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Editor’s Message

Welcome to the fourth issue of JLAMS. With this issue we complete our second year of publishing a peer review association journal. Stewart Brower, Christopher V. Hollister, Cynthia Tysick, and Thomas Pirrung bring us a timely article on tenure issues, based on a survey of library human resource officers. We have an article on mentoring by Beatrice Baaden and Jean O’Neill Uhl that deals with the issue of the transmission of organizational culture.

Dr. Gail Staines brings us a follow up article on implementing information literacy. This time she focuses the on important aspect of navigating campus politics. In our fourth article Henrietta Thornton-Verma presents an article on the important topic of open access, a topic near and dear to our hearts.

Once again we must thank our authors for their hard work and creative writing without which we would have nothing to publish. It is always great to work with them and really this is a great reward for getting JLAMS published.

And, we again offer our heartfelt thanks to our referees who reviewed the articles and made suggestions for improvement. We have had the help of excellent people from throughout the state. The peer review process is an important part of the writing, as it enriches and improves the ideas put forth, and as it suggests areas for further research.

We invite all librarians and information science professionals in our state to submit articles and ideas for articles and we again ask for your help by volunteering to be a referee. Let’s keep JLAMS going!

Richard Naylor
JLAMS Editor
ABSTRACT. The status of tenure for academic librarians is often discussed in the literature; however, there has been no significant examination of the impact of tenure on librarian recruitment. This is particularly important given another often discussed topic, the “graying of the profession.” The authors conducted a survey of library human resources officers to identify current trends in the status of tenure for librarians, and to gather the related opinions of those primarily responsible for librarian recruitment. The survey results indicate no significant differences between institutions that offer tenure for librarians and those that do not, and their respective adherence to the Guidelines for Academic Status for College and University Librarians (ACRL, 2002). The survey results also demonstrate ambivalence among library human resources officers regarding the status and usefulness of tenure for librarians. Possible implications regarding the future of tenure for librarians are discussed.
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INTRODUCTION

The Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), a division of the American Library Association, serves as the professional organization that guides all academic librarians, regardless of their status or rank. The ACRL Guidelines for Academic Status for College and University Librarians (2002) (1) details a significant listing of rights, privileges, and responsibilities for academic librarians without faculty status. These Guidelines include such matters as professional responsibilities, governance, length of contracts, scales of compensation and salary increases, promotions, leaves and funding for research, academic freedom, dismissals and grievances.

The Guidelines also serve as a touchstone for concerns of recruiting new professionals into academic libraries. While many established academic librarians have wrestled for years with the concepts of faculty status and tenure, younger librarians being recruited into the existing system may not value the same rights, privileges, and responsibilities as their predecessors. These issues are of particular concern to academic library directors who are faced with the “graying of the profession,” and established librarians anticipating retirement. This paper and the research presented herein will attempt to assess the value of tenure as a recruitment tool for librarians.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The academic library profession has developed an ongoing body of literature to address issues of academic or faculty status for librarians. Slattery (2) has noted that the faculty status issue started over a century ago and still sustains intense interest.

A review of the literature suggests that most of the research papers and commentaries address four major areas. These include:

1. issues of the appropriateness and value of tenure for librarians;
2. institutional benefit or productivity;
3. the nature of tenure or academic status relative to the ACRL Guidelines for Academic Status for College and Research Librarians; and,
4. requirements of tenure relative to publishing.

The appropriateness and value of tenure for librarians may be exemplified by comparison of library professional obligations to teaching faculty with “second class status” or “dissatisfaction” sometimes noted by McGowan and Dow (3); Slattery (2); and Hegg (4).

In two studies regarding institutional benefit or productivity, Kingma and McCombs (5) as well as Meyer (6) looked at the cost of faculty status for ACRL libraries and concluded that productivity is reduced as a result of conferring faculty status on professional librarians. The nature of tenure or academic status relative to ACRL guidelines has received much attention. Surveys suggest variant definitions of faculty status. This results in surveys that assess faculty status statistics ranging from Bradigan and Mularski’s 31.3% (7) to Werrell and Sullivan’s 79% (8). Lowry (9) reports that 67% “of all categories of academic libraries” offer faculty status. The same author notes that “the good news for advocates of the ACRL standards is that a majority of librarians work under employment conditions defined by faculty status”. A 1999 ACRL survey addressed the lack of a strongly held uniform definition of what constitutes faculty status by utilizing survey questions based on the nine conditions listed in the ACRL Guidelines; approximately 43.6% of 845 libraries reported having full
tenure and an equivalent statistic (45.4%) having peer review (10).

Requirements of tenure relative to publishing represent another important topic in the literature. Hersberger (1989) notes variance in the standards of publication by librarians relative to the earliest days of faculty status where the preparation of in-house bibliographies or reports was considered a “publishing” activity. With the current status of original research setting the standard, Hersberger (11) and others have noted that “few librarians can either develop meaningful original research or have the time flexibility to pursue it”

Despite the seemingly elevated standard, others such as Mitchell and Reichel (12) find that librarians required to publish achieve tenure “at very similar rates as librarians not required to publish”. Mitchell and Morton (13) state that the lack of consensus among librarians regarding faculty status has had consequences, not the least of which impedes librarians’ acculturation to the academic environment.

More recently, there are discussions focused on the changing demographics of the academic library profession. Retirement projections for Association of Research Libraries (ARL) members suggest that up to 40% of the current professional workforce will have retired by 2010, with an additional 27% retired by 2020 (14) (15). In reviewing the fluctuations in apparent demand-supply of applicants for academic/research librarian positions published in 2002, Hardesty noted anecdotally that contact with 20 libraries revealed no less than 12 failed searches and that, further, the number of job advertisements is increasing and employers seeking new employees outnumber individuals seeking positions as academic/research librarians (16).

Rarely are questions raised in the literature about the recruiting advantage/disadvantage that is posed by tenure. However, anecdotal evidence cited by the ACRL Ad Hoc Task Force on Recruitment and Retention Issues (17), indicates that “recent MLIS graduates and librarians new to academic libraries do not care to enter organizations where librarians have faculty status.”

Weaver-Meyers (15) suggests that, considering how inconsistent faculty status is among libraries, recruits may choose to work under the tenure demands they prefer. Additionally, Weaver-Meyers writes, “it seems unlikely that new recruits, weighing equal salaries and benefits, would choose more rigorous job duties”. This is supported by the suggestion of Henry, Caudle and Sullenger (1994) that tenure does not have a significant impact on turnover rates across the profession and that, further, librarians considering working in a college or university library with tenure can make more informed decisions about whether they desire to work within a tenure system (18). The ACRL Study previously cited similarly states that “the reality is that the need or desire for faculty status and/or tenure is mostly applicant-driven – some candidates want it and some do not.”

No recent study was found that indicates the potential role of tenure in the allure and appeal to academic library candidates. No methodologies reported in the literature have accessed the experience of HR officers in assessing the role of tenure as a benefit or impediment.

**METHODOLOGY**

In the summer of 2003 the authors met to begin work on the creation of a survey about the
benefit or impediment of tenure as a tool for recruiting academic librarians. They discussed target populations and determined that HR officers would be the most logical population from whom to gather data. HR officers are often the first representatives from prospective employers whom candidates encounter. HR officers are deeply involved in their library’s recruitment, retention, and staffing allocations. Because of these responsibilities, they are able to comment on the difficulties of recruiting for both tenure and non-tenure librarian positions.

The authors shared their research interests on various aspects of tenure. As a group they began formulating questions that would capture data to address these interests. Over a four-month period the group met biweekly to refine the survey questions. During that time the authors honed the survey by collapsing a number of questions dealing with the types of support offered for tenure track librarians (Question 8) and the institutional history of tenure (Questions 4 & 5). The authors also determined that it would be important to separate responses by whether or not the respondents were from ARL member institutions (Question 9).

The University at Buffalo HR Director facilitated the distribution of the survey to the PERSN-L list, which is an electronic discussion list primarily populated by ARL member HR officers. In January 2004, after receiving approval from the University at Buffalo Institutional Review Board, the “Tenure in Academic Libraries Questionnaire” went online and the URL was distributed to PERSN-L.

During the institutional review process the authors were required to assure the confidentiality of respondents. This was accomplished by removing e-mail addresses or any other personally identifiable information to be submitted or embedded in the form responses. The web form stripped the “To” and “From” addresses and suppressed any “send host” information before the submission was sent via e-mail to one author’s e-mail address. The authors then manually entered the response data into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet maintained on a university computer.

The survey questions were designed to address a number of research interests. Firstly, the survey addressed the perceived trend toward non-tenure track librarian positions that are not classified as “faculty.” Unfortunately, given the multitude of institutional specific definitions of the word “librarian,” simply asking whether or not an institution offered tenure proved to be difficult. Therefore, Question 1 sought to define the types of librarian positions offered at an institution, and Question 4 sought to determine whether or not an institution offered tenure.

The authors also wanted to determine whether new librarians are being discouraged either internally or externally from applying for tenure-track positions. Since a survey of new librarians was beyond the scope of the project team’s resources, Question 6 was added to the survey with a section for comments. The authors agreed that HR officers would be capable of commenting on whether or not they believed tenure was a selling point during the initial recruitment process.

The authors were also interested in the levels of support that librarians receive, regardless of status, during their employment. This applies to both tenure and non-tenure type librarian positions. ACRL’s Guidelines for Academic Status for College and University Librarians seemed a fitting rubric against which to measure such support.
Once the final survey was completed, the authors conducted a final group evaluation. Question 6 was rewritten as a Likert scale and the survey was distributed within the library for peer review. As a result of this review, grammatical corrections were made and two questions reworded for clarity.

RESULTS

The authors released the online survey (see Appendix 1) to the PERSN-L list on February 16, 2004, and continued receiving responses until February 27, 2004. At the time of the survey’s release, 91 individuals were subscribed to the PERSN-L list. A total of 35 respondents completed the survey, which represented 38% of the list’s subscription population. Survey results were tabulated in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet, and percentages were calculated to the nearest one-hundredths.

Job Description

For Question 1, (see Table 1A on next page) respondents were given four options to select from: faculty, professional staff, faculty and professional staff, or other. For respondents who selected the “other” option, a text box was provided to specify the status of librarians at their institutions. The breakdown of responses was 40% faculty, 34% professional staff, 6% faculty and professional staff, and 17% other.

Two of the six respondents who selected the “other” option to Question 1 indicated that librarians at their respective institutions are ranked as academic staff. The remaining four rankings listed were academic appointees, academic personnel, academic professionals, and non-tenure-track faculty. Two of the respondents from this pool also stated that librarians at their institutions have “faculty status, but not faculty rank.”

For Question 2, respondents were given the options of “yes” or “no” (see Table 1A). Respondents were not given a text box with this question to elaborate on their answer. The breakdown of responses was 34% yes, and 66% no.

For Question 3, respondents were given the options of “yes” or “no” (see Table 1A). Respondents were not given a text box with this question to elaborate on their answer. The breakdown of responses was 34% yes, and 66% no.

For Question 4, respondents were given the options of “yes” or “no” (see Table 1A). For respondents who selected the “yes” option, a text box was provided to indicate the approximate year during which tenure was first offered at their institutions. The breakdown of responses was 40% yes and 60% no. Six of the 14 respondents who answered “yes” to Question 4 also provided the years that tenure was first offered at their respective institutions. The years listed were 1960, 1972, 1975, 1982, and 1989.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions:</th>
<th>Answers:</th>
<th>Numbers (n=35):</th>
<th>Percentages:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Which of the following best describes individuals with the word “librarian” in the job title at your institution?</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty &amp; Prof. Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does your institution offer positions that require an MLS but do not have the word “librarian” in the job title?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does your institution offer positions that prefer an MLS but do not have the word “librarian” in the job title?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does your institution currently offer tenure to librarians?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Did your institution offer tenure previously, but does not currently?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. As human resources director, do you view tenure as a benefit or impediment in the process of recruiting librarians?</td>
<td>[Refer to Table 1B]</td>
<td>[Refer to Table 1B]</td>
<td>[Refer to Table 1B]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If you answered “No” to Question 4, please indicate what factors contributed to your institution’s decision not to offer librarians tenure.</td>
<td>[Refer to Table 1C]</td>
<td>[Refer to Table 1C]</td>
<td>[Refer to Table 1C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Please check any of the following statements that are true for your institution:</td>
<td>[Refer to Table 1D]</td>
<td>[Refer to Table 1D]</td>
<td>[Refer to Table 1D]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Is your institution a member of ARL?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Question 5, respondents were given the options of “yes” or “no”. For respondents who selected the “yes” option, a text box was provided to indicate the approximate year during which tenure was last offered at their institutions. The breakdown of responses was 9% yes, and 91% no. One of the three respondents who answered “yes” to Question 5 also provided the last year that tenure was offered at their institution: 1980.

For Question 7, respondents were provided a text box to explain why their institutions do not offer tenure for librarians (see Table 1C). There were 20 respondents who answered “no” to Question 4, and 17 of those answered Question 7. Responses to Question 7 fell into five different categories. The list and breakdown of responses was as follows: 30% separate rankings and review processes for librarians; 20% institutional opposition to tenure for librarians; 20% not known, or information not available; 15% no response provided; 10% tenure refused by librarians, and 5% tenure not asked for by librarians. Thirty percent of the respondents to this question indicated that their institutions have an alternative form of permanent appointment similar to tenure.

### Recruitment

For Question 6 (see Table 1B), respondents were given the following options to select from: strong benefit, benefit, moderate benefit, neutral, moderate impediment, impediment, or strong impediment (see Table 1B on page 14). Respondents were also provided a text box and encouraged to elaborate. The breakdown of responses was 14% strong benefit, 11% benefit, 14% moderate benefit, 26% neutral, 14% moderate impediment, 17%

---

**Table 1C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 7: If you answered “No” to Question 4, please indicate what factors contributed to your institution’s decision to not offer librarians tenure.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responses:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate rankings &amp; review processes for librarians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional opposition to tenure for librarians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known, or information not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure refused by librarians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure not asked for by librarians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 6: As human resource director, do you view tenure as a benefit or impediment in the process of recruiting librarians?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answers:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate impediment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impediment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong impediment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
impediment, and 3% strong impediment.

A grouping of survey results shows that 40% of the respondents regard tenure as a moderate benefit, a benefit, or a strong benefit for recruiting librarians. Thirty-four percent of the respondents regard it as a moderate impediment, an impediment, or a strong impediment. Twenty-six percent indicated that they were neutral on the subject. The authors combined this data with the results from Question 4 to compare and contrast human resource directors’ opinions on tenure for recruitment with whether or not their institutions currently offer tenure for librarians.

Eighty-six percent of the respondents who work for institutions that currently offer tenure indicated that they regard tenure as a benefit for recruitment. The most cited benefit from this pool of respondents was job security. One respondent wrote, “It is hard to get people to give up secure positions for a position that can be seen as ‘work at the pleasure of.’ Even though this isn’t true, it’s a difficult thing to explain (and prove) to someone who is making a big career move.” Respondents from this pool provided the following as other benefits: service to the profession, enhanced salaries, service to the college or university, academic freedom, and academic status. Additional benefits noted were the peer-review process, increased vacation time, and the ability to go on sabbatical. Fourteen percent of the respondents that regard tenure as a benefit for recruitment work for institutions that do not currently offer tenure.

Seventy-five percent of the respondents who work for institutions that do not currently offer tenure for librarians indicated that they regard tenure as an impediment to recruitment. Among the impediments specified were delays in the hiring process, distractions from the librarians’ primary roles, publishing and professional activity requirements, and the lack of financial support for those requirements. One respondent from this pool commented, “Younger librarians tend to view tenure as a nuisance. They are less interested in publishing, and more interested in doing cutting-edge things.” Twenty-five percent of the respondents who work for institutions that currently offer tenure for librarians indicated that they regard tenure as an impediment to recruitment. Their supplemental comments on the matter mirrored those of the former pool.

One hundred percent of the respondents who work for institutions that do not currently offer tenure for librarians indicated they were neutral on the matter of tenure for recruitment. The ambivalence from this pool of results is represented in the following respondent’s commentary:

“Librarian interview candidates have not indicated to me a concern with librarians not being on tenure track. To my knowledge, we’ve not had a job offer declined because of a lack of tenure status. At the same time, I do not have a sense of the number of candidates who did not apply for a librarian position due to the absence of tenure status.”

Professional Standards

For Question 8, respondents were provided 14 statements related to the status of librarians at their institutions (see Table 1D on next page). The statements were adapted from the ACRL Guidelines. Respondents were asked to select all applicable statements. The survey results from Question 8 are fleshed out in the discussion section of this paper.
**Table 1D**

**Question 8:** Please check any of the following statements that are true for your institution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Librarians are assigned responsibilities matched to their educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competencies and interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians are given maximum latitude in fulfilling their responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors and peers regularly and vigorously review the performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of librarians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians participate in the development of the institution’s mission,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curriculum, and governance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians participate in the development of policies and procedures for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their library, including hiring, review, retention, and continuing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appointment of their peers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians are appointed by written contracts of no less than one year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After a period of no longer than seven years, and through a process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which includes peer review, librarians are granted continuing employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if they have met the appropriate conditions and standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians are promoted through ranks on the basis of their professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proficiency and effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures for promotion and salary increases include peer review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians are eligible for internal and external research funds to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promote their active participation in research and other professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians are eligible for leaves of absences or sabbaticals to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promote their active participation in research and other professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numbers (n=35):</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARL Membership

For Question 9, respondents were given the options of "yes" or "no" (see Table 1A). The breakdown of responses was 91% yes, and 9% no.

Additional Comments

At the end of the survey, the authors provided a text box and asked respondents to provide any further opinions related to the matter of tenure and academic librarians. The authors selected the following as being representative of those opinions:

“I personally would find it useful to have a non-tenure track available to librarians who would prefer not to submit to research, publication, [and] service rigors. We have many who can be very good practicing librarians with little interest in the tenure requirements.”

“I have served as a personnel librarian in a library that awards tenure and one that does not. My experience is that tenure does not make librarians more credible or respected by other faculty—It is what librarians accomplish that impact those relations. I think that the tenure system may work where it fits with the identity, vision, and goals of a particular library, but may impede progress in another library. I believe that it is possible to have effective systems for librarian involvement and participation in decision making, for career advancement, and for tangible rewards without a tenure system. I have found that a tenure system that holds librarians to the same standards as regular faculty (especially for research and publication) is extraordinarily difficult to achieve when combined with the level of service expectations we have for librarians. I also have found that the tenure system puts enormous pressure on early career librarians.”

“I consider it [tenure] an opportunity for our librarians to fully participate in further developing our profession through service and scholarship. It also benefits them as they are protected by academic freedom; it provides job security once they have continuing status; it provides a foundation for them to be actively involved in developing the library—freely expressing diverse views—and [it] gives them the rights to due process afforded the faculty.”

“At many institutions, those going through the tenure process are treated unjustly and unfairly by those with the power to grant or deny tenure. Those with tenure tend to sit on their laurels and criticize rather than be actively involved in any unified effort to serve the public.”

“The best kind of tenure includes a rigorous post-tenure evaluation process that finds a way to ensure...continued work performance, not allowing librarians to kick back and relax after they obtain tenure.”
The survey responses indicate that while the majority of academic librarians are considered to be “faculty” (40%), the majority of academic libraries surveyed do not, in fact, offer tenure (60%). Because of a low response rate to the questions indicating when particular institutions did or did not adopt tenure requirements for their faculty, it is impossible to say whether this is indicative of an upward or downward trend overall.

What is more certain is the opinions of HR directors regarding the use of tenure as a recruitment tool. With 60% indicating that they are either neutral on the subject or that they regard tenure as some form of impediment, it is clear that HR directors do not perceive tenure as a significant benefit to the process of hiring and retaining librarians. With only 51% of libraries offering contracts of more than one year, this perception takes on a troubling nuance. Not only is tenure not well regarded as a retention tool, nearly half of the respondents have indicated that short-term contracts are the norm. If the 1994 article by Henry, Caudle and Sullenger(18) is correct in stating that there is no demonstrable causality between tenure requirements and turnover, and tenure has no value in retention, then what purpose does tenure really serve as a tool for recruitment?

ACRL has a record of support for faculty rank and tenure for librarians, and intends this document to suggest standards for any librarian who is not appointed into tenure track faculty positions. These standards are, in short, a set of criteria for non-tenure track, non-faculty positions that attempt to bring them on par with standard faculty positions to whatever extent possible. They also serve as minimally acceptable standards for tenure-track faculty positions.

The results of this survey seem to indicate, however, that most institutions meet the majority of these standards, regardless of tenure status or membership in ARL. Question 8 (see next page) was designed to gauge each library’s commitment to the ACRL Guidelines by separating it into 14 statements and asking respondents to indicate which statements were true for their library. The average of all responses to Question 8 was 78%, indicating strong general acceptance of the ACRL Guidelines. ARL member institutions averaged 78% and non-ARL libraries averaged 79%.

Tenure status also had little impact on acceptance of the ACRL Guidelines. Tenure track libraries averaged 78% on Question 8, and non-tenure track libraries averaged 73%. Of particular note, the 11 libraries that indicated both faculty status and tenure track averaged 88%, with 5 of those libraries indicating that they met 100% of the ACRL Guidelines. By comparison, libraries that indicated professional, non-tenure track status for their librarians averaged only 63% of the ACRL Guidelines.

Interestingly, those institutions that chose “Other” as the best description for their librarians averaged 82% of the ACRL Guidelines, second only to those who chose tenure track faculty. These appointments can be generalized as a “separate but equal” category, with titles such as “Academic Staff” or “Academic Professionals.” Only one of the six libraries that indicated “Other” status for librarians currently offers tenure.

Of the individual statements solicited for the ACRL Guidelines, several had interesting results. Highest ranked results included:
• Librarians have access to grievance procedures (97%)
• Librarians participate in the development of policies and procedures for their library including the hiring, review, retention, and continuing appointment of their peers (94%)
• Librarians are assigned responsibilities matched to their educational competencies and interests (91%)
• The institution may dismiss a librarian during the contractual period for just cause and through academic due process (89%)

Lowest ranked results included the aforementioned contracts of no less than one year (51 percent); continuing appointment (60%); supervisors and peers regularly and vigorously reviewing the performance of librarians (63%); and peer review as a part of procedures for promotion and salary increases (69%).

CONCLUSIONS

While it is difficult to classify these results and to note specific commonalities, a general trend does seem to reveal itself in these numbers. Items that are highly ranked and common to the majority of libraries are of greater value to the institution than to the individual. Grievance procedures protect the institution from potential liabilities while not necessarily endowing the grieving employee with specific protections. The notion of librarians participating in library policy and procedure development and being matched to their work based on competencies only addresses workflow concerns for the library itself.

Comparatively, lowest ranked results are those that favor the individual over the institution, including contracts of substantial length and the potential for permanent appointment. Peer review, in particular, can serve to protect an individual’s job. When a librarian is due for promotion in an environment where administration is hostile, peer review can serve to balance the scales. Similarly, peer review can help protect a librarian against wrongful termination by a supervisor in ways that a standard grievance procedure cannot.

The authors recognize that classifying the ACRL Guidelines as noted above may be viewed as subjective. A survey should be undertaken to determine which of the ACRL Guidelines are the most valued, and by which demographics of librarians and library school students. Related areas of interest might include job satisfaction surveys and salary and benefit package comparisons between academic librarians and M.L.S.-bearing non-librarians in the academic workforce.

Issues of personnel recruitment and retention have always been a significant concern for academic library administrators. As established librarians approach retirement, the question becomes how best to recruit a new generation of librarians into the academic profession. New library school graduates have different career options than their predecessors had, and may also have significantly different values that could have an impact on future academic library recruitment.

If it is determined that the next generation of librarians does not possess the same values as the current one, then academic libraries should prepare for the possibility of radical changes in librarian status and benefits. Until we can thoroughly assess and understand the values of the next generation of librarians, it is likewise vital that those elements of academic librarianship which benefit the individual, such as peer review and continuing appointment, be protected.
# APPENDIX

## Tenure in Academic Libraries Questionnaire

Please answer the questions below. You may add comments if you wish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Which of the following best describes individuals with the word &quot;librarian&quot; in the job title at your institution?</td>
<td>Faculty, Professional staff (MLS required or preferred), Both faculty and professional staff, Other (please list)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does your institution offer positions that require an MLS but do not have the word &quot;librarian&quot; in the job title.</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does your institution offer positions that prefer an MLS but do not have the word &quot;librarian&quot; in the job title.</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does your institution currently offer tenure to your librarians?</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you answered &quot;No,&quot; proceed to question 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If &quot;Yes,&quot; in approximately what year was tenure first offered at your institution?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Did your institution offer tenure previously, but does not currently?</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you answered &quot;No,&quot; proceed to question 6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If &quot;Yes,&quot; in approximately what year was tenure last offered at your institution?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. As human resources director, do you view tenure as a benefit or impediment in the process of recruiting librarians?

If possible please explain your choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong Benefit</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Moderate Benefit</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Moderate Benefit</th>
<th>Moderate Impediment</th>
<th>Strong Impediment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Strong Benefit" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Benefit" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Moderate Benefit" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Neutral" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Moderate Benefit" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Moderate Impediment" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Strong Impediment" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. If you answered "No" to question 4, please indicate what factors contributed to your institution's decision to **not** offer librarians tenure.

8. Please check any of the following statements that are true for your institution:

- Librarians are assigned responsibilities matched to their educational competencies and interests.
- Librarians are given maximum latitude in fulfilling their responsibilities.
- Supervisors and peers regularly and vigorously review the performance of librarians.
- Librarians participate in the development of the institution's mission, curriculum, and governance.
- Librarians participate in the development of policies and procedures for their library including the hiring, review, retention, and continuing appointment of their peers.
- Librarians are appointed by written contracts of no less than one year.
- After a period of no longer than seven years and through a process which includes peer review, librarians are granted continuing employment if they have met the appropriate conditions and standards.
- Librarians are promoted through ranks on the basis of their professional proficiency and effectiveness.
- Procedures for promotion and salary increases include a peer review.
- Librarians are eligible for internal and external research funds to promote their active participation in research and other professional activities.
- Librarians are eligible for leaves of absences or sabbaticals to promote their active participation in research and other professional activities.
- Librarians are entitled to the protection of academic freedom as set forth in the *American Association of University Professors 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*. 
The institution may dismiss a librarian during the contractual period for just cause and through academic due process.

Librarians have access to grievance procedures.

9. Is your institution a member of ARL?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

Any comments you have regarding tenure would be helpful:

We would like to thank you for taking time to respond to this questionnaire!

Stewart Brower, Senior Assistant Librarian, Health Sciences Library, University at Buffalo
Christopher Hollister, Senior Assistant Librarian, Undergraduate Library, University at Buffalo
Cynthia Tysick, Senior Assistant Librarian, Lockwood Library, University at Buffalo
Thomas Pirrung, Senior Assistant Librarian, Health Sciences Library, University at Buffalo
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Abstract: The role of the School Library Media Specialist has evolved from the “keeper of the books”, teaching stand-alone library skills lessons to an instructional partner who integrates classroom curriculum with information literacy for inquiry and research process instruction. The experience of the incoming professional to a new school culture is central to their acclimation and ultimate performance. The most important person able to provide information on policy, collection, curriculum and other vital functions of the School Media Center is the exiting School Library Media Specialist. This article will analyze the nature of the “transition mentoring”, the transmission of knowledge from the exiting professional to the new one. This exploratory study also analyzes the pathways for this transmission of a professional culture to occur. The article outlines both suggestions and challenges that arise during this transition period and will provide important information to ease the impact experienced by new professionals in their transition into the library facility and school culture.
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Evolving professional standards and culture:

Recently, functions of library and information science institutions have been subject to changing models of service, leading to reflection and change of standards. The school media field has been in a state of transition since 1988. Formerly, professional standards dealt with quantitative, administrative and managerial issues, such as collection size and facility use. With the publication of Information Power in 1988, a document from the American Association of School Libraries (AASL) of The American Library Association (ALA), and the reaffirmation in 1998 (1) of its mission and philosophy, an emphasis on instructional and collaborative roles took priority over the traditional view of the services offered in the school library media center. Standards regarding the roles and services of library media specialists were specified through this document from AASL and substantiated by leaders of the school media field (2). Along with new standards, there arose new teacher certification requirements for School Library Media Specialists (SLMS) from the New York State Department of Education (NYSED). In addition, the No Child Left Behind Act required “highly qualified and effective” teachers (3). NYSED also implemented a new content specialty test to qualify incoming SMLS for certification in NYS schools, thus ensuring that the SLMS “has demonstrated subject matter competency” in the subject the teacher teaches in a manner determined by the state as mandated by the U.S. Department of Education (4).

These developments have tremendously impacted the nature of services and type of work that school media specialists need to be prepared to perform in schools today. In particular, the role of the SLMS has evolved from the traditional keeper of the books, teaching stand-alone library skills lessons, to an instructional partner who integrates classroom content curriculum with information literacy skills for inquiry and research process instruction (5).

In schools, new classroom teachers need to adapt quickly to their schools and teaching assignments because students are relying on them as soon as the school year begins. Incoming school media specialists, hired as teachers, share this requirement but to a greater extent. Not only students depend on their readiness, but classroom teachers also need their services as instructional partners and information specialists, as well as expecting that the school library is an efficiently functioning entity from the moment school begins.

Information Power highlights the leadership role of the SLMS in student learning in today’s schools (6). School culture is a critical key to student achievement and student learning. Successful schools have “leaders who can read, assess, and reinforce core rituals, traditions, and values” (7), which are indicative of school culture. School libraries are particularly reflective of the culture of the particular school building and district. Although pre-service school media specialists perform internships at both elementary and secondary levels, their experiences are relative to the schools in which they served.

Traditionally, one SLMS has been the only professional tending the library for a considerable amount of years and is knowledgeable not only about the library but also about the culture of the school. School media specialists, as well as other librarians, leave the profession for a variety of reasons, but one of the most common causes is retirements. Dissonance occurs when that person with a more traditional philosophy of service but a great deal of working
knowledge leaves and a new professional arrives and attempts to implement a new vision with little practical experience. This rings true in all library settings.

**Mentoring programs:**

In recognition of the needs of incoming teachers, many schools have developed mentoring programs. Mentors help new teachers by providing support and encouragement, by providing information about the culture of the school community and the way things work in that school, thus enabling them to become “acclimated to the school environment” (8). Mentors also function as peer coaches by offering confidentiality and feedback to improve new teachers’ teaching skills and strategies (9). The role of a mentor is critical to a new professional not only as an experienced master able to answer questions. Mentors enable carefully developed relationships and partnerships to continue and thrive. In school media centers, the outgoing SLMS has invested time and energy in analyzing the teaching staff’s needs, teaching styles and interests. They are also highly cognizant of the unique aspects of the site’s formal and informal culture and of policies and procedures, routines and expectations.

While public schools in New York State have developed mentor programs for classroom teachers, this presents a dilemma for the SLMS. A school media specialist performs other roles besides that of a teacher. A school media specialist is also a program administrator, performing administrative and managerial services, and an information specialist, providing reference services. When a district assigns another teacher within the school to mentor or be a buddy of the school media specialist, the mentor has little understanding of the unique roles of the school media specialist and can thus offer only limited advice. If the district assigns a school media specialist from another school as a mentor, there is still a lack of understanding about the function of that school media center within the culture of the particular school. The only person who can provide information about the school’s culture, students, curricula and teaching imperatives as it relates to the school media center is the outgoing school media specialist. Because of school hiring practices, the incoming SLMS often does not have the opportunity of a contact with the outgoing SLMS.

**OBJECTIVES:**

The general objective of this exploratory study is to examine the communication of past practices between the exiting SLMS and the incoming professional. In particular, the study analyzes the nature of the “mentoring” that the exiting or retiring professional provided for the new person and the impact of this for ease of transition into the facility and the school culture. This transmission of the culture and practices of the exiting school media specialist to the new professional can be considered transition mentoring, in a sense a transmission of a professional culture. This study is important because it will lead to recommendations and steps that a departing SMS can take to ensure the successful transmission of a professional culture to the incoming SMS. In addition, recommendations will be made for successful transition mentoring practices for other branches of library and information science. Basic research questions included: what kind of communication, if any, took place prior to entry of a new school media specialist? What was the nature of that communication? How useful was that communication in the transition into the new position? What specific items or materials were left by the exiting school media specialist and how helpful were they in the transition?
METHODS:

Subject Population:

Subjects for this study were School Media Specialists in Nassau and Suffolk Counties, Long Island, New York who have received new positions or changed positions in the last five years. Students and teachers in this demographic area, Nassau and Suffolk Counties, are multi-ethnic and economically diverse. There is also much diversity from school district to school district, giving the study a cross section and broad scope.

To consider eligibility for this study the following procedure was followed. Using the “Schools/Media Centers” sections of the Directory of Long Island Libraries and Media Centers for 1999 and 2004 (10), 270 School Library Media Specialists employed in Nassau and Suffolk County schools, New York, were considered subjects for this study. Everybody who was new in the 2004 Directory who was not in the 1999 Directory was considered a qualified participant and received a revised questionnaire. One hundred and thirty seven school media specialists, including pilot responses, sent back completed surveys. Fifty-one of the surveys were eliminated based on subjects not meeting criteria. Qualified respondents serve in a variety of grade levels; 53 teach in grades K-5; 22 teach in grades 6-8; 9 teach in grades 9-12; and 6 teach in K-12 settings, such as private or small district schools. The following chart shows the grade level distribution of study respondents:

![Grade Level Currently Teaching](image)

Forty-two respondents have taught in their current positions for 4 – 5 years; 34 respondents are teaching in their 2 – 3 year; while the smallest number of respondents (14) were in their current position for one year as is shown in the following chart:

Procedure:

The researchers developed an initial questionnaire based on their personal experience of transition mentoring and on concepts about effective mentoring in education as they relate to the school media center. This initial questionnaire was sent to four SLMS in new positions as of September 2004 for purposes of pilot testing the design, terminology and ease of use of the questionnaire. Initial pilot questionnaires were sent out in January 2005. Based on
comments, revisions were made. The final survey consisted of 11 questions in total: 8 directed questions and 3 open-ended opportunities for comments. (See attached survey.)

Two hundred and seventy surveys were sent out in April 2005 with 132 returned by May 2005. Fifty-one surveys were disqualified because most were in positions longer than the 5 year cut off. It was thought that the memories of those in positions longer than 5 years would be faulty in remembering the exact kind and nature of the communication between incoming and departing SMS, but even more relevant is the conception and understanding of the changing role of the School Media Specialist.

Data was analyzed using a content analysis. Codes of ideas from the closed questions, as well as open-ended responses, were developed and analyzed. Main coded ideas were the following: A. Basic data; B. Checklist of left items; C. Comments. Basic data about grade level and years of service of the respondents and the checklist items with associated numbers are in the attached charts. Comments were divided into “Things left,” “People who helped,” “Problems and suggestions.” Most of Part C was determined from the open-ended questions.

Findings:

I. Communication:

Of the 90 viable respondents, 61 had some form of communication with the exiting school media specialist; 29 said there was no communication. Nineteen of the respondents deemed the amount of this communication to be very little; 24 described the amount to be some communication and 20 said that the communication was substantial. Two respondents who checked “no” on the questionnaire responded that the communication was very little.

Questions on the survey asked respondents to determine the nature of the communication that took place. Choices included a phone call, brief introduction sometime during the interview process, more than one meeting, specific conversations about administration of the media center and specific conversations about instruction, such as sharing information about classes and lessons. Respondents were directed to check all that applied. Twenty-nine respondents cited a phone call as the communication; 18 had a brief introduction; 19 had a brief meeting in the school library media center; 32 had more than one meeting; 24 noted specific conversations about the administration of the media center and 24 noted specific conversations about instruction.

Forty-eight respondents stated that this communication took place before the start of the new position, while 23 replied it took place after the start of the new position. Most respondents felt that the communication was helpful in some way: 20 noted it was somewhat helpful, while 31 noted that it was very helpful. Only 11 respondents felt that the communication was not at all helpful.

Comments: Therefore, communication with exiting school media specialists was considered helpful in the transition by the incoming school media specialist.
When communication did not occur, the incoming school media specialist felt at a loss or floundering. For example, one respondent stated that the transition was “difficult since no information was left about lessons... and no information about curriculum. I had no idea about which information skills had been taught” and thus didn’t have a good foundation on which to proceed. Whereas for this respondent the issue was about instruction, for others it was about the entire transitional experience: “My first year I felt like I was drowning... the library itself was a mess.” One suggestion that this might lead to is that exiting school media specialists make an effort to meet formally with incoming school media specialists with the specific intent to share information about instruction and managerial, administrative matters.

II. Materials:

There were a number of materials that respondents noted were left by the exiting school media specialists for the incoming person. Fifty-eight of the new school media specialists felt that these materials were helpful, while 31 felt that they were not. One person did not answer this question. The following table indicates which items were left and how helpful they were determined to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>NOT HELPFUL</th>
<th>HELPFUL</th>
<th>VERY HELPFUL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>calendar of prior year’s schedule</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prior plan book</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lesson plans, unit plans</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curriculum map</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning sheets</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bibliographies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prior collaborative planning forms</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prior communication w/ CR teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beginning-of-year procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end-of-year procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>correspondence and/or notes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prior purchase orders</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prior budget or budget procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prior year’s inventory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protocol for automation system</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>words and/or protocol for technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology support information</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>list or range of barcodes</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circ. procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selection policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptable use policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school policies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>library policies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff directory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community information (book fairs etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the data, it was found that exiting school media specialists left more procedural information rather than instructional information that was considered helpful. Among the most helpful procedural items left were prior purchase orders, prior budget procedures and circulation procedures. When these items were not left, the new school media specialist felt at a loss. One respondent wrote: “It would have been wonderful if the exiting librarian could have given me some information on procedures already in place... I was very overwhelmed in the beginning...”

What is interesting to note is the amount of instructional materials that were left by the exiting school media specialist that were not considered to be very helpful by the incoming school media specialist. For example, while the literature (see Endnote 2) has spoken about the collaborative and instructional role of the school media specialist for over 15 years, few planning sheets or collaborative planning forms considered helpful by the new SLMS were left. Only 6 respondents noted that planning sheets were left and were helpful, while 8 respondents said that collaborative planning forms were left and helpful. One respondent commented: “All previous file and lessons were ‘tossed.’ I have had to create my own curriculum and ‘fly by the seat of my pants’... I have just pasted on a smile and forged on.” Another respondent noted that “the major difficulties were created by a lack of district or building info as to library curriculum & various policies & procedures. The previous SLMS also took all her files, lesson plans... as she was still teaching – not retiring.” Another respondent noted that “the transition was difficult. Every library is very different. Not having a curriculum to follow makes it very difficult. Classroom teachers have guidelines to follow & set curriculum. Library media specialist should put together a book of lessons & lesson plans.”

It is also interesting to note that very few important policies were left. Only 7 out of 90 respondents noted that a selection policy was left and 12 noted that an acceptable use policy was left.

In addition to the items noted on the checklist, respondents noted other materials of importance to them on the open-ended questions. The following list is an indication of other helpful materials for the incoming school media specialist’s transition as written by the respondents:

- Form letters for communication with parents and teachers
- Copies of monthly reports to the principal
- Prior book lists
- Professional literature and resources
- Web page; website information
- Library posters
Helpful People:

In answer to the question: was there anyone else who helped you in your transition, the number of respondents who said no was only 16, out of 90 respondents. This indicated that a large majority of the respondents did consider someone helpful. The following list was compiled from respondents who noted that there were others helpful:

- Other librarians in the district; library department
- Principal
- Library aide, library assistant, clerk, paraprofessional
- Teacher assistant (clerical and automation concerns)
- Mentor (another building’s elementary school media specialist); district assigned mentor
- “Buddy assigned to new teacher”
- Friends in the profession; fellow librarians from a professional association (CLA)
- Other buildings’ school media specialists
- SLMC secretary
- Other teachers in the building; faculty, classroom teachers
- Curriculum associate; department head
- District library coordinator
- BOCES School Library System Director
- Computer tech staff, teacher or coordinator
- University professors
- Public children’s librarian
Comments:

Many respondents who noted that someone else was helpful in their transition also voluntarily commented on the nature of that help. The people on the list above were put into the following categories: library aides or paraprofessionals, other district librarians, university professors, and assigned mentors. A sampling of respondents' comments include:

Library aide, clerk, secretary, paras: “Without the help of the long-time para I could not have made as successful a transition as I did. She taught me procedures, automation and everything else”; “I was fortunate to have a terrific library clerk who was both willing to share the "old ways" with me, but equally supportive when it came to trying out "new ways"; “I am very fortunate to have a full-time library clerk who knows everything with regards to purchasing, cataloging & processing, student IDs and circulation. If it were not for her – my transition would not have been so smooth.”

It is interesting to note the use of school media specialist's words about being “fortunate.” This study documents the importance of the library paraprofessional's knowledge in the successful transition of incoming school media specialists.

Other district librarians, library department, chairperson: “…it really has been helpful to network with two very experienced helpful librarians in my district. They are my mentors!”; “…the other MS librarian really helped me. I felt she was the most important part of my transition since I was left with little help or guidance within the building simply because nobody knew anything library related!... I called her almost every day those first couple of months & would sit with her in her library or she would come to mine if I had specific questions or concerns.” New school media specialists felt the need of specific mentoring from other library professionals.

District or building assigned mentors: “I was given a mentor and a program for new teachers was set up called the Mentor Teacher Internship Program (MTIP)…. we were paid to participate. It was (and still is) extremely helpful in the transition process”; (#60) “A buddy is assigned to a new teacher, and my buddy was very helpful in knowing proper procedures and understanding school policies.” Yet these mentors were not instrumental in advising about specific library matters. For a complete mentoring experience, the SLMS also needed a library colleague.

University professors and classes: “I… have taken many ideas from the classes I took during my time at [the university]”; “I did refer to my notes from SM classes,” as well as “Change is a slow process.” “It takes time to establish the relationships with the school administration, the teachers, the parents, and the community that are necessary to making meaningful changes which help to bring the library into the center of school activities.” This substantiates the need for university professors to impart practical advice as well as theoretical content.

IV: Comments Regarding the Nature of the Transition: In responding to the open-ended questions, comments that respondents made about the nature of their transition were mostly in two categories: those noting transitional problems and those offering suggestions for new colleagues:
**A. Transitional Problems:** The nature of the problems mentioned by new media specialists fall into the following themes: a feeling of being overwhelmed and not understood; difficult aides or important others; little information left that was considered essential.

1. Feeling of being overwhelmed, not understood or unprepared: This theme seems to be a recurrent thread as can be ascertained through the following voluntary comments:

   - “I was pretty much left to my own devices…”
   - “Nobody was able to offer any help.”
   - “My first year I felt like I was drowning. Nearly every free moment during my week was spent researching ideas & planning lessons. The Library itself was a mess... It’s difficult when you’re the only librarian in a school district with no mentor, and not even an experienced clerk to lean [on].”
   - “It’s been my perception that most people really didn’t know nor understand my position as a library media specialist anyway.”
   - “I know it is the nature of the job to be on your own and create your own programming & relationships, but I feel that I was left with very little information about policies, procedures, collaborations, barcodes, etc. from previous years... I had the phone number of the prior SMS but very often felt uncomfortable contacting her only because I felt it was my responsibility to figure things out on my own.”
   - “My first job was much more difficult in that I was in a daily teaching situation. I had to create a library curriculum & teach 3 classes a day (5th & 6th grade) as well as work collaboratively with all the teachers... Nothing in my education really prepared me to be a classroom teacher, prepare units independently, create rubrics and manage my own classroom... I was also responsible for all AV equipment which I felt totally unprepared for as all courses focused on traditional areas of librarianship (cataloging, technology, print sources, etc.) and education courses focused on our collaborative role, but in actuality the position was quite different.”

2. Difficult aides or difficult important others: This second theme shows the importance of others who are familiar with the media center environment in the transition between school media specialists.

   - “My biggest transition [problem] was with a library aide who had been there for 19 years. She had difficulty accepting the changes I was making and my different philosophy on what a library should be.”
   - “The old school media specialist cleaned out file cabinets and records. It was not a pleasant retirement from what I had been told so I understand the lack of information left behind.”
“The biggest obstacle to a successful transition was the assistant in the library. She was extremely difficult to work with and resistant to change of any kind.”

“[The previous librarian] wanted to make sure that I did everything EXACTLY the way that he did... He spent my budget for the year and didn’t leave me one dollar for anything.”

3. Little relevant information left: This third theme points to the feeling of incoming media specialists for some data to give them a context in which to begin work.

“All previous files and lessons were ‘tossed’. I have had to create my curriculum and ‘fly by the seat of my pants’. Classroom teachers are, by and large, overwhelmed. They looked to me for guidance! I have just pasted on a smile and forged on.

“The transition was difficult since no information was left about lessons that were previously taught in the library and no information was left about curriculum. I had no idea which information skills had been taught to the students.”

“The major difficulties were created by a lack of district or building info as to library curriculum & various policies & procedures. The previous SLMS also took all her files, lesson plans...”

“The transition was difficult. Not having a curriculum to follow makes it very difficult.”

[the previous librarian] “left very little information about policies, procedures, collaborations, barcodes, etc. from previous years.”

“Most of the information left behind was out of date with current best practices.”

B. Suggestions by respondents: In answer to the open-ended question that asked respondents to offer other comments about the nature of the transition to the new position as school library media specialist, some respondents voluntarily offered suggestions. These suggestions fall into the following categories: what the exiting librarian could have done or did to make the transition easier; a request for peer support; and comments about the helpfulness or lack of prior experience or prior advice. Some respondents offered general advice for new media specialists.

Exiting Librarians: Advice that the exiting librarian could have given or what a new media specialist would have wanted is noted in the following quotes:

“Classroom teachers have guidelines to follow & set curriculum. Library media specialist should put together a book of lessons & lesson plans.”

“It would have been wonderful if the exiting librarian could have given me some information on procedures already in place.”
The following quote shows the contrast as to the efficacy the new librarian feels when relevant information is left: “The retired librarian left good files with records of all transactions as well as notes about different programs she chaired. These along with several lessons helped me to evaluate the success of the library program & I could make changes some minor to continue the success of the library media program.”

Peer support: Although respondents noted the importance of mentors and peer support in answering the questions about helpful people, the following quotes noted in the “Comments” section of the survey highlight the feeling of the new school media specialist about the value of some kind of support:

· “The mentor was very important in so far as informing me about district library-related procedures and the history of my lmc [library media center].”

· “As far as my peers, any support would have been appreciated. Yet, it was sink or swim – I swam!”

Prior experience or advice: The following quotes highlight the importance of prior experience in the transition:

· “My prior experience within the district helped me transition into my private school position. I feel I was able to move further a lot faster due to this familiarity.”

· “I was very fortunate to be able to complete my internship in the same library media center where I was eventually hired. I had the opportunity to work with the previous school media specialist for an entire school year. During that time I took part in all aspects of maintaining a library. I attended all department & faculty meetings, participated in computer workshops, completed book & supply orders, taught classes, prepared lessons and reviewed all beginning & end of the year paperwork. All of these activities helped to make my transition into my new position a smooth one.”

· “I was fortunate to be hired in March for a September position & was able to meet with the retiring librarian a few times & get in during the summer. My style is different from my predecessor’s so not all the information was valuable but basic things, about where the bathroom is, was.”

· “After I was hired, I took a day off from work and spent it with the exiting school media specialist. Not only did I become familiar with the procedures of the library, but I made some new friends. It was nice seeing some friendly faces in September.”

These comments suggest that time spent shadowing or working alongside an outgoing SLMS may be helpful in the transition.

In one case, prior experience was not considered a plus: “My library is not automated and I trained in automated systems. Just adjusting to the card system was a big change.”(95)

The following comment notes the importance of practical advice given during graduate studies:
“I remember Dr. B saying in one of her classes that it takes time to establish the relationships with the school administration, the teachers, the parents, and the community that are necessary to making meaningful changes which help to bring the library into the center of school activities.”

General advice: Respondents generously offered the following advice to make the transition more successful:

- “...Be prepared to come in early and leave late in the beginning so that you have time to learn the technology, the automation system and the school procedures...
- “... I guess one of the best pieces of advice I can give is to learn the students’ names as quickly as possible – this will help tremendously with classroom management...
- “And make certain you go around to each teacher that first day and introduce yourself. Try to be as flexible as you can without compromising your own program.”

- “This is my second job in the field. I have found that we are often left to “wing it.” Each school has a climate that is unique. Flexibility is the #1 requirement of the job.”

- Two voices urge patience: “Librarians need to be patient when starting out. They need to establish both short-term and long-term goals for their libraries and they need to periodically raise those goals in order to meet their library’s needs. In some ways, it gets easier each year, but each year brings its own new challenges;” “You need to be patient with yourself in the beginning because there is so much to learn...

- “It’s a very scary time & being the only one in the library was hard. There wasn’t anyone who could answer my questions. But you get through & people are generally helpful if you ask questions. No one was checking on me; if I needed something I had to go after it & find the answer.”

And in the wishful thinking category...

- “I hope that NYS will establish standards for School Library Media programs in the future in order to generate more support from administrators.”

- “It is important for new SLMS to understand the impact of budgetary and (mandates of) Dept of Ed. constraints. Elementary librarians are now in a very difficult position (which is why I chose to change districts rather than risk phaseout at the elementary level).”

DISCUSSION:

This study shows that there is a need for greater consideration for some type of transition mentoring between an exiting professional and an incoming professional. Transition mentoring in this context can be defined as communication between a departing professional and an incoming one. This study reviewed the nature of this communication. In the context of school media centers, which are often spoken about as the heart or the
hub of the school and as such often represent the culture of the school, this communication is essential yet not often done in such a way as to be helpful to the new professional.

Comments from the new school media specialists in this study show that they experience a sense of isolation. This is not new; it substantiates common knowledge.

This study shows that any communication with the exiting school media specialist was considered helpful in the transition. Therefore one suggestion that arises from this study is that more formal meetings occur and are deliberatively planned for.

Communication can take the form of personal contact or virtual contact. Communication of a professional culture can be imparted through artifacts that exist and are available to be scrutinized. This study shows that people rather than things left proved to be of a high value in the transition period. Of special importance is the knowledge that library support staff impart to the new school media specialist. Other school media specialists, support staff, the principal and other administrators, such as library coordinator or department head, assigned mentors and a university professor’s professional preparation also helped in the transition for these respondents. Yet, the understanding of the role of the school media specialist by other educators was considered problematic. So it can be concluded that there is a high value placed on personal communication, which conforms to the humanistic nature of the profession. Another implication is that library support staff needs to be recognized for their knowledge of important procedures and routines and should be prepared for their important role in transition mentoring.

In their pre-service education and in Information Power (1998), the instructional role of the school media specialist is highlighted (11). Yet, exiting school media specialists left more procedural information rather than instructional information that was considered helpful. In addition, very few policies were left, such as selection or acceptable use policies that were considered helpful. It is open to question, therefore, whether these even originally existed, were not considered an important tool to be left for the incoming professional or were just not found. The most helpful items left appear to be procedural, such as prior purchase orders, prior budget procedures, circulation procedures; yet not having a curriculum to follow was considered problematic. It can be concluded that it is important to leave such artifacts as they are considered helpful in the transition. Therefore another suggestion is that exiting school media specialists make a special effort to leave such materials where the incoming SLMS can have easy access.

The issue of collaboration, which has permeated recent school media literature, doesn’t seem to be an issue in the transition. Current literature suggests it as an important trend yet it doesn’t come up as a suggestion or problem in this study. Therefore a question can be asked: Does this mean that collaboration is not happening or is not important to new school media specialists?

Knowledge of change and the change process impacted how new school media specialists felt during their transition. It is suggested that knowledge of the slowness of change and the need for the new SMS to have patience and to be flexible during the change process is important for the incoming professional to internalize.
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

For school media personnel:

Based on the survey responses, we make the following recommendations.

• Most preferably, the exiting school media specialist should hold one or more face-to-face meetings in the school media center with the new professional. At that first meeting, the exiting school media specialist should introduce the new professional to important staff and personnel, show the new professional where important documents are and delineate important procedures. At follow-up meetings, discussion should take place about instructional materials, curriculum and the place of the school media center in the culture of the school. If a face-to-face meeting cannot be held, the exiting school media specialist should leave contact information, such as email address or phone number, so the new professional can make contact.

• An exiting SLMS should leave instructional information as well as procedural. This should take the form of prior plan books, schedules and prior calendars, lesson plans, collaborative planning forms, curriculum maps, bibliographies and information about any instructional improvements under consideration or recommended.

• The exiting SLMS should leave carefully labeled and accessible procedural information, such as circulation, budget, and beginning-of-year procedures; prior purchase orders; selection and acceptable use policies; important phone numbers and keys. It is important for the exiting SLMS to leave automation procedures, words and protocols for technology; technology support information and lists/ranges of barcodes.

• In addition, it is important that a core curriculum of information literacy and inquiry skills be developed by local or state agencies that would provide instructional guidelines for new SLMSs, similar to the Resource Guides and Core Curriculum for classroom subject areas in New York State or the new Information Fluency Continuum developed by the New York City School Library System (12).

• University preparation programs need to prepare SLMSs with skills necessary for libraries that may not yet be automated. As well, programs leading to teacher certification for SLMSs need to provide students with those classroom teaching and classroom management skills specific for teaching in school media centers.

For other library professionals:

• Each library or information setting has its own culture, as well as procedural imperatives. The above suggestions should act as a guide for other information professionals as they consider transition mentoring programs.

• Transition mentoring programs should be studied further in a range of library and information settings.

A final comment:

Villani notes that there are four ways that mentors can support new teachers: by providing “emotional support and encouragement”; by “providing information about the daily workings
of the school and the cultural norms of the school community”; by providing information about the cultural diversity of students and their families; and by engaging in peer coaching (13). Transition mentoring programs can use these concepts to develop processes and structures that will be helpful for new library professionals.

Developing an e-mentoring program, an Internet-based program used by 200 novice teachers in Minnesota, might also be an exciting technological solution for transition mentoring programs. This program pairs new teachers with master teachers in the same content areas, grade levels and school settings (14).

A new school media specialist enters a school with some knowledge of the many myriad tasks s/he needs to perform. S/he also enters the school workplace with a vision of how to incorporate his/her skills and knowledge into the school culture with only a vague sense of what that might entail. The exiting school media specialist is a key source who has this knowledge, even though other significant stakeholders may be important. Communication between the outgoing professional and the new one is critical for the transition process. Engaging in transition mentoring, where specific meetings occur and specific documents are left, is one way to ensure that a carefully nurtured professional culture is being transferred.

Notes


5. Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning p 4-5


9. The following sources contain information about mentors in schools:


Navigating Campus Politics:
The Key to Embedding Information Literacy Across-the-Curriculum

by Gail M. Staines, Ph.D.

Abstract: This article provides library professionals with direction on making their information literacy program an integral part of the curricula offered in various academic departments and divisions within their institution by gaining an understanding of maneuvering through campus politics. Stakeholder analysis is explained as a method of identifying those individuals who need to be included in the process and to determine their level of commitment. Negotiation techniques are provided as a means of persuading stakeholders of the importance and necessity of integrating IL instruction throughout an institution.

Introduction

As many library professionals may know (especially library directors and librarians who have the primary responsibility of overseeing information literacy programming on campus), persuading others outside of the library of the importance of a library resource or service can be challenging. Preston makes this very clear: “Changing the curriculum of colleges and universities is political.” (1) For almost two decades, the author has discussed the issue of how to get faculty and administrators to buy-into the value of teaching students how to search for, locate, and analyze information effectively with academic librarians and library administrators. One theme that has emerged through these discussions is the recognition by
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librarians of the need to actively persuade stakeholders to increase the priority of information literacy instruction within curricula and on campus, but a lack of understanding of and/or confidence in communicating this need to those individuals on campus who can assist in making a difference in regards to information literacy instruction has persisted.

In the article “Information Literacy to Information Fluency: Using Strategic Agility to Affect Change,” (2) the author discusses using the “strategic agility” model (3) to create an action plan that enables librarians to change a static instructional program to a vibrant one. The action plan blueprints the steps to making change happen. Some or all segments of the action plan can, and should, be used as a PR tool to share information with others, and also as a document to persuade others of the importance of making this change. The key to effectuating change is not the plan itself, but the ability of librarians and library administrators to use the information gathered about current information literacy (IL) programming to convince those that need convincing (i.e., stakeholders) about the importance of teaching searching and critical thinking skills to students.

As a library professional working in academe, one could continue to employ the “scatter-shot” approach of trying to get stakeholders to see things from your side of the fence in terms of teaching information literacy skills. Using this approach, the information literacy librarian asks every possible faculty member, on a one-on-one basis, to bring their classes into the library for instruction. The library director, also, presents to stakeholders that information literacy is a service that the library offers to faculty – not with a value-added argument – but more of a PR announcement. The hope here is that information literacy instruction will be embedded across-the-curriculum if all, or almost all, faculty bring their classes into the library for instruction thereby assuming that an increase in the number of IL classes results in the acceptance by stakeholders of the importance of IL instruction. Fortunately, there are better methods to obtain stakeholders’ commitment and subsequent positive actions. This is the purpose of this article – to provide IL librarians and library administrators with strategies that will assist in achieving the goal of embedding IL instruction throughout various degree programs. This involves the identification of stakeholders, as well as becoming acquainted with negotiating techniques in order to convey to and convince others of the importance and necessity of integrating information literacy instruction into curricula.

**Stakeholder Analysis**

Mitchell, Agle, and Wood (1997), in one of the most frequently cited articles on the topic, provide an in-depth look at stakeholder analysis. (4) The importance of identifying stakeholders in any process cannot be understated. Your library may have developed the best IL program on earth. However, unless you properly target those individuals who will champion your cause and those who may present challenges to your cause, you may fall short of your goal of creating and implementing a shared vision of IL.

**Identifying Stakeholders**

As Angel (2001) explains, “Participation analysis – or stakeholder analysis as it is sometimes called – seeks to identify all persons, institutions, etc. involved in a project, in addition to the target group and the implementing agency, and speculates on their expected support or opposition to the program.” (5) Figuring out which people on campus should be involved at some level in this process is not difficult. Making a list of departments and other entities within your institution is a good way to begin making a visual map of what areas need to be involved. Here is a sample starter list:
· Library

· Academic Affairs

· Center for Teaching and Learning

· Instructional Technology

· Academic Deans, Department Chairs, faculty in areas of study (e.g.: Humanities, Business, Sciences, Social Sciences, etc.)

Other departments or areas on campus to consider for inclusion are deans of graduate and professional schools (law, medicine, etc.), and those responsible for student orientation and first-year freshmen experience. These are broad areas to consider when targeting stakeholders. Who is included from what departments depends on the vision, mission, and goals of your IL program.

Once you have determined entities on campus that need to be included, go through each department or area to identify key individuals that should be considered as a stakeholder. At this stage, you may need to contact various departments on campus to determine specific individuals responsible for or have an interest in IL. Here is a sample starter list:

· Library – Director, Head of Public Services, Coordinator of Information Literacy

· Academic Affairs – Academic Dean or designee, Head of Curriculum and Instruction, Director of Assessment

· Center for Teaching and Learning – Director, Instructional Designer

· Instructional Technology – Director

· Department chairs or their designees from various disciplines (i.e., Humanities, Business, Sciences, Social Sciences, etc.)

When doing this exercise, consider having a core team of people who are working on this project create the list. This is one method to ensure that perceptions are balanced in regards to both the departments and individuals who are selected for inclusion.

This is one method to get you started. How the end product looks – that is, which departments and individuals are identified as stakeholders – is dependent upon your specific situation. For example, if your institution is in the middle of re-accreditation, identify an individual from the core re-accreditation team as a stakeholder. If you have any doubts at this stage, include everyone who could be considered an important individual in this process. Once you have completed the list-making exercise, pare down the list by including only those individuals who may be very influential – either in a positive or negative way – as these people cannot be ignored. (6)
Analyzing Levels of Interest

Working with your final list of stakeholders, the next stage is to determine what each stakeholder needs and their potential reaction to your project. There is no right- or wrong-way to conduct this part of the process. A search of the "change leadership" literature will provide you with many models to select from. (7) Most models share these tasks in common:

- Predicting each stakeholder’s level of interest
- Determining the level of support needed from each individual
- Predicting the actual level of support you may obtain from each stakeholder
- Listing positive ways to work with each individual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder(s)</th>
<th>Interest Level</th>
<th>Level of Support Needed</th>
<th>Predicted Actual Support</th>
<th>Positive Approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Director</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Humanities Dept.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Academic Affairs</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Technologies Team Leader</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1 Sample Stakeholder Analysis Spreadsheet**

In Figure 1, stakeholders have been identified as individuals that have some level of interest in information literacy. For each stakeholder, estimate the level of interest in your project using a Low-Medium-High (L-M-H) scale. A rank of “low” on this scale indicates that the individual has little or no interest in your program. Those with a rank of “medium” have some level of interest, although it is not a top priority for them. “High” ranking stakeholders are very interested in what you are doing and what you want to do with IL on campus.

Go through the list of stakeholders again. This time indicate the level of support you need from each individual on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 or 2 being little or no support and 5 being full support. Maurer (2005) further refines this scale where a 3 is your need to have someone to go along with your project and a 4 as someone who is not only a project supporter but also will help you out if they are asked. (8)
Work through the process once more, this time guestimating at what level – from 1 to 5 -- each person might actually support your project. Here, 1 is an individual who does not support IL and may actually convey open resistance to what you are trying to accomplish. A 5 is equivalent to “champion” status. Here, you can count on the person not only to fully support your endeavors, but someone who will work on your behalf to persuade others of the importance of your mission. For the rankings in between 1 and 5, a 2 might complain and thus interfere with your goal; a 3 will passively agree with your project; and a 4 will support you. Note that you may not be able to rank how an individual will actually support you. If so, indicate this with a “?” and, through conversation, attempt to discover their level of support. (9)  

It is important to be as honest with your rankings as possible. This may require working through your chart a few times with a group of individuals so that you and your team are confident with the rankings on the final spreadsheet. Where there is real doubt about an individual's level of support, or there is disagreement within your team as to what ranking to apply, do some research to attempt to uncover the level of support from the stakeholder.  

Once you have completed this exercise, look at the rankings for each individual. Where you have a match or a close match (e.g.: Library Director is a 5 on “level of support needed,” and a 5 on ”predicted actual support), you should be confident that this individual will act as indicated. You need to focus your energies on where there is a mismatch (e.g.: Chair of the Humanities Department is a 5 on ”level of support needed,” but a 2 on ”predicted actual support.”) It is here that you will need to use persuasion, diplomacy, and negotiation techniques to obtain the level of support you need from these key individuals.  

**Navigating Politics**  

**Building Relationships**  

Numerous texts share a variety of methods to persuade others to support your project. Getting to Yes by Fisher and Ury (1991) and Getting Past No by Ury (1991) are two of the more popular and useful texts on negotiation. (10) The key to starting and being successful in negotiation is building relationships. Creating and maintaining the “personal connection is imperative,” according to Cindy Hill, Manager of the Library at Sun Microsystems. (11) This advice is echoed by Sandra Hirsh, Information Research Consultant for Hewlett-Packard. “You need to develop good relationships with key people.” (12)  

There are endless ways to build relationships – as informal as talking over coffee to more formal as in departmental discussions. Venturing out of the library and conversing with stakeholders over time and on many different levels strengthens the bond with these individuals. Discussion does not always need to center around information literacy. Take time to get to know the person as a person. Ask them about their current research, hobbies, current events, etc. Additionally, identify for yourself where information literacy may play an important role, such as on a curriculum committee or re-accreditation team. Ask to become an official part of that specific group(s). The library in an organization tends to be a safe haven, frequently reactive instead of proactive, and sometimes insular. “With all the politics that go on and the re-organizations, it is highly detrimental to stay with in the narrow confines of the library.” (13) The goal is to be comfortable working with all types of people at all levels.
Communicating Effectively

Before you work with stakeholders on information literacy programming, and after you have estimated their potential reaction to your proposal, take time to think about what you could say and/or do to persuade individuals to accept, support, and work on making your goal of integrating information literacy a reality. For example, in working with faculty, the Association of College and Research Libraries recommends asking faculty what challenges they face in getting students to write or produce quality research papers and projects. (14) This will open the door to conversation about specific approaches to how librarians and faculty can collaborate to improve students’ projects in terms of information gathering, analysis, and documentation. Then agree to meet within the next week to further discuss and implement at least one strategy.

Using the example with the Chair of the Humanities Department as presented in this paper, consider an informal meeting with the Chair to chat about what their perception is of information literacy and how, ideally, an information literacy program meets the needs of the humanities faculty. (15) This will provide you with the opportunity to share some positive collaborations you may have had with humanities faculty in the past along with an opening to talk about the librarians’ perspective regarding information literacy. Be positive and energetic in explaining that the librarians on campus have drafted a plan or agreed on a plan of how to effectively integrate IL into instruction – a project that librarians are very excited about! Request a short period of time – no more than 20 minutes – to present the plan to the faculty at their next department meeting. By the end of the conversation, you should have a firm date to present your plan to the Humanities Department.

A similar approach can be used in seeking a higher level of support from the Instructional Technologies (IT) Team Leader in the example above. Consider inviting this individual for informal discussion in the library. Give them the opportunity to observe an IL class in session where students and the professor are using technology to learn searching concepts. Having a conversation with the professor immediately after the session will give the IT Team Leader a chance to listen to the professor’s point of view. This initial contact will build communication about IL at a basic level that you can then use to build shared communication about the importance of librarians and IT people working together.

Communication of this type takes time and results are frequently not instantaneous. Maneuvering through campus politics in this way may give you a higher level of actual support – at the 3 or 4 level – rather than a 2. Taking time, having patience, and being flexible will greatly assist you in moving towards your final goal.

Negotiating Techniques

When written on paper, the process of persuading others to support you in your endeavors sounds easy, and, for the most part, you will discover that it is. Reasonable people are open to accepting reasonable arguments. Through your work, you need to establish a sense of urgency about your needs to others. In doing so, persuading your stakeholders to take some immediate action with a deadline will move you closer toward your goal.

In Secrets of Power Negotiating (1995), Dawson presents four different stages of the negotiation process:

- Establishing your goals and objectives
Be very clear and specific about what your goals and objectives are before entering discussion with stakeholders. Know what you and your team consider the ideal information literacy program to be able to explain it succinctly. In this way, you have a tangible goal to work towards. Starting with the ideal allows you to work backwards, giving you room for negotiation should you need this in your conversations with stakeholders.

Determine if the other person(s) want anything, and, if so, what they are seeking in relation to IL. For faculty, it could be improved student papers and projects. For administrators, it could be positive results on grades as determined through assessment. For library administrators, it could be better use of the higher level skills of librarians. Knowing what the other individual(s) need lets you have conversation around items that motivate stakeholders to support your goals.

The final two steps of identifying “pressure points” and searching for compromise may be the most challenging parts in the negotiation process. If, for some reason, the individual(s) you are trying to persuade seem immovable from their position, seek workable alternatives. For example, if the IT Team Leader is not willing to support the IL initiative, move the discussion to other options. If it is a question of who should teach IL – the librarians or the IT staff – explore a compromise around team teaching. If it is a question of staffing or equipment or technical support, know what items in your ideal IL plan that you would be willing to collaborate on with IT. Negotiating and seeking support from others is about creating a win-win situation where the parties walk away with the satisfaction of accomplishing something positive. (17)

**Conclusion**

The purpose of this article was to provide the reader with an understanding of how to maneuver through campus politics in order to achieve the goal of effectively integrating information literacy into curricula offered throughout an institution. Stakeholder analysis was explained as one method to identify individuals on campus that have an interest in IL as well as to predict each individual’s actual level of IL program support. Navigating the campus political environment is a process involving relationship building, effective communication, and applying negotiating techniques.

As Rader (1990) explains, librarians “...exercise leadership through demonstrating commitment to the initiation of IL programs, the promotion of IL through newsletters and annual reports, developing a program of principles, goals and objectives, and developing strategies for the effective evaluation of learning outcomes.” (18) Promoting IL successes via publications, presentations, and word-of-mouth complements efforts to further embed IL productively and successfully into curricula. Such efforts should continue simultaneously along with discussions on improving IL programs. Learning negotiating skills and having the willingness and motivation to use these techniques along with continued public relations about the program gives librarians the complete package to navigate through campus politics effectively.
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Is Open Access the Answer?

The High Price of Scientific, Technical and Medical Journal Subscriptions

By Henrietta Thornton-Verma

Abstract: Since institutions and government funding provide much of the funding for scientific research, some argue that the results should be free in online open access journals. With journal prices rising much faster than budgets and more journals then ever being published, library managers are considering turning to these sources. Traditional publishers argue that their services provide quality lacking in open access. Libraries must decide whether and to what extent they should embrace open access and what role it can play in their service mix.

Introduction

Library managers are well aware by now of the exploding prices of journal subscriptions. Nowhere are these prices growing faster than in the Science, Technology and Medicine (STM) fields. The causes of these increases are a subject of great debate, as are the remedies to be taken.

One extreme example is the Elsevier journal Brain Research. In 1999, an annual subscription would have cost a library $15,203. In 2003, it was $20,000 and the rate for 2006 is $26,607. Though Elsevier is not alone in its high prices, as the biggest publisher of STM journals, it stands out. As of 2004, the company’s prices had increased at three times the rate of the consumer price index over the previous sixteen years (1). The discussion of prices and profits at profit scientific publishers has become heated; in an interview, the former Director of the National Institutes of Health once described Elsevier as “the devil” (2). A recent article in Library Journal describes large academic publishers as “gouging the
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Higher prices have been accompanied by increases in the number of available journals. In 2003, it was estimated that there were about 28,000 STM journals (2), and the number is growing all the time. Between 1986 and 2000, the number of journals in all subjects increased by 62%, or a growth of about 4,000 titles a year (4). Each journal comprises its own monopoly, as journals publish unique articles, and it is the publisher, not the author, who owns the copyright to them. Thus librarians are forced to spend ever increasing proportions of their budgets on these resources, draining funds that would have gone toward books or toward journals in the Humanities and Social Sciences.

There seems to be no good reason for such steep price increases. It cannot be the cost of paper or other production costs, as some publishers maintain; prices for paper based journals outside the sciences and for scholarly books, which involve many of the same production processes, have not increased similarly (4). The editors of the journals and the peer reviewers of the articles are mostly unpaid professors, who undertake this work to further their careers. Neither can the higher prices be attributed to the costs of the research behind the articles. Scientific research is certainly an expensive undertaking, but, at least in this country, the costs are mostly borne by educational institutions and the government. In fact the government (which really means the taxpayer) can pay twice, as public funds are often used by universities to pay for both research and for library subscriptions.

Higher prices seem mainly to be caused by the increasing concentration of publishing in several large companies formed by mergers. In 2003, it was estimated that the three largest scholarly publishing companies: Elsevier, Springer, and Taylor Francis, controlled 60% of the journal market (5). There have been efforts to apply antitrust legislation to the academic publishing market, but these have failed because the Department of Justice is unconvinced by the data (6). Even the practice of bundling has not caused the Justice Department to sue to stop mergers. “Bundling” is the publishing world’s term for “tying,” which is normally a practice frowned upon by antitrust enforcers as anti-competitive. It refers to the practice of selling products only as part of a package, instead of offering them individually. Librarians are familiar with the “big deal”: the library can only get electronic access to popular, core journals as part of a database that also includes titles that they don’t want and may never use. Together, mergers and bundling have caused prices and profits to skyrocket (7). Between 2001 and 2004, According to Hoover’s, Elsevier’s net income went up by 219%, and Kluwers’ by 48.4%.

Of course, commercial publishers argue that their services are not only expensive to provide, but also necessary. As Willinsky (5) points out, they filled a gap, when after World War II, education and research was growing so fast that the publishing arms of scholarly societies could not keep up.

Open Access

So, what’s a library manager to do? Some advocate boycotting these publishers altogether, until their prices are more reasonable. Cancellations have already happened at some large academic libraries, like Cornell University, Duke, and the University of California (8). Librarians are not alone; researchers at the University of California at San Francisco have urged their colleagues throughout the world not to publish with or work as reviewers for Cell Press, an Elsevier imprint, because of the high price of access to their journals. In 2004, the
entire editorial board of Elsevier’s Journal of Algorithms resigned in protest over Elsevier’s prices and began a competing journal with another publisher (9).

But a boycott would be impractical as well as ineffective for most schools, which don’t have the same clout as the larger research universities mentioned above. There is understandable pressure on librarians from faculty to carry core journals in their subjects. Faculty are usually unaware of the costs, as they should be; it is their job to teach students, not to save the library money, and they expect the necessary resources to be in place.

Another option that is gaining increasing popularity is to sidestep and eventually overthrow current practices by creating a parallel market. Proponents advocate doing this using “open access,” also referred to as open content or free content, which generally means making articles free online. Definitions and plans differ in their access policies, but three main ways of creating open access have emerged: creating new journals that are open access from the start; making existing journals open access; or giving authors copyright to their own work and allowing them to self-archive in an open access repository, while the same article is still available for pay from a regular publisher. Proposals for funding differ also. At the moment, working open access plans survive through a combination of government support, private grants, institutional subscriptions, and the controversial author-pays system, whereby authors (or their institutions) pay upon submission of articles. Peter Suber, the Open Access Project Director at the Public Knowledge organization, provides a thorough overview of the movement on his website (10). The open access movement is showing no sign of slowing down, so library managers will soon have to decide whether or not to embrace these sources or remain with traditional print or electronic access. A long term decision should be based not only on costs but also on the likelihood that the chosen system will last. Some sources say that the demise of the print, subscriber-pays system is inevitable, given the ubiquity, popularity and democracy of open electronic access, while others maintain that open access is untenable in the long term and print will win out. A hybrid of the two is inevitable, at least in the beginning while some journals are not yet available through open access. However, some believe that the hybrid model will be permanent as the current system will survive, with a smaller customer base, alongside the open access movement. An analysis of the arguments and motivations of the various stakeholders will clarify the state of the movement and help librarians to decide with which side they should align themselves (and their budgets).

Open Access Proponents

Many organizations have already embraced open access and have been making their articles freely available on the Internet for several years now. These innovators maintain that publisher’s high prices and profits will soon cause the “collapse of scientific communications” (11), and contend that knowledge is a public good, the results of which should not be restricted.

Another argument, more tangible than the “public good” issue, is that research that has been publicly funded should be freely available to the public. This has now become a government recommendation (although they fell short of making it law). In 2004, the House Appropriations Committee recommended that the results of research that was wholly or partially funded by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) should be published without copyright restriction, and archived within six months of publication in the NIH’s open access repository, PubMed Central (PMC) (www.pubmedcentral.gov). The existence of PMC is significant to open access proponents, since the NIH is the world’s largest funder of medical
research (12). PMC began life as a proposal by Harold Varmus, a Nobel Prize winner and the Director of the NIH from 1993-1999. Dr. Varmus’ idea was an archive of mostly unreviewed, unpublished scientific papers (13), but after uproar from publishers and scientific societies, and a period of open discussion by scientists on the NIH website, the proposal was altered before its launch in February 2000. Although the scientists who responded to Varmus’ call for comments by posting to the NIH website favored a repository of preprint articles that had not been peer reviewed, in other words, self published articles, PMC included only peer reviewed material, and would not include a pre-print server. It also allowed publishers and scientific societies a significant role; delays in publication would be allowed at their discretion, and they would control the content (14). PMC currently provides open access to 219 journals, most of which are made free immediately after publication though schedules vary. Publishers are encouraged to provide the entire content of available issues, not just selected articles.

A similarly groundbreaking project is the Public Library of Science (PLoS) (www.plos.org) also founded by Harold Varmus, along with Michael Eisen from the University of California and Pat Brown from Stanford University (15). PLoS differs from PMC in that it publishes its own journals instead of archiving journals from other publishers. Authors maintain the copyright to their work. PLoS currently publishes five peer reviewed journals: PLoS Biology, -Medicine, -Computational Biology, -Genetics, and -Pathogens. PLoS Clinical Trials will be added in 2006 (Public Library of Science Journals, n.d.). The initiative is funded by grants as well as author fees, which PLoS describes as ‘modest’, and which will be waived, no questions asked, if an author cannot afford to pay. PLoS’ founders maintain that, under the system of traditional publishing, authors are charged fees anyway when part of their research grant goes to the library of their institution; if PLoS or other OA repositories charge authors directly it is only a rechannelling of funds (2). Another funding stream for PLOS is institutional memberships. Institutions who are interested in supporting open access can pay for membership, just as they would pay for access to a traditional database, but it is not necessary – free access is open to anyone (Public Library of Science FAQs, n.d.). One of the benefits to an institution that subscribes to PLoS is that its authors will not have to pay fees to publish in a PLoS journal.

There are numerous other, lesser well known open access projects too. Various lists are available (16), and their estimation of the number of OA repositories varies. The Directory of Open Access Repositories (17) maintained by the Universities of Nottingham, in England, and Lund, in Sweden, currently lists 324 repositories worldwide. So far, usage rates for these repositories have been robust, for both authors and readers. Steve Harnad, a proponent of the practice, estimates that about 15 percent of current scholarly articles are self-archived (18). PubMed Central estimates that it has about 30,000 unique users per month (19).

Unsurprisingly, librarians have been vocal supporters of open access from the start, mainly advocating the author-pays model. If open access catches on, libraries would be able to make their subscription budgets go further, or divert money from subscriptions to monographs. The pressure on interlibrary loan and document delivery budgets should also decrease. This is assuming of course that library budgets are not decreased according to the amounts that will be saved using open access, and that libraries will not be expected to pay author publishing fees for faculty at their institutions. Open access particularly helps libraries and in the developing world, who could not otherwise afford to provide current, peer-reviewed material. HINARI (the Health InterNetwork Access to Research Initiative) (www.who.int/hinari/en/) was begun in 2001. Organized by the World Health Organization, it is an alliance of six of the top commercial journal publishers (Blackwell, Elsevier Science,
Harcourt Worldwide STM Group, Springer Verlag (Bertelsmann), John Wiley, and Wolters Kluwer International Health & Science) who have agreed to provide low cost or free online access to the contents of their journals to researchers in developing countries. The prices charged depend on the GNP per capita of the country (20). In an example which must be very common in the developing world, Willinsky describes the library of the Kenya Medical Research Institute, which, until gaining access to the HINARI database, had seen its subscriptions dwindle to only five journals, none of which addressed the Institute's primary research focus, tropical diseases. It must be pointed out, however, that HINARI has not provided access to some countries that could benefit, such as India and China, where the publishers involved already had a substantial customer base (21).

The provision of OA journals to developing countries means that researchers there will have access to the results of research in the developed world, helping them to improve conditions of life in their countries. They will also be better able to contribute to the literature themselves. The barriers to publication they have identified - editorial bias against internationally unknown researchers and the relatively poor quality of many of their papers – go hand in hand (20). Scientists in developing countries will be better equipped to produce internationally publishable work if they have access to leading journals in their field, and after they begin to produce better work, they and their institutions will become better known. They still face another problem, however; to gain research funds, they have to publish. But the work they are doing is often only of local interest, and will not generally attract international funding or readers. Also, by publishing in the major journals that will lead to funding, they are cutting off local access to their findings. One possible solution to this is for publishers to allow developing country researchers to republish their papers in local publications, perhaps in translation and/or in simplified language. This would mean that publishers would have to relax the Inglefinger rule, a publishing convention which prohibits such duplicate publication. This might be possible; John Willinsky, an OA proponent already cited here, has the following note appended to an article in the Public Knowledge Project: “Link is to earlier unedited draft, as HER [Harvard Educational Review] does not grant permission to post the published paper” (22).

Academic librarians might notice an increase in the quality of student work as OA takes off. It has been shown that open access articles are more frequently read, and are 25% more likely to be cited than works that are available only through a subscription (23). We've all noticed that many students prefer to use the Internet, primarily Google, over library databases. Google ranks pages according to how much they are linked to by others. For example, take two scholarly articles. One is available via open access for all to read on the Internet. The other can only be read in print or via a subscription database. Any author who cites the OA paper will provide a link to it in his bibliography, whereas an author citing the for-pay paper will not be able to provide a link. Since Google ranks frequently linked-to pages higher in its results than lesser linked-to ones, the OA paper will be higher in the results than the for-pay paper, and will become even more frequently read and cited. This will increase the impact of the paper, and will have a positive benefit for the author in terms of prestige, and possibly more pay down the road as his work gains audience and prestige. But it also means that students who use Google will be exposed to peer-reviewed, quality information without even realizing it.
Open Access Detractors

The founders of PubMed Central, Public Library of Science, and the numerous other open access initiatives around the world share a common goal: more widespread and faster access to the results of scientific research. However, they have also been accused of having something else in common: being a “proselytizing...host of John the Baptist-like figures” (24) with a zeal bordering on “messianism” (25). It’s not difficult to see why, when Michael Eisen, a co-founder of PLoS has been quoted as calling the current system “insane”, and open access an “obvious common good”. Commenting on PLoS, he maintains that “we are not just another Nature, Science or Cell. We are morally superior and what we are doing is better for the future of science” (2).

Mainly though, critics of open access say that it is both unnecessary and unworkable, calling it “a costly solution in search of a problem” (25). Some go as far as to predict the same consequences as critics of conventional journals: open access will destroy scientific publishing (26). Criticism does not come solely from commercial publishers; far from it. Scholarly societies are very worried about the loss of publishing revenue, which funds many of their activities, though some have access to other sources of revenue (27). They point out that most organizations already put much of their material online for free, and that even if the rest is only available for a fee, people are used to paying for things. Legislation forcing open access to government funded work is premature, they say, because the new model has not been tested (28), and the public funding issue doesn’t stand up to scrutiny. The NIH wants the results of publicly funded research to be publicly available, but should whole articles be available? Or only the part that is publicly funded? As Alice Reich, Director of Publications for the American Physiological Society points out, her tax dollars subsidize farmers as well as research, but no one is giving her free loaves of Wonder Bread (29). Also, open access proponents don’t mention the fact that NIH money that goes to fund PubMed Central is draining research funds (27).

Quality is also an issue. Even though the major OA repositories include only peer reviewed articles, there still seems to be a perception on the part of mainstream publishers that open access means the abandonment of quality. They may have a point; although articles will still have the quality assurance of peer review, the adoption of an author-pays model and accompanying loss of subscription revenue may force some journals to accept articles that may be off topic for the publication (30). The perception of OA journals, and online journals generally, as being of shoddy quality is a real concern for those who need to publish in high-impact, prestige laden publications to gain tenure and research funding. In an ideal world, the prestige of a journal would come from the quality of the articles and not the publisher’s economic model but, at least for now, that is not the case (31). No matter how highly used OA journals are or become, faculty, especially junior faculty, may remain concerned that publishing in a lesser known and less prestigious publication will not bring the rewards they seek. As Frank Gannon, Executive Director of EMBO (the European Molecular Biology Organization) put so bluntly, “Ph.D. students have their career to make and should not be sacrificed on some altar of idealism” (2). Research funders and educational institutions will have to get behind OA to convince faculty that it is acceptable. This will be a slow process, but there has been some positive movement; the Wellcome Trust, the Howard Hughes Medical Institute and the Max Planck Society, all major funders of scientific research, have all either endorsed OA or given permission for use of their grants to cover author fees (2) (15).

Conversely, some critics worry that OA journals, instead of being of poor quality, will be dangerously good; representatives of some scholarly societies say that the increased
availability of professional-level medical information might be harmful to lay readers, who would not necessarily understand what they were reading (32). In his excellent book on OA, Willinsky on page 8, quotes John Jarvis, the Managing Director of Wiley Europe, as saying that increased public access to medical literature will cause “chaos...speak to people in the medical profession, and they will say the last thing they want are people who may have illnesses reading this information, marching into surgeries and asking things” (8).

Despite all these other objections, the greatest derision is saved for the “author-pays” question. These fees will pose yet another obstacle for scientists from developing countries, but also create concerns for their counterparts here. PubMed Central and PLoS appear to run well, but opponents point out that, although these pioneers advocate the author-pays model of OA, this is not how they themselves run their repositories. PLoS, for example, enjoys generous grants – one of its journals, PLoS Biology, was begun with a $9 million grant from the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation. Its author fees are suspiciously low, well below the cost of publishing an article (30). However, this might be a result of one positive aspect of author fees - they can be lower than the cost of publishing an article because authors pay a submission fee whether or not the article is published. Thus the submission fees for rejected articles subsidize the publishing costs of articles that actually make it into the journal. However, scholars are voting against the author-pays system. The STM publisher Springer has “called the bluff of the open access movement” (33) by offering to make any article OA if its author pays a $3,000 fee. No author has taken them up on the offer.

“Open” Already Works

These problems are real, but this does not change the fact that “open” as a concept has already been shown to work. Detractors need only look to the computer programming industry. For some time now, computer programmers have been working for free on programs and then giving the source code away for free as well. The Linux operating system is an example of this “open source” software, which is constantly revised and improved by an army of volunteer programmers worldwide. This model is working very well, and has birthed a for-pay system around it; for example, Red Hat is a company that provides support for companies running Linux. Skeptics, among them Bill Gates, ask whether volunteers will keep a product going long term. However, according to Steven Weber, an open source proponent, questions such as this disregard the addictive nature of creation for programmers. As John Willinsky points out, the same “cool opportunities to create new and exciting functions or do hard things in elegant ways” provided by working with open source software could equally apply to scholarship (8).

What Librarians Can Do

Red Hat, the company that provides support for Linux open source software, describes open source as “inevitable” (34), and open access scholarship is too. The movement has already taken hold, is growing fast and cannot be ignored. Librarians will have to make sure that the author-pays problem is properly taken care of; we must be vigilant in ensuring that our newly-liberated subscriptions budgets are not diverted to author fees. Then we can turn our attention to promoting open access. Peter Suber recognizes that librarians will have an important role in advancing OA, and his website provides a long list of to-do items for us (36). The suggestion that’s easiest to implement is that librarians should alert institutional
faculty in biomedicine about the NIH public-access policy. He also makes suggestions for those willing to go farther:

- Launch an open access institutional archive, with material that is annotated with its metadata. He provides instructions on how to do this, as well as how to help faculty to deposit their work in the archive.

- Publish an OA journal, and help to publicize other such publications, for example by including them in the OPAC.

- Renegotiate electronic subscriptions so that your library can provide free access for walk in patrons, or even consider rejecting current “big deals” altogether.

- Help design OA impact measurements.

- Join SPARC (an OA advocacy group) and the Alliance for Taxpayer Access.

This author would add to Suber’s recommendations the fact that librarians who work at proprietary schools might be at an advantage in setting up OA archives and/or journals. Proprietary schools usually do not provide tenure, and the corresponding lack of pressure on faculty to publish in prestigious publications might make them more willing to try an OA journal. After the journals reputation has been solidified it can begin to solicit or attract authors from outside the institution. Librarians should also work to test the Inglefinger rule just as we have upheld fair use principles by not always asking for permission to use copyrighted materials. We can do this by archiving different versions of published work, perhaps unedited preprints. Our advocacy of open access will help not only our budgets, but also our patrons, ensuring that they will have access to peer reviewed research from the widest range of viewpoints possible.
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Each month I have presented a personal review of a selection of articles appearing in library periodicals over the past six months. Due to the irregular nature of some publications, in some cases I have gone a few months further. No claim is made that these are the best articles, only that they struck me as particularly interesting.

In "What it takes to gain "Mindshare" from the perspective of academic librarians", James P. McGinty describes from an information industry perspective what it takes to get academic librarians to pay attention to products. This is a nice counterpoint to this month's JLAMS article by Dr. Gail Staines, where she describes a process of gaining mindshare from stakeholders for IL efforts. Information Services and Use, Vol. 5, No. ,4 2005, p. 149-162.

In a three page article "Re-Evaluating web evaluation", Greg R. Notess suggests that we reconsider the refrain that we cannot trust web material as opposed to printed materials. He suggests that the attitude may eventually backfire and we will lose credibility. For example, is a page on a professional organization page less trustworthy than an article written by a think tank with a bias? From my point of view we do need an improved approach. From Online Vol 30, No 1, p. 5-47.

Volume 49, No. , 2005 of "the Serials Librarian" includes several articles relating to Open Access (see also the article "Is Open Access the Answer?" by Henrietta Thornton-Verma in this issue). Michael Bugeja and Daniela V. Dimitrova write about the problems of lapsed url's and Maria D.D. Collins writes and introduction to a series of articles on an e'journal workshop, "Discover the Magis of Electronic Journals". It seems as though the main challenge for JLAMS is just keeping things going.

In "Plagiarism: The Technological, Intellectual, and Personal Facets of the Principles of Attribution, Use, and Acknowledgment" Annette Kaltenbaugh describes succinctly, major issues of plagiarism and perhaps most importantly lists five ways to prevent it. This topic, as pointed out by Staines in the previous JLAMS issue, is an important part of Information Literacy. Journal of Information Ethics, Vol 14, No. 2, p. 50-60.

The entire winter 2006 issue of LAMA's Library Administration & Management is devoted to fund raising. Articles cover large college libraries, community college libraries, and public libraries. The article may be helpful both to people not sure if they want to get into fund raising and to those who want to get better. Vol. 20, No. 1.

In "The Face of 21st Century Physical Science Librarianship", Lina Ortega reports on a survey covering US and Canadian librarians that should be of interest to other university subject specialists. Major findings included that there is a lack of information on current and future personnel needs. It also found a serious lack of research and publishing activity. Science & Technology Libraries, Vol. 6, No. , 2005, p. 71-90.

In "Doing the Job without the Job Doing You", Gail K. Dickinson, describes 8 things you can do to lose influence. My favorite was #6, "Impose rules to limit the access of all, rather than work to change the behavior of a few." Library Media Connection, Vol, 24, No. 5, p. 20-22.
In another article related to involving stakeholders, Marla W. McGhee and Barbara A. Jansen, describes how the principal is the most important stakeholder. Library Media Connection, Vol. 24, No. 4, p. 34-35.

In back to back issues, Annette Lamb and Larry Johnson describe blogs and blogging and how they can be used as tools of Library Media specialists. They also present extensive bibliographies. School Library Media Activities Monthly, Vol 22, No. 8, p. 40-43 & Vol. 22, No. 9, p. 40-44.

In "Strengthening Professionals: a chapter-level formative evaluation of the Medical Library Association mentoring initiative" Hnna Kwasik, Pauline O. Fulda, and John P. Ische describe the results of a survey of their South Central chapter. The principal findings were: that the most important mentoring activity was anything improving job performance and that having a mentor improved their professional experience. Respondents wanted more web resources and a formal program. However, it was found that participation levels were somewhat low. Journal of the Medical Library Association, Vol. 94, No. 1, p. 19-29.

In the ongoing discussion about providing on-line reference services, Laura K. Probst, provides some help by describing the services of Penn State University libraries. They divide their services into synchronous (text messaging) and asynchronous (eMail or forms based). And, they consider their web site as a service point. I think this latter orientation forces one to change how we think about online reference. Internet Reference Services Quarterly, Vol. 10, No. 2, p. 43-59.

In "If I Ask, Will They Answer? Evaluating Public Library Reference Service to Gay and Lesbian Youth", Ann Curry, reports on an unobtrusive study asking the same gay and lesbian related question to 20 different information desks. While librarians scored acceptably in terms of confidentiality, but did not score so well in terms of the quality of the interviews and a knowledge of materials. Vol. 45, No. 1, P. 65-75.

Mention should be made of the entire January/February 2006 issue of public libraries, as it is devoted to retention and recruitment. Tracie Hall and Jenifer Grady write about diversity recruitment; Paul Singer and Jeanne Goodrich write about retaining and motivating high-performing employees; and, there is also a report from the PLA Recruitment of Public Librarians Committee on their survey. Three suggestions were made: Fund work experience programs for internships; raise wages; and cut bureaucracy. Respondents also valued the pleasure of helping people and connecting them with information, having an ever-changing job, and knowing that they make a difference. Public Libraries, Vol. 45, No. 1.

In "The Final Hurdle?" Ann Jason Kenney, describes the new Information Literacy Test developed by the Educational Testing Service to measure 21st century information skills. The 'Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Literacy Assessment not only measures a student's knowledge of technology but also seven IL proficiencies. The test is currently undergoing testing itself. School Library Journal, Vol. 52, No. 3, P. 62-64.

In "Question Authority" Glenn DeVoogd describes the process of developing a balanced view of the world and why it is important to question. Librarians can help by introducing children to critical literacy. School Library Journal School Library Journal, Vol. 52, No. 4, p. 48-53.

In "Loosening the Ties that Bind: Academic Librarians and Tenure", Jeanie M. Welch and Frada L. Mozenter argue that only faculty status and tenure guarantee full