienced librarians
- Fantastic Systems Department/staff that keeps everything running
- Focus on students, inviting environment
- Friendly/collegial work environment but morale destroyed by cut backs
- Get to work with students (get to see into the future or help the future)
- Hours
- Kindness and compassion to help our students to the point that we handicap them. Let’s educate them.
- Large area of staff so easier to make friends amongst staff members (not just a group of 4 people, etc.)
- Librarians’ research, publications and presentations in the profession, collaboration with faculties, systems and Library technologies
- Openness to expanding our collection upon request
- Organizational skills
- Our pan-University outlook
- Public computers
- Reference help (weekdays only, none on the weekend day shift)
- Staff generally get along and are willing to work together
- Top-notch university librarian
Try to do our best within the environment restrictions

**Weaknesses**

- Aging staff
- Coffee shop should be open on the weekend
- Collection maintenance
- Communication with the students. We set up course reserve and reading list and link the items so the student even knows its availability. It is not being passed onto the student, so we set up the website reading list, the students DO NOT EVEN DO THIS IT IS TOO TIME CONSUMING.
- Consultation or collaboration between department
- Do not do regular feedback or reviews to students to get their input
- Hierarchical management structure/environment rather than task-based structure. 2 tier social structure-> admin/faculty and support staff as dogs
- In-fighting amongst staff
- Lack of career planning and ongoing skills training, especially for Library staff, and especially in the area of new information technologies, software.
- Lack of communication among staff members
- Lack of funds to do anything
- Lack of individual rooms for student use
- Lack of teamwork
- Librarians not visible enough
- Morale
- Negative staff attitudes/assumptions
- No call numbers for students at the information desk (for course reserves material)
- No investment in staff (training, team building, morale boosters)
- No librarian reference help on Saturday and Sunday(during the day - as in the past years)
- Not enough advocacy, promotion and advertising of Library services and resources so that the University Administration, faculty, staff and students understand the integral role that the Library plays for research and teaching
- Not enough communication and transparency from the Library Administration in the past, although this is now improving
- Not enough funding to maintain and expand Library resources and services
- Not enough librarians and staff to cover the expanding services and roles for the Library on campus. Safety concerns on weekends
- Physical space: lots of underutilized space in need of interior design expertise (lobby and main floor, West, in particular) - and basics: painting, excess sign removal, window cleaning, replacing broken glass, landscaping (don't leave beds full of weeds)etc.; we need better student spaces, e.g. more well-equipped group study rooms; desperate need for more archives space
- Staff’s specialties (too many shared responsibilities and positions), could spend more time and involve more people on large-scale project planning/review
- The monograph collection is weak, especially in the humanities and for local history/publications; the budgets in this area have been cut back too much; collection does not meet the needs of our users
- Too much focus on the collective agreement versus specific job duties
• Too noisy. NO reverence and respect for others reading.
• Unrealistic expectations of staff members
• Web presence: home page and subject pages; users cannot find the Leddy Library web site and when they do get to our website, they cannot find our main content and services - because they are hidden in the top left-hand corner and below the crease. Minor things take up most of the real estate. A lot of contents is also buried or not listed anywhere (even in the a-z list). This is part of the reason for the under-utilization of our collections. Librarians need to have more control over the content and organization of their subject pages.
• Workflow

Opportunities
• Archiving of research data, i.e. the data behind published articles; continue with Scholarship@UWindsor.ca and the archiving or the articles themselves
• Big data and related technologies
• Building stronger liaison relationships on campus with the various departments including spending time onsite in departments every week during the academic year
• Closer partnership with the law and public libraries
• Department/campus wide outreach
• Digitization of in-house and local history collections
• Don’t allow staff to sit doing nothing…. or refuse to train staff because of how they came to be full-time (2 IT employees)
• Drawing the students to the Library, expand role as central hub for students
• Empowering staff to do more through training
• Enhancing information literacy and reference services on campus
• Evaluating existing departments in the Library and making better use of Library space for them - e.g., moving the Archives out of the basement to a more prominent and advantageous space
• Increase study space for non-graduate level students
• Increasing involvement in key campus committees and projects and thereby helping to raise the Library's profile
• Library services to science, engineering and international student body, collaboration with faculties on research and teaching,
• Long-term digital preservation of university administration, faculty documents, not just official, but also email, web pages, etc. This is part of the archives mandate - but hasn't happened yet.
• More open communication/connections with archives
• More outreach/information literacy, focusing on faculty and staff. These days, they are often not aware of our collections - and so don't use, and don't encourage students to use; more emphasis on marketing of our databases and services.
• Open publishing
• Open to all high school student as well
• Organizational structure
• Partner with external organizations
• Provision of online access to collections
• Seamless integration with other departments,
• Software for using/interpreting/doing research with these collections
The collaborative future project at OCUL
Use staff more effectively; need their help to accomplish projects
User friendly search databases (for both staff and students)

**Threats**
- Aging staff
- Budget/staff cuts. Not replacing the many who have left and will be leaving shortly
- Building esthetics (outdated and does not function well from the millennial viewpoint) and inadequacies buildings will have serious consequences for Library collections and employees
- Collections budget: inflation and currency exchange
- Digitization of reading materials
- How to promote a culture of collaboration, mutual learning, etc.
- Inadequate funding resulting in cancellation of Library resources and reduction of staff and librarians
- Lack of understanding on campus of the very valuable services and resources that the Library provides to the campus and beyond, resulting in a view held by some that only a skeleton crew of Library staff is needed because of electronic access to information
- Losing an increasing amount of space in the Library to external departments on campus thus reducing the Library's ability to expand and grow existing services and resources
- Safety
- Technological/Marketing: bypassing of Library; lack of awareness of "better", more scholarly resources
- That the Library will lose outstanding employees to other libraries because it can't provide the right opportunities and working environment for them
- The development of technologies and the fear of change and re-training, the changing demands by faculty and students
- University wide IT centralization

**Other comments**
- I appreciate having the opportunity to provide feedback. This is definitely a step in the right direction.
Emerging Themes

A “thematic analysis” of the information gathered through the survey was conducted. To assist with the analysis, the broad categories/themes identified through the analysis of the information gathered through the SWOT sessions was used. The strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats gathered through the SWOT survey were summarized and grouped by theme.

1. Emerging Themes – Strengths of the Leddy Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging Theme</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services provided to the campus community</td>
<td>• Access and diversity of materials available in various formats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High level of customer service including commitment/compassion to help students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students’ ability to access computers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reference assistance provided days/weekdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people who work at the Library, their roles and the work environment</td>
<td>• Level of dedication, experience of staff, librarians including the University librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Employees’ commitment to teamwork/collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Friendly and collegial work environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Librarians involvement in research, publications and presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enhanced transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of operation</td>
<td>• Hours of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study areas for students</td>
<td>• Some attractive study areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborations/partnerships across campus</td>
<td>• Positive collaborations with faculties and departments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Emerging themes – Weaknesses of the Leddy Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging Theme</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services provided to the campus community</td>
<td>• Library collection is not maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Limited services provided on evenings and weekends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Weak monograph collection particularly in the humanities and local history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Noise levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Website and search databases are not user friendly, hard to navigate and find needed information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work environment</td>
<td>• Hierarchical structure, various class systems of employees and unrealistic expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Poor consultation/collaboration between departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Poor communication and teamwork</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The work environment Cont. | • Lack of professional development/career planning opportunities  
• History of lack of transparency  
• Low morale, internal conflicts, negative attitudes/environment  
• Safety concerns on weekends due to staffing levels  
• Not capitalizing on staff’s areas of expertise  
• Balancing the obligations of the CA versus the day to day realities of the work  
• No capitalizing on employees’ strengths  
• Workflow |
| Financial resources | • Limited budget to meet needs of the campus community |
| Facilities and infrastructure | • The buildings are underutilized, outdated and not well maintained  
• Not sufficient and not well-equipped study rooms  
• Allocation of space within the Library. Departments such as Archives are not located in a prominent area. Librarians are not located in visible areas. |
| Outreach, promotion and collaboration | • Insufficient promotion and outreach activities |

3. **Emerging themes – opportunities that the Leddy Library could pursue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging Theme</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Services to students, campus and the community | • Promote/expand archival services  
• Take advantage of new technologies and open access  
• Enhance digitization of University and local collections |
| Promotion, outreach and partnerships | • Regular onsite departmental visits and opportunities for seamless integration of the Library  
• Expand collaborations and partnerships with the Law Library, other local libraries as well as with faculties such as Science and Engineering  
• Outreach to international students, faculty and staff and high schools  
• Become more engaged in key campus committees/projects  
• Projects with OCUL |

4. **Emerging themes – Threats that could negatively impact the Library**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging Theme</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Financial resources | • Budget cuts/inadequate funding resulting in a reduction of staff and librarians and further negative impacts on the collection  
• Inflation and currency exchange |
| Workplace challenges | • Aging staff  
• Loss of expertise to competing libraries |
## New technologies and electronic/digital platforms
- Availability of materials in digital format and the public perception that libraries are not needed/obsolete
- Introduction of new technologies (impact on jobs and job functions) and resistance to change
- Centralization of information technology services

## Other
- Loss of space. Allocation of space to departments outside the Library
Summary of the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats

The information emerging from the SWOT sessions is consistent with the information gathered through the SWO survey. The tables below provide a summary of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats identified through these two (2) processes.

**Strengths of the Leddy Library**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging Theme</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Services provided to the campus community**              | • High quality services provided and great customer service  
• Technology available to students including specialized software  
• Tailored services for specialized groups such as ADC, Liaison and ESL  
• Size, scope and diversity of the print and digital collections  
• Course reserves  
• Open access resources  
• Efforts made to make the Library more welcoming  
• Reference assistance provided days/weekdays |
| **The people who work at the Library, their roles and the work environment** | • Level of experience and expertise of staff, librarians and the University librarian  
• Commitment, dedication and compassion of employees  
• Diversity of opinions and approaches to work including librarianship  
• Engagement of librarians in research, publications and presentations  
• Employee’s commitment to teamwork, collaboration within departments and shared values  
• Job/role satisfaction  
• Positive shifts in the work culture and enhanced transparency  
• Friendly, collegial work environment |
| **Hours of operation**                                     | • Generous hours of operation including extended hours during exams                                                                                                                                 |
| **Study areas for students**                               | • Diversity of study and collaborative spaces including some attractive, comfortable seating areas, tables, spaces for group work and quiet areas                                                                 |
| **Collaborations/partnerships across campus**              | • Positive relationships and collaborations with faculty/researchers and departments                                                                                                                                 |
## Weaknesses of the Leddy Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging Theme</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Services provided to the campus community | • Not sufficient textbooks for students to access, particularly as the cost of textbooks rise  
• Outdated Library collection and resources  
• Unavailability of many services in the evening/weekends  
• Inconsistencies in the provision of service and application of policies and no coherent direction  
• Imbalance between core and emerging services  
• Declining usage statistics (desk, website and borrowing), no assessment/evaluation strategy and no coherent direction  
• Weak monograph collection particularly in the humanities and local history  
• Website and search databases are not user friendly, hard to navigate and find information |
| The work environment | • Not enough training/professional development opportunities, including opportunities for cross-training and career planning  
• Communication silos between departments and employee groups  
• Internal conflicts, poor collaboration and teamwork, negative attitude/environment  
• Low staff morale, mistrust of administration, history of lack of transparency  
• Downsizing through attrition. Not enough employees to carry out the work. Safety concerns associated with low staffing levels on weekends.  
• Many employees feel disengaged, unmotivated, tired and burnt-out  
• Lack of team building opportunities including opportunities to learn about individuals’ areas of expertise  
• Centralization of work which could be shared and not capitalizing on the strengths of employees  
• Decision making and conflict resolution processes  
• Hierarchical structure, various class systems of employees and unrealistic expectations |
| Financial resources | • Insufficient financial resources to meet needs and inequitable allocation of resources within the Library |
| Facilities and infrastructure | • Dated building and infrastructure impacting safety, security and the student experience  
• Lack of technological integration with the rest of the campus  
• Lack of customization of the library software |
Opportunities that the Leddy Library could pursue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging Theme</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Services to students, campus and the community | • Expand open access role and digitization projects such as digitization of University and local collections and archival services  
• Explore opportunities for embedding Library use in the curriculum  
• Take advantage of new technologies. Look for opportunities to introduce specialized labs, other electronic platforms and services such as 3D printing and virtual reality  
• Capitalize on social trends. Explore opportunities for making the Library a social hub such as using a digital wall for movie night  
• Engage students in the identification of needed services  |
| Promotion, outreach and partnerships        | • Expand use of social media for outreach  
• Explore opportunities to expand high school outreach and outreach to international students  
• Expand/establish partnerships with local libraries, Detroit Library, colleges, hospitals and community organizations  
• Expand partnerships with OCUL  
• Expand partnerships/collaboration on campus with the Law Library, other departments as well as with faculty and researchers including onsite visits and engagement in key campus committees/projects  
• Establish a partnership with UWSA and other student groups  |
| Financial resources                         | • Explore external funding sources and fundraising opportunities to support new initiatives  |

Threats that could negatively impact the Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging Theme</th>
<th>Summary of information gathered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Financial resources | • Cuts to the Leddy Library budget resulting from the introduction of Activity Based Budgeting, decrease in student enrolment and or changes in the Provincial government’s funding formula  
• Trend towards performance based funding  
• Increased competition for resources on campus |
| Financial resources Cont.                  | • Cost of digital access  
|                                          | • Inflation and currency exchange  
|                                          | • Library debt  
| Workplace challenges                     | • Challenges and constraints associated with working in a highly unionized environment  
|                                          | • Loss of institutional knowledge resulting from retirements and bumping  
|                                          | • Loss of expertise to other libraries  
|                                          | • Aging workforce  
|                                          | • Centralization of IT services  
| New technologies and electronic/digital platforms | • New technologies (impacting jobs and job functions) and resistance to change  
|                                          | • Changes to Primo, Alma software support  
|                                          | • Increased availability of resources in electronic/digital format  
|                                          | • Increased usage of Google and Wikipedia for information  
|                                          | • Outsourcing of services to groups such as Ex Libris, Pro Quest, EBSCO  
|                                          | • Students ability to access illegal electronic copies of resources faster than inter-Library loans  
| Other                                    | • Ontario Council of University Libraries (OCUL) consolidation of services at a local level  
|                                          | • Lack of trust of University administration and values misalignment  
|                                          | • Restrictions placed by Publishers and other external companies impacting the Library’s ability to move into emerging areas of service  
|                                          | • Public perception of libraries as obsolete/irrelevant  
|                                          | • Loss of space. Allocation of Library space to other departments  

Parking Lot & Next steps

Parking Lot

A Parking Lot is a tool utilized in facilitation to “park” items that are brought forward during the session but are outside of the agenda for the day. The following is a compilation of the items brought forward:

Information Services Session

- One participant requested that her SWOT brainstorming be placed on the Parking Lot as its content did not align with the small group discussion. The following is the information found on the worksheet that was posted (please note that it is written verbatim)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Library values and professionalism</td>
<td>• Library “neutrality”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Library contacts with campus</td>
<td>• Lack of awareness of systemic issues restricting/degrading the profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Too many librarians being graduated – loss of expertise as pool increases in size and cheaper ones get hired</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opportunities

- Spaces of resistance as libraries move into non-economic areas where Library administrators have not yet figured out how to “audit”/micromanage

Threats

- Library administration and university administration under neoliberalism
- Implementation of ideologically based decision making over evidence based
- Forced movement of librarians away from non-approved or economic dependent aspects of jobs = restriction of professionalism/disliking

Systems session

- Hay system of job evaluation is not equitable

Next Steps

The following next steps were identified:

- P. Calarco to send the link to the web-based SWOT survey to staff and librarians
- M. Ciampa to compile the information gathered through the SWOT sessions and the web-based survey and present a report to the Library Administration
Appendix II: Leddy Library Faculty Publications & Presentations, 2012-2016

Books/Research Report Authored:


Chapters in Books:


Articles in Refereed Journals:

• Jacobs, HLM, Koufogiannakis, D. (2014). Counting What Cannot be Counted: Bringing the Humanities to EBLIP, Evidence Based Library and Information Practice, 9, 3, 2014
• Jacobs, HLM (2014). Pedagogies of Possibility Within The Disciplines: Critical Information Literacy and Literatures in English, Communications in Information Literacy, 8(2), 2014, Accepted as lead article for Fall 2014 issue.

Articles and/or Papers Presented (Posters presented):


Jacobs, HLM (2014). Oh, the Humanities: A Literature Scholar Turned Librarian Ponders the Art and Science of Librarianship, Brain-Work: the Centre for Evidence-Based Library and Information Practice, published online, 2014.


• Pillon, K. (2013). Exploration to Transformation: how to achieve big changes in your library (University of Waterloo, November 2013)
• Pillon, K. (2013). “The culture of Decision making: taking customer service to a whole other level!” (Medical Library Association, NYC Rochester Chapter, October 2013)


• Pillon, K. (2012). “No student turned away: Using Kohlberg’s 6 Stages of Moral Development to inform a customer service model” (Librarian Research Series, April 2012)


• Thompson, K (2014). Chaired session Developing Meaningful Data Support Roles and Services, IASSIST Annual Conference, Toronto, ON, June 4, 2014.


• Williams, M. (2014). "Intro to Open Data", HackWE 3.0 Science Hackathon (WETech Alliance, Hackforge, University of Windsor, St. Clair College), Friday, October 17, 2014
• Zhao, S. (2016). Forum presentation: Information literacy needs for graduate students: e-journal platforms survey (poster), the Faculty of Education Research Forum, University of Windsor, March 4, 2014, Windsor, ON
• Zhao, S. (2013). IFLA presentation: Library user education (poster) : 79th IFLA General Conference and Assembly, August 17-23, 2013, Singapore
Technical reports

- Zhao, S. (2014) Workflow in Alma for acquisition and bibliographic services

Book Reviews

Strategic Mandate Agreement
(2014-17)

Between:
The Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities & The University of Windsor
ONTARIO’S VISION FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Ontario’s colleges and universities will drive creativity, innovation, knowledge, and community engagement through teaching and research. They will put students first by providing the best possible learning experience for all qualified learners in an affordable and financially sustainable way, ensuring high quality and globally competitive outcomes for students and Ontario’s creative economy.

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR’S VISION/MANDATE

Mission Statement

Enabling people to make a better world through education, scholarship, research, and engagement.

Vision Statement

The University of Windsor is a progressive, student-centred university, where the challenges of communities and of a world in transition inform the education.

PREAMBLE

This Strategic Mandate Agreement between the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (the Ministry) and the University of Windsor outlines the role the University currently performs in the postsecondary education system and how it will build on its current strengths to achieve its vision and help drive system-wide objectives articulated by the Ministry’s Differentiation Policy Framework.

The Strategic Mandate Agreement (SMA):

- Identifies the University’s existing institutional strengths;
- Supports the current vision, mission, and mandate of the University within the context of the University’s governing legislation and outlines how the University’s priorities align with Ontario’s vision and Differentiation Policy Framework; and
- Informs Ministry decision making through greater alignment of Ministry policies and processes to further support and guide the University’s areas of strength.

The term of the SMA is from April 1, 2014, to March 31, 2017. The SMA proposal submitted by the University to the Ministry has been used to inform the SMA and is appended to the agreement.

The Ministry acknowledges the University’s autonomy with respect to its academic and internal resource allocation decisions, and the University acknowledges the role of the Ministry as the Province’s steward of Ontario’s postsecondary education system.
The agreement may be amended in the event of substantive policy or program changes that would significantly affect commitments made in the SMA. Any such amendment would be mutually agreed to, dated, and signed by both signatories.

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR’S KEY AREAS OF DIFFERENTIATION

The University of Windsor supports the economic and cultural development of its region by providing its diverse student population with a comprehensive range of programs, while focusing its research activity to respond directly to regional priorities.

ALIGNMENT WITH THE DIFFERENTIATION POLICY FRAMEWORK

The following outlines areas of strength agreed upon by the University and the Ministry, and the alignment of these areas of strength with the Ministry’s Differentiation Policy Framework.

1. JOBS, INNOVATION, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

This component highlights institutions’ collaborative work with employers, community partners, and regions, or at a global level, to establish their role in fostering social and economic development, and serving the needs of the economy and labour market.

1.1 Areas of Institutional Strength

The University of Windsor supports the economic and cultural development of its community and the surrounding region. Initiatives and outcomes include:

- Creating a space for collaboration on local economic development. This includes:
  - New industrial courtyard
  - On-campus office of the Windsor Essex Economic Development Corporation
  - New Innovation Centre to link students with local companies and organizations

- Conducting research directly linked to the needs of the region. This includes:
  - Automotive technologies
  - Great Lakes
  - Wastewater management facilities
  - Low-income housing projects
  - Border challenges

- Focusing on entrepreneurial education opportunities for students through partnerships with multiple organizations and programs. This includes:
  - More than 1,000 students engaged in some form of entrepreneurial activity since 2011
  - 17 spin-off companies created last year
  - Students are working with over 300 companies across the region
• Graduates across all disciplines at the University secure employment at a rate consistent with university graduates across Ontario.
• The University has worked in partnership with the City of Windsor to begin the development of a campus location in the downtown core of the city, where programs in the arts, social work, and executive education will be centred. These programs will have a major impact on the community and help to drive the economic revitalization of the downtown Windsor core.

1.2 Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Metrics</th>
<th>System-Wide Metrics¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Number and type of organizations in the community that our students work with</td>
<td>• Graduate employment rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of students engaged in programs that develop entrepreneurial skills</td>
<td>• Number of graduates employed full-time in a related job</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Teaching and Learning

This component will capture institutional strength in program delivery methods that expand learning options for students, and improve the learning experience and career preparedness. This may include, but is not limited to, experiential learning, online learning, entrepreneurial learning, work integrated learning, and international exchange opportunities.

2.1 Areas of Institutional Strength

Windsor focuses on the undergraduate experience by providing students with mentorship opportunities and engaging in activity that enhances teaching quality, and access to open-learning and information. Initiatives and outcomes include:

Mentorship

• The two-course Fundamentals of Academic Writing (FAW) program provides peer-reviewed and mentored writing instruction to approximately 2,000 first-year students.
• The Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences Mentorship Program provides course-based academic mentors for five of its largest first-year courses.

¹ Additional system-wide metrics focused on applied research, commercialization, entrepreneurial activity, and community impact will be developed in consultation with the sector.
Open-learning and information

- The Office of Open Learning is developing open learning programs.
- The Leddy Library is facilitating the development of:
  - Open access journals and monographs
  - Approaches to copyright issues in the digital context
  - Open access digital repositories

Teaching Quality

- Windsor’s faculty have won the second most provincial and national teaching awards across the university sector.
- The Centre for Teaching and Learning offers formal teaching improvement programs to faculty.
- Windsor is the only university in Canada that offers an internationally recognized certificate program in university teaching.

Online and Co-operative Education

- Windsor also focuses on the undergraduate experience by providing students with online learning and co-operative education opportunities.
- Windsor has 10,521 registrations in online courses and 10% of its undergraduates are engaged in co-op programs.

2.2 Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Metrics</th>
<th>System-Wide Metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students with access to mentoring programs</td>
<td>Student Satisfaction Survey results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in student academic performance between first year and program completion</td>
<td>Graduation rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students in co-op and other experiential learning programs</td>
<td>Retention rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of students enrolled in a co-op program at institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of online course registrants, programs, and courses at institution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. STUDENT POPULATION

This component recognizes the unique institutional missions that improve access, retention, and success for underrepresented groups (Aboriginal, first generation, students with disabilities) and francophones. This component also highlights other important student groups that institutions serve that link to their institutional strength. This may include, but is not limited to, international students, mature students, or indirect entrants.
3.1 Areas of Institutional Strength

Windsor supports access for a diverse range of student populations, including: international, first generation, Aboriginal, new Canadians, and landed immigrants. Outcomes include:

- Almost 14% of its student population are international students.
- Over 10% of its student population are first generation students.
- Over 50%, of its students apply for OSAP and just under 40% receive the 30% Off Ontario Tuition Grant. As a proportion of total student enrolment, 66.3% of Windsor’s students applied for OSAP.

Supports for students include:

- Turtle Island (Windsor’s Aboriginal Centre), providing resources for First Nation students.
- The 4Winds Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) program for Aboriginal youth (grades 6-8), introducing them to STEM as pathways to a university education.
- The Gateway Program, which provides high school graduates with an average between 60.0% and 69.9% alternative paths for admission to the University.
- English language training programs for international students (as required).
- Tuition rates for American students that are lower than average international student fees.

3.2 Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Metrics</th>
<th>System-Wide Metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admission averages into first year</td>
<td>Number and proportion of Aboriginal, first generation, students with disabilities, and francophone students at an institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students applying to and entering through the Gateway Program</td>
<td>Number and proportion of international students enrolled in Ontario (as reported in annual institutional enrolment reporting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of students between professional programs and general arts and sciences programs</td>
<td>Proportion of an institution’s enrolment that receives OSAP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **RESEARCH AND GRADUATE EDUCATION**

This component identifies the breadth and depth of institutional research activity (both basic and applied), and will identify institutional research strengths from niche to comprehensive research intensity.

4.1 **Areas of Institutional Strength**

Windsor engages in research activity that addresses the following four “challenges”: sustainable industry; understanding borders; viable, healthy, and safe communities; and healthy great lakes.

**Sustainable Industry**
- Research contributes to the sustainability of manufacturing across multiple sectors.

**Great Lakes**
- The Great Lakes Institute for Environmental Research addresses a number of key issues in this field and facilitates international collaboration on the topic.

**Understanding Borders**
- The Cross Border Institute received over $7M in funding from the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario to support initiatives on border logistics and security.
  - Over 35 faculties are engaged in this initiative and supporting about 30 students (undergraduate to postdoctoral research assistants).
- The Institute for Border Logistics and Security is a partnership with the City of Windsor that will see technical training and economic development capacity in a cargo terminal at the Windsor airport.
- The work on borders and security presents opportunities for education and research collaboration and partnerships with St. Clair College.

**Health and Wellness**
- Research partnerships with industry, government, and the public sector develop new health promotion strategies and mechanisms for knowledge mobilisation to promote health and safety for groups at risk.

Across all faculties, Windsor attracts $25-$30M in external research funding, with $10M from Tri-Council Agencies.
4.2 Additional Comments

System-wide metrics reflect Windsor’s focussed activity in this area.

Institutional Strategies

- Establishing the Institute for Border Logistics and Security, in partnership with the City of Windsor and collaboration with St. Clair College.

4.3 Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Metrics</th>
<th>System-Wide Metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Number of graduate students engaged in community-based programs</td>
<td>Research Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Time to completion for each category of graduate program</td>
<td>• Total sponsored research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of research funding applications submitted to Tri-Council and application success rate</td>
<td>• Number of research chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of graduate degrees awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of graduate awards/scholarships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Focus**

- Graduate degrees awarded to undergraduate degrees awarded
- Graduate to undergraduate ratio
- PhD degrees awarded to undergraduate degrees awarded

**Research Impact**

- Normalized Tri-Council funding (total and per full-time faculty)
- Number of publications (total and per full-time faculty)
- Number of citations (total and per full-time faculty)
- Citation impact (normalized average citation per paper)

**International Competitiveness**

- Ratio of international to domestic graduates (used by Times Higher Education Rankings)
- Aggregate of international global rankings
5. **PROGRAM OFFERINGS**

This component articulates the breadth of programming, enrolment, and credentials offered, along with program areas of institutional strength/specialization, including any vocationally oriented mandates. This component also recognizes institutions that provide bilingual and/or French-language programming for students.

5.1 **Areas of Institutional Strength**

Current program areas of strength include:

1. Business
2. Creative Arts and Media
3. Education in a Global Context
4. Engineering
5. Environment and Ecosystem Adaptation and Recovery
6. Health and Wellness from classroom and laboratory to community
7. Humanities
8. International Borders
9. Law
10. Physical and Chemical Sciences

Proposed program areas for growth include:

1. Health and Wellness
2. Law, Education, and Philosophy
3. Engineering, Science, and Computing
4. Creative Arts and Digital Media
5. Business, Political Science, and International Borders

5.2 **Additional Comments**

- The Ministry notes that a large number of new engineering degree programs are proposed province-wide, which will have an impact on the Ministry's review of new engineering program proposals.
- The Ministry notes that a number of new Fine and Creative Arts degree programs are proposed province-wide, which institutions may want to consider in their own planning.
5.3 Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Metrics</th>
<th>System-Wide Metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Institution-specific and provincial Key Performance Indicators, including employment rate after two years, percentage of students completing the degree, and OSAP default rates for each area of strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Program enrolment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. INSTITUTIONAL COLLABORATION TO SUPPORT STUDENT MOBILITY

This component profiles partnerships between institutions that ensure students have access to a continuum of learning opportunities in a coordinated system. This may include, but is not limited to, credit transfer pathways and collaborative or joint programs between or within sectors.

6.1 Areas of Institutional Strength

The University of Windsor develops pathways for student mobility, and supports this through:

• Establishing agreements with 11 colleges in Ontario.
• Making credit transfer opportunities viewable on the University’s college transfer website.
• Membership in the Pan-Canadian Consortium on Admissions and Transfer.
• Windsor’s largest collaboration is in nursing degree completion pathways with St. Clair College and Lambton College.
• Windsor’s new downtown campus places the University in direct proximity with St. Clair College, allowing it to build on existing and develop new collaborations.
• New program development specifically tailored to college-university articulation.
6.2 Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Metrics</th>
<th>System-Wide Metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Completion rates for students who transfer in from a college</td>
<td>• Number of college and university pathways and/or articulation agreements (college-college, college-university, university-college)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employment rates of transfer students compared with those of direct-entry students</td>
<td>• Number of transfer applicants and registrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of college graduates enrolled in university programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASPIRATIONS

The Ministry recognizes the importance of supporting institutions to evolve and acknowledges the strategic aspirations of its postsecondary education institutions; the SMA is not intended to capture all decisions and issues in the postsecondary education system, as many will be addressed through the Ministry’s policies and standard processes. The Ministry will not be approving any requests for capital funding or new program approvals, for example, through the SMA process.

ENROLMENT GROWTH

The strategic enrolment and planning exercise is in the context of a public commitment in the 2011 Budget to increase postsecondary education enrolment by an additional 60,000 students over 2010-11 levels. This government has demonstrated a longstanding commitment to ensuring access to postsecondary education for all qualified students.

Baseline Projected Eligible Full-Time Headcounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>11,050</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>11,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University of Windsor’s planned enrolment forecast as expressed in this baseline eligible enrolment scenario is considered reasonable and in line with Ministry expectations, based on the current and projected demographic and fiscal environments.
GRADUATE ALLOCATION

The Province committed to allocate an additional 6,000 graduate spaces in the 2011 Budget. The allocation of the balance of the 6,000 graduate spaces is informed by institutional graduate plans, metrics identified in the differentiation framework, and government priorities. Based on these considerations, the allocation for the University of Windsor is provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>905.81</td>
<td>918.04</td>
<td>933.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>214.22</td>
<td>225.76</td>
<td>231.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,120.03</td>
<td>1,143.80</td>
<td>1,164.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For a detailed breakdown of graduate space allocations, see Appendix.

FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY

The Ministry and the University recognize that financial sustainability and accountability are critical to achieving institutional mandates and realizing Ontario’s vision for the postsecondary education system. To this end, it is agreed that:

- It is the responsibility of the governing board and Senior Administrators of the University to identify, track, and address financial pressures and sustainability issues. At the same time, the Ministry has a financial stewardship role. The Ministry and the University agree to work collaboratively to achieve the common goal of financial sustainability and to ensure that Ontarians have access to a full range of affordable, high-quality postsecondary education options, now and in the future; and
- The University remains accountable to the Ministry with respect to effective and efficient use of provincial government resources and student resources covered by policy directives of the Ministry, or decisions impacting upon these, to maximize the value and impact of investments made in the postsecondary education system.

The Ministry commits to engage with the sector in spring 2014 to finalize the financial sustainability metrics to be tracked through the course of the SMAs, building on metrics already identified during discussions that took place in the fall of 2013.
MINISTRY/GOVERNMENT COMMITMENTS

Over time, the Ministry commits to aligning many of its policy, process, and funding levers with the Differentiation Policy Framework and SMAs in order to support the strengths of institutions and implement differentiation. To this end, the Ministry will:

• Engage with both the college and university sectors around potential changes to the funding formula, beginning with the university sector in 2014-15;
• Update the college and university program funding approval process to improve transparency and align with institutional strengths as outlined in the SMAs;
• Streamline reporting requirements across Ministry business lines with the goals of (1) creating greater consistency of reporting requirements across separate initiatives, (2) increasing automation of reporting processes, and (3) reducing the amount of data required from institutions without compromising accountability. In the interim, the Multi-Year Accountability Report Backs will be adjusted and used as the annual reporting mechanism for metrics set out in the SMAs;
• Consult on the definition, development, and utilization of metrics;
• Undertake a review of Ontario’s credential options; and
• Continue the work of the Nursing Tripartite Committee.

The Ministry and the University are committed to continuing to work together to:

• Support student access, quality, and success;
• Drive creativity, innovation, knowledge, and community engagement through teaching and research;
• Increase the competitiveness of Ontario’s postsecondary education system;
• Focus the strengths of Ontario’s institutions; and
• Maintain a financially sustainable postsecondary education system.

SIGNED for and on behalf of the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities by:

Deborah Newman
Deputy Minister

April 7, 2014
Date

SIGNED for and on behalf of the University of Windsor by:

Dr. Alan Wildeman
Executive Head

April 15, 2014
Date
APPENDIX

University of Windsor - Summary of Graduate Space Allocations to 2016-17, FTEs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14 Graduate Space Target</td>
<td>864.38</td>
<td>232.99</td>
<td>1,097.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments to Graduate Targets (pre 2015-16)</td>
<td>41.43</td>
<td>-18.77</td>
<td>22.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Allocation Envelopes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Allocation Envelope</td>
<td>27.23</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>37.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priorities Envelope</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Graduate Spaces Allocated to 2016-17, over 2013-14 | 68.66 | -1.39 | 67.27 |

| 2016-17 Graduate Space Target | 933.04 | 231.60 | 1,164.64 |

Notes:

1. Adjustments to Graduate Targets (pre 2015-16) include: (i) 2013-14 approved fungibility requests; (ii) 2014-15 final Master’s allocations; (iii) resets of graduate targets, if any; and, (iv) other Ministry commitments, including further conversions.
2. General Allocation Envelope includes all metrics-based space allocations for 2015-16 and 2016-17.
3. Priorities Envelope includes: (i) Ministry and institutional priorities; and, (ii) approved spaces for identified niche programs.
   a. The 7 PhD spaces allocated as part of the Priorities Envelope are provided to the University of Windsor as 4 spaces in 2015-16 and 3 spaces in 2016-17.

The 7 PhD spaces allocated from the Priorities Envelope are provided to the University of Windsor to support the University’s niche strengths in their PhD program in Kinesiology with its community internship, and their PhD program in Nursing.
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Overview

Ithaka S+R’s faculty surveys have been fielded in the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand to analyze research, teaching, and information usage practices. Individual institutions and consortia use the survey to assess the needs of the academic community in order to develop appropriate strategies and services. Ten members of the Canadian Association of Research Libraries (CARL) consortium participated in a Canadian version of the Ithaka S+R faculty survey in the 2014-2015 academic year, hoping that it might expand over time to serve as a tracking tool for the Canadian higher education community in much the same way that it has done at the country-level elsewhere.

Ithaka S+R worked with the University of Windsor and other CARL institutions to develop a version of the survey instrument for the Canadian context. The Canadian version of the faculty survey covers many scholarly research and teaching-related topics, overlapping with several iterations of the Ithaka S+R U.S. Faculty Survey. The questionnaire covers topics in several key areas, including: how faculty members discover materials for research; faculty members’ data preservation and management behaviors and needs; their digital research activities and methodologies; practices and attitudes regarding undergraduate students’ research skills; the role of the library in supporting faculty members’ needs; faculty members’ scholarly communications needs and behaviors; and practices and attitudes regarding research dissemination.

The following report provides an analytical narrative of the results of the Ithaka S+R Local Faculty Survey, which was administered at the University of Windsor to 1,073 faculty members. In addition to an analysis of the uWindsor findings, comparisons are also drawn against aggregated findings of all participating CARL institutions.¹ During fall 2014, all 1,073 uWindsor faculty members received an email invitation to participate in a survey about the impact of electronic technologies on their research and teaching. Three reminders were sent before the close of the survey. In total, 335 respondents clicked the survey link (about 31%), with 322 of those starting the survey (about 30%), and 227 of those completing the survey (about 21%). In this analysis, we also report findings at the disciplinary level in addition to the aggregate for further context.²

---

¹ Participating CARL member institutions include: Memorial University of Newfoundland, University of New Brunswick, Ottawa University, Université de Montréal, Ryerson University, University of Guelph, University of Alberta, McMaster University, and York University. The survey was fielded in French and English at three institutions and solely in French at one institution.

² A total of 26 medical/veterinary/health sciences faculty members completed the survey, compared with 57 arts and humanities faculty members, 67 science respondents, and 70 social scientists. Please note the small sample sizes when interpreting disciplinary-level findings reporting in this document.
Key Insights

A key goal of the uWindsor Local Faculty Survey is to provide evidence-based strategic insights into how faculty members perceive the role of the uWindsor library and identify areas of opportunity for growth. This analysis aims to identify how disciplinary differences drive and shape faculty members’ understanding of the role of library-provided content and support services. The results from the survey revealed the following strategically relevant high-level findings:

- uWindsor faculty members’ views of the role of the library and the library’s services are highly stratified by disciplinary affiliations.
- Arts and humanities faculty members at uWindsor highly value and recognize the library’s role in providing student support services related to the development of information literacy skills.
- There is less awareness among faculty members in STEM fields at uWindsor regarding both the library’s content-provision and support services roles. In general, scientists at uWindsor are less likely than their colleagues in other disciplines to value the library’s role in supporting research activities involving data or in providing support or training to develop undergraduates’ research skills. This highlights a growth area for the library to enhance strategic communications or targeted outreach to faculty members in STEM fields specifically.
- A majority of faculty members at uWindsor support an institutional policy requiring that their peer-reviewed journal articles or conference proceedings be made open access or publicly available via a repository.
- A majority of respondents across all disciplines value the library’s role in providing access to subscription-based online repositories of research data, indicating that uWindsor faculty members value specialized research content and collections in addition to access to traditional literature.
- Across all four major disciplinary categories, faculty members view the library’s spending on acquisitions and resources as critical to their ability to conduct research.

Ithaka S+R believes these topics are among those that are valuable to track for change over time.
The Role of the Library

The CARL and uWindsor faculty survey included a set of items developed to measure faculty members’ views regarding the primary functions of academic libraries in supporting their research and instructional needs. Three of these items cover activities regarding different but inter-related aspects of the content-provision roles of the library, including facilitating the discovery of scholarly content, paying for resources and licensing content, and serving as an archive or repository. The remaining three items cover the library’s varying roles in engaging directly with constituent communities, including support services for research, teaching, and information literacy instruction.

In general, the majority of faculty respondents at uWindsor view the library’s six content-provision and support roles as important. In particular, faculty members at uWindsor are more likely than faculty members at other CARL institutions to value the library’s role in the discovery and access of research-related information resources. However, a smaller share of faculty members at uWindsor find the other five roles of the library as important compared to faculty members at the other participating CARL institutions (see Table 1).

Table 1
How important is it to you that your college or university library provides each of the functions below or serves in the capacity listed below?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>uWindsor faculty</th>
<th>CARL Aggregate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The library serves as a starting point or &quot;gateway&quot; for locating information for my research</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The library pays for resources I need, from academic journals to books to electronic databases</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The library serves as a repository of resources – in other words, it archives, preserves, and keeps track of resources</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The library supports and facilitates my teaching activities</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The library provides active support that helps to increase the productivity of my research and scholarship</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The library helps undergraduates develop research, critical analysis, and information literacy skills</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of respondents rating each item as “extremely important” (5-6 on a 6-point scale)
When considering these items at a more granular level of analysis, it is clear that the aggregate results of the uWindsor survey mask substantial disciplinary differences regarding faculty member’s perspectives of the importance of the library’s roles and services. Notably, a substantially smaller share of science faculty members at uWindsor rate the library’s six roles as important compared with faculty members in other disciplines at uWindsor. A majority of uWindsor faculty members across all disciplinary categories rate the library’s content-provision roles as important. However, only 55% of scientists at uWindsor rate the library’s discovery role as important, compared with 82% of social scientists, 74% of faculty members in arts or humanities disciplines, and 73% of faculty members in medical or veterinary disciplines. A larger share of social scientists view all three of the library’s content provision roles as important compared with faculty members in other disciplines.

Regarding the library’s role in providing support services, a substantially larger share of medical, veterinary, arts and humanities faculty members view the library’s teaching support and information literacy instruction services as important compared with faculty members in other disciplines (see Table 2). Specifically, 77% of uWindsor arts and humanities faculty members, and 65% of medical or veterinary faculty members, rate the library’s teaching support services as important, compared with 60% of social scientists and a minority of 40% of science faculty members.

In addition, 81% of medical or veterinary faculty, and 79% of arts and humanities faculty members, value the library’s role in providing services and instructions to support students’ development of information literacy skills, compared with 60% of social scientists and a concerning 34% of science faculty members. A larger share of medical or veterinary faculty members (69%), and a large share of social scientists (68%), report that they find the library’s research support important in contributing to their research productivity, compared with 56% of arts and humanities faculty members and 42% of science faculty members.
Science faculty members at uWindsor diverge from their colleagues in other disciplines. These results highlight a possible lack of awareness among science faculty members about the breadth of library-provided services that may be available and relevant for their research and teaching. Based on these results, uWindsor science faculty members may benefit from more targeted strategic communications or outreach regarding library-provided support services.

However, similar to their colleagues in other disciplines at uWindsor, science faculty members do place a high degree of value on the library’s role in purchasing and licensing scholarly content. In particular, 82% of science faculty members rate the library’s “buyer” role as important, compared with 85% of social scientists, 85% of medical or veterinary faculty members, and 75% of arts and humanities respondents. This indicates that science faculty members, in addition to faculty members from the other disciplines, view the library’s spending on acquisitions and resources as critical to their ability to produce research. In particular, this indicates that science faculty members at uWindsor appear to be fully aware of the library’s role in facilitating access to needed research resources via collections-related expenditures.

In general, the disciplinary-level findings of the six items measuring faculty members’ attitudes towards the roles of the library indicate a specific opportunity for the library to focus on enhancing engagement among science faculty members at uWindsor regarding library-provided research and instructional support services.
As Table 3 indicates, uWindsor faculty members are as likely as faculty members from other CARL institutions to view the library’s role in providing access to scholarly content as fundamental. In addition, faculty members at uWindsor are less likely than faculty members at other Canadian institutions to view undergraduate support services as a primary role of the library. This may indicate that uWindsor faculty members place a high priority on library-provided support to faculty members in particular, and may thus warrant further investigation.

As Table 4 indicates, disciplinary differences exist among faculty members’ perspectives regarding the primary role of the library. Science and medical and veterinary faculty members are more likely to view the library’s role as primarily related to access. Interestingly, medical and veterinary faculty members place a substantially higher level of value on the library’s role in supporting undergraduates when compared with faculty members in other disciplines.
In addition to surveying faculty members directly regarding the role of the library, the CARL survey also included thematic modules on a range of research and teaching related topics relevant to faculty members’ library-related needs and practices. This analytical report focuses on several of these thematic modules, including faculty members’ perceptions of open access, their scholarly communications practices, the sources that faculty members rely on for the management and preservation of their research data, and their views regarding the development of students’ research and information literacy skills. These topics should be interpreted in the broader context of faculty members’ perceptions and awareness regarding the roles of the library.
Scholarly Communications and Open Access

In addition to a set of common questions fielded at all participating CARL institutions, the uWindsor survey included two additional thematic modules related to scholarly communications and research dissemination. In general, faculty members at uWindsor support broad sharing of their scholarly work via a range of mechanisms. However, scientists at uWindsor, while in practice report that they are comfortable sharing their work via open access channels, do not report a consistent level of support or interest in the institutional facilitation of scholarly communication through services offered by uWindsor and/or its library. As Table 5 shows, nearly 40% of faculty members at uWindsor, in the aggregate, share a final or pre-print version of their articles and/or scholarly monographs via open or other non-traditional channels such as their personal webpage or blog, the Scholarship at uWindsor repository, or a cross-institutional disciplinary repository.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My personal webpage or blog</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A repository provided by my college or university, its library, or my university system</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A cross-institutional repository focused on my discipline or field of study</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of respondents rating each item as “extremely important” (8-10 on a 10-point scale)

As with faculty members’ view of the roles of the uWindsor library, disciplines also contribute to faculty members’ practices related to scholarly communications and their views regarding open access. Arts and humanities faculty members are substantially less likely to publish their scholarly work on their personal webpages or blogs when compared with faculty members in all other disciplines. However, a majority of arts and humanities faculty members report that they share the final or pre-print version of their scholarly work via an online repository, and in addition to medical and veterinary faculty
members, are more likely to utilize Scholarship at uWindsor for this purpose when compared with faculty members in the social and hard sciences. A larger share of scientists report that they make their scholarly work available via their personal webpage or blog, when compared with faculty members in all other disciplines. It is particularly noteworthy that uWindsor scientists report that they are less likely than faculty members in all other disciplines to publish their work via online repositories, given the stronger history of open access publishing among the scientific community and the prevalence and prestige of digital repositories serving fields like mathematics, computer science, and physics.

Table 6
In addition to publishing your scholarship in a traditional journal or monograph, you may also have the ability to make a final or pre-print version of the article or monograph text available through a variety of other channels.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Arts and Humanities</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Sciences</th>
<th>Medical/Vet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My personal webpage or blog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A repository provided by my college or university, its library, or my university system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A cross-institutional repository focused on my discipline or field of study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of respondents rating each item as “extremely important” (8-10 on a 10-point scale)

The uWindsor survey included additional questions that allow for a further investigation of faculty members’ practices and attitudes regarding publishing channels and open access. Faculty members at uWindsor indicate a clear preference for publishing their data or other primary source materials via the Scholarship at uWindsor institutional repository. Faculty members prefer to publish working papers or draft manuscripts in open access disciplinary repositories, and prefer to publish pre-prints of articles elsewhere online such as their personal webpage. In addition, uWindsor faculty members are equally comfortable depositing their peer-reviewed article journals or conference proceedings in any of the three online channels, including the institutional repository. However, faculty members are generally much less comfortable depositing books or scholarly monographs in the uWindsor repository compared with other more explicitly open access online channels.
When asked to what extent they would support an uWindsor policy “requiring” that their scholarly work be made freely available online, a majority of faculty members reported that they would support such a policy as applied to peer-reviewed journal articles or conference proceedings. Not surprisingly, faculty members are more likely to oppose such a policy if working papers or manuscript drafts would be included in the requirement. Interestingly, faculty members are much less likely to support an open access publishing requirement for their data or primary source research materials. This may reflect disciplinary differences for faculty members’ in social science, science, medical, or veterinary fields regarding restrictions such as those related to confidentiality and anonymity of human research subject, or this may indicate concerns related to the proprietary nature of primary source research data. However, these findings could also highlight an opportunity for the library to promote the open access
publishing of data and primary source materials as a vital component of the publication of corresponding research outputs.

### Table 8

To what extent do you support or oppose your institution or university system requiring that each of the following types of scholarly research outputs be made freely available online (i.e., via an open access repository or database)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Scholarly Output</th>
<th>Support Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed journal articles or conference proceedings</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-prints of peer-reviewed journal articles</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working papers or draft manuscripts</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data, images, media, or other primary source materials</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books or scholarly monographs</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of respondents indicating they “strongly support” the statement (5-6 on a 6-point scale)

Indeed, as Table 8 shows, disciplinary differences account for faculty members’ support or opposition to an institutionally mandated open access policy. The disciplinary findings are somewhat counterintuitive given current larger scale trends. In particular, it is surprising that a much smaller share of scientists support a mandated open access policy for all types of scholarly outputs compared with faculty members in other disciplines including arts and humanities. On the one hand, this finding could indicate that scientists do not view a formal requirement as necessary since open access publishing is already the norm among science faculty members. On the other hand, it could indicate that uWindsor scientists are less supportive of institutional interventions regarding scholarly communications. It is also noteworthy that large shares of arts, humanities, and social science faculty members support a policy that would require books and scholarly monographs to be made available via an open access channel.
Table 9
To what extent do you support or oppose your institution or university system requiring that each of the following types of scholarly research outputs be made freely available online (i.e. via an open access repository or database?)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Output</th>
<th>Arts and Humanities</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Sciences</th>
<th>Medical and Veterinary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed journal articles or conference proceedings</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-prints of peer-reviewed journal articles</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working papers or draft manuscripts</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data, images, media, or other primary source materials</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books or scholarly monographs</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of respondents indicating they “strongly support” the statement (5-6 on a 6-point scale)

These findings are also especially puzzling given faculty members’ general attitudes regarding open access publishing. A majority of uWindsor faculty members believe, across all disciplines, that it is important to enable “the broadest possible readership” of their scholarly work in order to “maximize the impact” of their findings. In addition, about half of faculty members across all disciplines agree with the statement that they “would be happy to see the traditional subscription-based publication model replaced entirely by an open access publication system in which all scholarly research outputs would be freely available to the public.” It appears as though faculty members at uWindsor are eager to express their support for open access in general, perhaps from their perspective as consumers of information, but are not as overly enthusiastic about the prospect of disseminating all of their own research outputs via open access channels. This indicates that faculty members are highly interested in innovative and open mechanisms for scholarly communications, and that the concept of a shift to open access is well socialized among faculty members at a high level, but faculty members remain traditional in their practices and attitudes related to their own research outputs. An encouraging finding from this set of questions is that arts and humanities faculty members seem nearly as eager and aware about open access as their colleagues in the...
The general level of support and interest in open access, as expressed by uWindsor faculty members across disciplines, indicates that faculty members may not be aware of associated costs of licensing and supporting the publishing and access of openly available research outputs with regard to the library’s role. If supporting access to or the dissemination of open content and research is not a sustainable model, these findings highlight an opportunity for the library to engage in education and outreach about the costs associated with an open access model.
Supporting Data Curation

Across disciplines, there is a strong self-service culture at uWindsor with regard to the method through which faculty members obtain or collect data for their research. However, it is worth noting that at least half of respondents across all disciplines rate the library’s subscriptions to online repositories as an extremely important source of research data. This indicates that uWindsor faculty members are aware of the role that the library plays in facilitating access to needed research data. Except for social scientists, faculty members across disciplines rate the library’s subscriptions to repositories as a more important source of data than freely available data.

Table 10
How important to your research are the following types of data?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data, media, or images that I collect myself</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Medical/Vet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data, media, or images collected by other researchers in my field at my college or university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data, media, or images collected by researchers in my field at other institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data, media, or images that I access through my college or university library’s subscription to an online repository</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data, media, or images that are freely available online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data, media, or images collected by other researchers outside my field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of respondents rating each item as “extremely important” (8-10 on a 10-point scale)

Consistent with the findings regarding faculty members’ use of the library to access datasets for their research, faculty members at uWindsor are more likely than their peers
at other CARL institutions to view the library as a valuable or potentially valuable source of support for managing or preserving research data. In addition, uWindsor faculty members are also more likely to view their institutional repository as a valuable resource for data management. This clearly demonstrates that faculty members’ value or would value the library’s services regarding data management and preservation, although differences at the disciplinary level again highlight a growth opportunity.

**Table 11**
How valuable do you or would you find each of the following possible sources of support for managing or preserving research data, media?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>uWindsor</th>
<th>CARL Aggregate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My college or university library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college or university IT department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An AV or media support department at my institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A disciplinary or departmental repository at my institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A disciplinary repository at another institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A publisher or a university press</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A scholarly society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freely available software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of respondents rating each item as “extremely valuable” (8-10 on a 10-point scale)

Not surprisingly, a larger share of arts and humanities faculty members view the library as a valuable source of support for services related to the management and preservation or data compared with faculty members in other disciplines. Interestingly, social scientists and arts and humanities faculty members are less likely to view the institutional repository as a valuable source of support for data curation, compared with faculty members in other disciplines. Scientists are more likely to view the campus IT department, scholarly societies, and the institutional repository as valuable or potentially valuable sources of support for data-related services. Scientists at uWindsor are much less likely to place value in the library for supporting research activities involving data. This highlights a growth area for the library to enhance strategic communications or
targeted outreach to faculty members in science disciplines specifically.

A smaller share of faculty members at uWindsor find it difficult to manage and preserve their research data when compared with their peers at other CARL institutions. As Table 14 shows, however, a smaller share of arts and humanities faculty members find it difficult to manage or organize their data compared with faculty members in other disciplines, but a larger share of arts and humanities faculty members are experiencing difficulties with the preservation and long-term storage of their research data when compared with faculty members in other disciplines at uWindsor. Arts and humanities faculty members may benefit from workshops or educational outreach regarding the preservation of their research data.
Table 13
Data preservation and management behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>uWindsor</th>
<th>CARL Aggregate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I find it difficult to organize or manage my data, media, or images</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it difficult to preserve or store my data, media, or images for the long-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of respondents rating each item as representing their viewpoint “extremely well” (8-10 on a 10-point scale)
Table 14
Data preservation and management behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I find it difficult to organize or manage my data, media, or images</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical/Vet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I find it difficult to preserve or store my data, media, or images for the long-term</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical/Vet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of respondents rating each item as representing their viewpoint “extremely well” (8-10 on a 10-point scale)
Information Literacy and Research Skills

In addition to questions related to the research workflow, the CARL survey also included questions to gauge faculty members’ perceptions of the role of the library in developing students’ research skills and information literacy. In general, a much larger share of faculty members at uWindsor value the library’s role in undergraduate instruction when compared to faculty members at other CARL institutions. As Table 15 indicates, faculty members at uWindsor generally believe that librarians provide significant help in supporting undergraduates’ learning success.

Table 15
Indicate the extent to which undergraduate students’ interaction with librarians at your college or university library helps them to succeed in your courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>uWindsor</th>
<th>CARL Aggregate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>0%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>60%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>80%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of respondents indicating the interaction “Helps significantly” (8-10 on a 10-point scale)

Faculty members at uWindsor are also slightly less likely to believe that their students have “poor” research skills when compared to faculty members at other CARL institutions, and this may in part be attributed to faculty members’ confidence in librarian-provided student support services. A much larger share of faculty members at uWindsor believe that librarians contribute significantly in teaching or improving students’ information literacy skills when compared with faculty members at other CARL institutions. In general, uWindsor faculty members recognize that librarians are a critical source of support for helping students locate and access needed primary and secondary materials for their courses or research projects. This is a particularly important finding given the context that a larger share of uWindsor faculty members aim to improve their students’ information literacy skills compared to faculty members at other CARL institutions.
institutions. It is worth noting, however, that uWindsor faculty members are less likely than their peers at other CARL institutions to recognize the role of librarians in developing students’ research skills.

Table 16
Faculty members’ views regarding their students’ research skills development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>View</th>
<th>uWindsor</th>
<th>CARL Aggregate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My undergraduate students have poor skills related to locating and evaluating scholarly information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians at my college or university library contribute significantly to my undergraduate students’ learning by helping them to find, access, and make use of a range of secondary and primary sources in their coursework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians at my college or university library contribute significantly to my undergraduate students’ learning by helping them to develop their research skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving my undergraduate students’ research skills related to locating and evaluating scholarly information is an important educational goal for the courses I teach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of respondents rating each item as representing their viewpoint “extremely well” (8-10 on a 10-point scale)

However, this divergence may be explained by differences at the disciplinary level. In particular, scientists at uWindsor are much less likely than their colleagues in other disciplines to value or recognize the role of librarian-provided student support or instructional services. In addition, a much greater share of arts and humanities faculty
members value the library’s role in teaching information literacy and research skills to students. Interestingly, a smaller share of scientists view their students’ research skills as “poor” when compared with faculty members in other disciplines. This could indicate that scientists’ expectations regarding their students’ research skills and information literacy are aligned with the level of their students’ skills. However, this could also indicate that awareness among scientists regarding information literacy standards is not widely understood or that science faculty members do not fully understand the library-provided services in these areas. A further investigation of scientists’ understanding of information literacy requirements may be warranted.

Table 17
Faculty members’ views regarding their students' research skills development

| My undergraduate students have poor skills related to locating and evaluating scholarly information |
| Librarians at my college or university library contribute significantly to my undergraduate students’ learning by helping them to find, access, and make use of a range of secondary and primary sources in their coursework |
| Librarians at my college or university library contribute significantly to my undergraduate students’ learning by helping them to develop their research skills |
| Improving my undergraduate students' research skills related to locating and evaluating scholarly information is an important educational goal for the courses I teach |

*Percent of respondents rating each item as representing their viewpoint “extremely well” (8-10 on a 10-point scale)*

uWindsor Faculty Survey: Analytical Memo
Concluding Remarks

The uWindsor library implementation of the Canadian version of the Ithaka S+R Faculty Survey suggests several key growth opportunities:

- A notable pattern to emerge from the findings is the importance of disciplines in shaping many aspects of faculty members’ perceptions regarding the roles of the library and the value of library-provided services and content. Specifically, science faculty members at uWindsor appear to be fully aware of the library’s role in facilitating access to needed research resources via collections-related expenditures. However, science faculty members consistently indicate that they do not view the library as a major contributor to the success of their students in acquiring research and information literacy skills. These findings highlight a specific opportunity for the library to focus on enhancing targeted outreach and strategic communication among science faculty members at uWindsor regarding library-provided research and instructional support services.

- Arts and humanities faculty members at uWindsor find it less difficult to manage or organize their data compared with faculty members in other disciplines, however, a larger share of arts and humanities faculty members are experiencing difficulties with the preservation and long-term storage of their research data when compared with faculty members in other disciplines at uWindsor. Arts and humanities faculty members may benefit from workshops or educational outreach regarding the preservation of their research data.

- In general, faculty members have mixed opinions about the role of the library and the institution in facilitating open access publishing of their scholarly outputs, but from a consumer perspective, faculty members support the availability of open access content. If supporting access to or the dissemination of open content and research is not a sustainable model for the library and/or the institution, these findings highlight an opportunity for the library to engage in education and outreach about the costs associated with an open access model.

Overall, it is clear that the uWindsor library’s content-provision role, including discovery and access in addition to licensing and purchasing, is essential for faculty members across all disciplines in terms of their research productivity.