

## **Appendices**

<i>Appendix 1: Project Staff .....</i>	<i>58</i>
<i>Appendix 2: Interview Script.....</i>	<i>61</i>
<i>Appendix 3: Survey Instrument.....</i>	<i>62</i>
<i>Appendix 4: Selected Survey Data Results .....</i>	<i>72</i>
<i>Appendix 5: University Libraries' My Field Prototype: User Feedback.....</i>	<i>80</i>
<i>Appendix 6: Design Event Participants, Agenda, and Discussion.....</i>	<i>88</i>

A Multi-Dimensional Framework for Academic Support:  
A Final Report

## ***Appendix 1: Project Staff***

**Paul Bramscher** is the Web Applications Developer at the University of Minnesota's Digital Library Development Lab. He received a B.A. in Anthropology & History from U of Minnesota (1993) and a B.S. in Computer Science from Metropolitan State University (2000). He is an open source advocate, and a technologist predominantly working with linux, mySQL and Java. Bramscher was the main programmer/architect behind LibData, currently used at several public and private colleges in Minnesota. He is also the author of authentication wrappers between the University of Minnesota enterprise x500 system and the Ex Libris Aleph and MetaLib products.

**John Butler** is the Director of the University of Minnesota Libraries' Digital Library Development Lab, which develops the systems, architecture, and tools enabling integrated access to the digital information resources and services in the university environment. Prior to his current appointment, he directed the Libraries' Distance Learning Development Project, a 4-year program funded by the Bush Foundation to implement a comprehensive array of library services to distance and distributed learners, which produced numerous innovative services including the nationally recognized InfoPoint digital reference service. Earlier in his career he served as Head of the University of Minnesota's Science and Engineering Library and also held positions at the McKinney Engineering Library at the University of Texas at Austin, where he earned his Master's of Library and Information Science. Butler is a frequent presenter on projects and initiatives at regional and national conferences and has authored several articles and chapters related to technology and information services.

**Eric Celeste** is the Associate University Librarian for Information Technology at University of Minnesota (Twin Cities) Libraries where he leads the continuing analysis of how library services and functions should evolve as the Libraries adapt to our digital age. He has responsibility for production systems and projects, activities relating to building the digital library, and relationships with partners around University and in various national forums. Recent projects include web archiving, university blog services, and digitization of poster images. Before coming to the University of Minnesota in 2001, Eric spent ten years with the MIT Libraries where he launched DSpace, a tool for building institutional digital repositories.

**Wendy Lougee** is University Librarian and McKnight Presidential Professor, a position held since 2002. Previously at University of Michigan, she has been significantly involved in digital library development since the early 1990's. Research and publication interests include digital libraries, economics of publishing, and collaborative models. She serves on the Boards of the Research Libraries Group, Digital Library Federation, and Council on Library and Information Resources.

**Cecily Marcus**, Postdoctoral Research Fellow, received her Ph.D. from the Department of Cultural Studies and Comparative Literature at the University of Minnesota.

**Kate McCready** received her BA in English from the University of St. Thomas and her Masters of Library and Information Science from University of WI Milwaukee. She worked at Marquette University as the Funding Information Center Librarian assisting non-profit organizations research funding opportunities. Kate currently works at the University of Minnesota as a reference librarian. She has provided public service through the reference desk, email reference and chat reference. She has also managed databases that create online guides for library users and been interested in digital delivery of information

**Shane Nackerud** is the Web Services Coordinator for the University of Minnesota Libraries, a position he has held for 8 years. Shane manages the University Libraries web presence, including coordinating the content, design, programming, usability, and overall quality control of the University Libraries' Web sites. Shane also manages the "UThink: Blogs at the University Libraries" project, the largest academic blogging site in the United States. Before coming to the U of M, Shane was a librarian at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. In addition to his work at the U of M, Shane also teaches a graduate level course at the College of St. Catherine called "Internet Fundamentals and Design." Shane has a bachelor's degree in history from Augustana College and a Master's in Library Science from Indiana University.

**Laura Purcell-Gates** is currently pursuing her doctorate in Theatre Historiography at the University of Minnesota, with a minor in Feminist Studies. A professional actor and director, she is focusing her research on rehearsal ethnography.

**Karen Steigman** is a PhD candidate in the English Department at the University of Minnesota completing her dissertation entitled "Fictions of Security." She has a BA in English and an MA in Humanities from SUNY-Buffalo. Her research and teaching interests include twentieth century Anglophone literature, postcolonial and global literatures, and critical theory.

**John Troyer** recently finished his Ph.D. in the Program in Comparative Studies in Discourse and Society in the Department of Cultural Studies and Comparative Literature at the University of Minnesota.

**Karen Williams**, Associate University Librarian of Academic Programs, began her appointment at the University of Minnesota in December 2004. In this position, she provides leadership for six departments and several initiatives that address campus needs in the areas of scholarly communication, collection

management, information literacy, archives and special collections, and reference services. Karen previously worked at the University of Arizona Library, serving there since 1983 in a variety of leadership positions, from library instruction to reference to digital library initiatives. Karen currently serves on the Board of Directors of the Association of College and Research Libraries and the ACRL Scholarly Communications Committee. A member of the Information Literacy Immersion faculty since 1999, Karen has taught in six of these 4-1/2 day intensive programs. Karen holds a B.A. in English and Secondary Education from the University of Michigan-Flint, and an A.M.L.S. from the University of Michigan.

## ***Appendix 2: Interview Script***

### I. General questions

- Please describe your current research project or projects.
- When you are doing your research, can you describe what you actually, physically, methodologically do?
- What kinds of challenges do you face as a researcher? What is easy, what is hard about your research process or processes?
- What challenges do you confront that may be specific to your discipline, or to the multiple disciplines in which you operate?
- What kinds of research-related activities require that you spend your own money? What other kinds of financial support do you seek and for what activities?
- If your work is collaborative or interdisciplinary, what special challenges do you face? What are the benefits of interdisciplinary or collaborative methods to your research?

### II. Library/Research Support questions

- What role does the library play in your research? At what stages of your research are you most likely to use library resources? What resources do you generally use?
- What role does technology play in your research (e.g. electronic indexes, digital archives, computers, databases, GIS, etc.)?
- What kind of assistance do you need or seek for your research? Who provides research assistance to you?
- Once you have identified an item that you need/want to see for your research, how quickly do you need to have it in hand? Or how long can you afford to wait? How do you prefer to get it?

### III. Fantasy Research

- Let's say I can give you something that will magically make it better for you to do your work. What does this make it possible for you to do?
- Describe your ideal research environment.

### Appendix 3: Survey Instrument



## SURVEY OF CLA FACULTY AND GRADUATE STUDENTS ABOUT RESEARCH PRACTICES IN THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Please circle the numbers or letters that correspond to the answers closest to your current situation or opinion, or write in the information requested. All individual responses will be confidential.

### PART 1: RESEARCH PRACTICES

Q1. Where do you most often work while conducting research? (*Circle all that apply.*)

- a. Home
- b. Office
- c. Laboratory
- d. University libraries
- e. Specialized archives or collections (non-University)
- f. Other institutions
- g. Other (*Specify*) \_\_\_\_\_

Q2. Which of the following best describes your typical research methodologies? (*Circle all that apply.*)

- a. Archival
- b. Ethnography
- c. Experimental
- d. Field work
- e. Historiography
- f. Linguistic
- g. Oral history
- h. Quantitative
- i. Statistical
- j. Textual analysis
- k. Other (*Specify*) \_\_\_\_\_

Q3. Which of the following types of research materials do you typically use as part of your research? (*Circle all that apply.*)

- a. Published materials
- b. Images and photographs
- c. Data sets/statistics
- d. Audio recordings
- e. Video/film recordings
- f. Interviews
- g. Ephemera
- h. Artifacts
- i. Other (*Specify*) \_\_\_\_\_

Q4. When conducting your research, how important are the following resources for finding information or materials? (*Circle one answer for each item.*)

	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Somewhat Important</u>	<u>Not Very Important</u>	<u>Not At All Important</u>
a. Library catalog	1	2	3	4
b. Library stacks	1	2	3	4
c. Bibliographies/citations	1	2	3	4
e. Online scholarly databases (indexes, online archives, etc.)	1	2	3	4
f. Search engines (Google, etc.)	1	2	3	4
g. Departmental resources or collections	1	2	3	4
i. Other institutions (libraries, museums, universities, etc.)	1	2	3	4
j. Librarian (in person)	1	2	3	4
k. Librarian (online)	1	2	3	4

Q5. For your research, which of the following do you find the most challenging or time consuming? (*Circle one.*)

- 1. Identifying relevant materials/data
- 2. Acquiring access to relevant materials/data once you have identified what you need
- 3. Managing resources that you have identified or acquired
- 4. None of the above

Q6. When finding or acquiring materials for your research, how much of a problem are the following? (*Circle one answer for each item.*)

	<u>Major Problem</u>	<u>Moderate Problem</u>	<u>Minor Problem</u>	<u>No Problem</u>
a. Obscurity of the topic	1	2	3	4
b. Your own physical distance from U of M Libraries	1	2	3	4
c. Confusing organization of U of M libraries	1	2	3	4

d.	Too many sources	1	2	3	4
e.	Too few sources	1	2	3	4
f.	Your own lack of expertise in finding materials	1	2	3	4
g.	Lack of expertise of others in helping you find materials	1	2	3	4
h.	Lack of funds	1	2	3	4

Q7. For a typical research project, how effective are your methods for the following tasks?  
(Circle one answer for each item.)

	<u>Very Effective</u>	<u>Effective</u>	<u>Somewhat Effective</u>	<u>Not Very Effective</u>	
a.	Tracking citations and sources	1	2	3	4
b.	Organizing or storing source materials	1	2	3	4
c.	Organizing or storing notes, drafts, etc.	1	2	3	4
d.	Keeping up with your field	1	2	3	4
e.	Editing	1	2	3	4
f.	Disseminating your research	1	2	3	4

How do you typically share the following types of information? (Check all that apply for each item.)

	<u>Haven't Shared This</u>	<u>Hard Copies</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Phone/FAX</u>	<u>Meetings or Conferences</u>	<u>Website</u>
Q8.	Source materials (articles, documents, objects, data, etc.)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Q9.	Drafts of co-authored works	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Q10.	Ideas	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Q11. If research assistance were available, would you use it for the following tasks? (Circle one response for each item.)

	<u>Yes, for most Projects</u>	<u>Yes, for some Projects</u>	<u>No</u>	
a.	Preparing bibliographies	1	2	3
b.	Acquiring sources or materials	1	2	3
c.	Data collection	1	2	3
d.	Analysis or synthesis of sources	1	2	3
e.	Creating presentations or websites	1	2	3
f.	Editing	1	2	3



g. Indexing	1	2	3
h. General organization of source materials	1	2	3
i. Saving or storage of source materials	1	2	3

Q12. What sources of funding do you typically use for the following research expenses? (*Circle one answer for each item.*)

	<u>Personal Funds</u>	<u>Departmental Funds</u>	<u>Sponsored Funds (Grants, etc.)</u>	<u>Do not Purchase</u>
a. Book purchases	1	2	3	4
b. Article purchases	1	2	3	4
c. Journal subscriptions	1	2	3	4
d. Database subscriptions	1	2	3	4
e. Other source materials	1	2	3	4
f. Travel related to your research	1	2	3	4
g. Technology purchases or upgrades	1	2	3	4
h. Research assistance	1	2	3	4

**PART 2: INTERDISCIPLINARY AND COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH**

Q13. In what ways is your research interdisciplinary? (*Circle all that apply.*)

- a. Your research is not interdisciplinary → **(PLEASE SKIP TO Q15)**
- b. It draws on literature or materials from multiple disciplines
- c. It draws on methods from multiple disciplines
- d. It involves collaboration with colleagues in other disciplines
- e. Other (*Specify*) \_\_\_\_\_

Q14. How does the interdisciplinary nature of your work affect your research needs and practices?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Q15. Do you collaborate with other researchers for any of your research projects?

1. Yes
2. No → **(PLEASE SKIP TO PART 3, Q18)**

Q16. In general, how would you characterize your collaborative working group? (*Circle all that apply.*)

- a. Single colleague
- b. Multiple colleagues within your department
- c. Campus research group
- d. Colleagues at other institutions
- e. Colleagues within your discipline
- f. Colleagues outside your discipline
- g. Other (*Specify*) \_\_\_\_\_

Q17. Which of the following are obstacles or disincentives to working collaboratively? (*Circle all that apply.*)

- a. Distance from colleagues
- b. Distance from resources or libraries
- c. Lack of workspaces for collaborative work
- d. Lack of rewards or incentives
- e. None of the above
- f. Other (*Specify*) \_\_\_\_\_

**PART 3: LIBRARY RESEARCH**

Q18. How important are the University Libraries for the following aspects of your research process? (*Circle one answer for each item.*)

	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Somewhat Important</u>	<u>Not Very Important</u>	<u>Not At All Important</u>
a. The library as a resource for identifying, retrieving, or working with research materials	1	2	3	4
b. The library as a place for research or study	1	2	3	4
c. The library as a collector, purchaser, or subscriber for books, journals, electronic databases, interlibrary loan materials, etc.	1	2	3	4
d. The library as a repository (organizer, archivist, or preservationist) of scholarly resources	1	2	3	4
e. The library as a developer of technology or tools for information access or management	1	2	3	4

Q19. In general, how often do you **physically** visit the University Libraries to do the following? (*Circle one answer for each item.*)

	<u>Daily</u>	<u>Weekly</u>	<u>Monthly</u>	<u>Occasionally</u>	<u>Never</u>
a. Check out or renew books	1	2	3	4	5
b. Browse stacks	1	2	3	4	5
c. Access print journals	1	2	3	4	5
d. Seek research assistance from library staff	1	2	3	4	5
e. Use computers	1	2	3	4	5
f. Study or read	1	2	3	4	5
g. Use archives or special collections	1	2	3	4	5
h. Request materials from another library (not U of M)	1	2	3	4	5

Q20. In general, how often do you visit the University Libraries' **website** to do the following? (*Circle one answer for each item.*)

	<u>Daily</u>	<u>Weekly</u>	<u>Monthly</u>	<u>Occasionally</u>	<u>Never</u>
a. Renew books	1	2	3	4	5
b. Access online indexes	1	2	3	4	5
c. Access online journals	1	2	3	4	5
d. Seek research assistance from library staff	1	2	3	4	5
e. Request materials from another library (Interlibrary Loan)	1	2	3	4	5
f. Request book or photocopy delivery (LUMINA to U)	1	2	3	4	5

Q21. What resources or services do you wish the University Libraries would provide that are currently unavailable?

---



---



---

**PART 4: RESOURCE ORGANIZATION AND ARCHIVING**

Q22. How do you **primarily** manage citations of books or articles? (*Circle one.*)

1. Citation management software (Refworks, Endnote, etc.)
2. Word processing program (Microsoft Word, etc.)
3. Paper-based system (file cards, etc.)

4. Other (Specify)

---

When you acquire the following materials in a physical format, how do you usually store them?  
 (Check all that apply for each item.)

	<b>File or store (on shelf, in cabinet, etc.)</b>	<b>Scan, digitize and save to hard drive, CD, database, website, etc.</b>	<b>Does Not Apply</b>
Q23. Print materials (books, articles, journals, newspapers, maps, etc.)	_____	_____	_____
Q24. Audio/Visual materials (tapes, film, recordings, etc.)	_____	_____	_____
Q25. Artifacts or ephemera	_____	_____	_____

When you acquire the following materials in a digital format, how do you usually store them?  
 (Check all that apply for each item.)

	<b>Create a hard copy</b>	<b>Save to hard drive, CD, database, website, etc.</b>	<b>Does Not Apply</b>
Q26. Text documents (PDF, Word documents, Power Points, etc.)	_____	_____	_____
Q27. Image files (JPEGs, thumbnails, etc.)	_____	_____	_____
Q28. Sound or video recordings	_____	_____	_____
Q29. Information downloaded from a website	_____	_____	_____

Q30. What factors influence your methods of storing physical and digital materials?

---



---

Q31. How would you rate the adequacy of your methods for organizing the following types of materials?  
 (Circle one answer for each item.)

	<b>Very Adequate</b>	<b>Adequate</b>	<b>Somewhat Adequate</b>	<b>Not Very Adequate</b>
a. Physical materials	1	2	3	4
b. Digital materials	1	2	3	4

Q32. It would be helpful to know about any special or unique materials you may have gathered during the course of your work. Do you have a collection of research materials (no matter how small, specialized, or unique) that you feel has value?

1. Yes
2. No → (PLEASE SKIP TO Q38)

Q33. Please **briefly** describe your special or unique research collection:

---



---



---

Q34. How valuable is your special/unique collection to other researchers? (*Circle one.*)

1. Very valuable
2. Somewhat valuable
3. Not very valuable
4. Not at all valuable
5. Don't know

Q35. How accessible is your special/unique collection to other researchers? (*Circle one.*)

1. Very accessible
2. Somewhat accessible
3. Not very accessible
4. Not at all accessible

Q36. Do any of the following obstacles hinder the storing or saving of your special/unique collection?  
(*Circle one answer for each item.*)

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
a. Inadequate funding	1	2
b. Too much material	1	2
c. Diversity of materials	1	2
d. Lack of expertise in cataloging or organizing materials	1	2
e. Rapidly changing technology	1	2
f. Not enough time; you are too busy	1	2
g. Lack of assistance	1	2

Q37. Are there any other obstacles that hinder the storing or saving of your special/unique collection?

1. Yes (*Specify*) \_\_\_\_\_
2. No

Q38. Please **briefly** describe one of your current scholarly/research projects:

---



---

**PART 5: INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION**

Q39. What department are you currently in? (*Circle one.*)

1. African American and African Studies
2. American Studies
3. American Indian Studies
4. Anthropology
5. Asian Languages and Literatures
6. Chicano Studies
7. Classical and Near Eastern Studies
8. Cultural Studies and Comparative Literature
9. English Language and Literature
10. French and Italian
11. Geography
12. German, Scandinavian, and Dutch
13. History
14. Political Science
15. Sociology
16. Spanish and Portuguese Studies

Q40. Which of the following best describes your current position? (*Circle one.*)

1  
Graduate Student

2  
Faculty

3  
Lecturer/Instructor

4  
Visiting Faculty

↓	↓	↓	↓
Do you work as a research assistant? 1. Yes 2. No  What degree are you pursuing? 1. Masters 2. Doctorate  Are you currently in the process of researching or writing your thesis or dissertation? 1. Yes 2. No	Do you currently employ a research assistant? 1. Yes 2. No  Do you have tenure? 1. Yes 2. No	Do you currently employ a research assistant? 1. Yes 2. No	Do you currently employ a research assistant? 1. Yes 2. No

**Thank you very much for your help with the survey.**

*Please return your survey in the enclosed envelope to:*

Minnesota Center for Survey Research

University of Minnesota

2331 University Ave SE, Suite 141

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414

## **Appendix 4: Selected Survey Data Results**

### **Q2. What are your typical research methodologies?**

	Humanities	Area Studies	Social Sciences	Grad Students	Faculty	Total
Textual Analysis	84.4%	64.7%	41.3%	58.4%	59.7%	58.7%
Archival	44.3%	79.4%	60.0%	53.3%	61.0%	55.4%
Historiography	39.2%	58.8%	40.9%	39.2%	46.8%	41.3%
Fieldwork	9.9%	14.7%	34.7%	23.7%	26.0%	24.3%
Quantitative	5.2%	2.9%	33.4%	19.6%	24.7%	21.0%
Ethnography	9.0%	20.6%	24.7%	20.1%	14.3%	18.5%
Statistical	3.3%	0.0%	29.7%	17.4%	19.5%	18.0%
Linguistic	29.7%	5.9%	3.4%	12.3%	16.9%	13.6%
Oral History	2.4%	23.5%	10.0%	8.5%	7.1%	8.1%

### **Q3. What research materials do you typically use in a project?**

	Humanities	Area Studies	Social Sciences	Grad Students	Faculty	Total
Published Materials	99.5%	100.0%	98.1%	99.0%	98.1%	98.8%
Images and Photos	48.1%	58.8%	35.0%	39.7%	45.5%	41.3%
Video/Film Recordings	37.7%	61.8%	12.8%	25.2%	24.7%	25.0%
Audio Recordings	17.5%	23.5%	8.4%	11.9%	15.6%	12.9%

### **Q4. When conducting research, how important are the following resources for finding information or materials?**

	Humanities	Area Studies	Social Sciences	Grad Students	Faculty	Total
Library Catalog	89.1%	87.9%	76.3%	82.3%	80.5%	81.8%
Online Scholarly Databases	81.3%	78.8%	85.7%	86.3%	76.5%	83.7%
Bibliographies/Citations	64.1%	67.7%	63.1%	61.4%	70.5%	63.8%



**Q6. How much of a problem is the following when finding/acquiring research materials?**

	Humanities	Area Studies	Social Sciences	Grad Students	Faculty
Obscurity of Topic	58.7%	81.8%	52.7%	59.5%	48.9%
Lack of Funds	48.3%	54.5%	50.0%	50.2%	48.3%
Too Few Sources	39.7%	48.5%	44.5%	44.1%	39.7%
Lack of Expertise	28.8%	42.4%	25.9%	31.0%	19.8%

**Q7. For a typical research project, how effective are your methods for: tracking citations and sources; organizing and storing source materials, organizing and storing notes and drafts, keeping up with field/s, and disseminating research.**

**METHODS SOMEWHAT/NOT EFFECTIVE FOR:**

	Humanities	Area Studies	Social Sciences	Grad Students	Faculty	Total
Disseminating Research	57.6%	56.3%	55.3%	66.7%	28.8%	56.1%
Keeping up with Field	24.6%	48.5%	48.7%	51.5%	42.9%	49.1%
Organizing or Storing Notes, Drafts, etc.	50.0%	39.4%	44.8%	43.1%	46.1%	43.9%
Organizing or Storing Source Materials	43.1%	42.4%	47.2%	45.9%	46.1%	45.9%

**Q8. How do you typically share source materials?**

	Humanities	Area Studies	Social Sciences	Grad Students	Faculty	Total
a. Email	61.8%	60.6%	70.7%	66.0%	69.1%	66.8%
b. Hard Copies	63.3%	66.7%	56.5%	57.3%	65.8%	59.7%
c. Meetings or Conference	34.3%	33.3%	28.4%	24.1%	49.3%	31.0%
d. Website	9.2%	3.0%	10.1%	9.4%	9.2%	9.3%

**Q9. How do you typically share co-authored works?**

	Humanities	Area Studies	Social Sciences	Grad Students	Faculty	Total
a. Email	43.4%	37.9%	54.2%	42.7%	66.9%	49.3%
b. Hard Copies	29.6%	31.0%	34.6%	29.0%	42.1%	32.5%
c. Meetings or Conferences	18.9%	20.7%	23.4%	18.6%	29.7%	21.6%

**Q10. How do you typically share ideas?**

	Humanities	Area Studies	Social Sciences	Grad Students	Faculty	Total
a. Email	77.1%	78.8%	78.1%	75.7%	82.2%	77.8%
b. Meetings or Conferences	70.2%	69.7%	68.9%	65.1%	81.3%	69.5%
c. Hard Copies	34.6%	33.3%	21.6%	26.7%	28.0%	27.1%
d. Phone/FAX	26.3%	24.2%	23.2%	22.3%	30.0%	24.4%

**Q11. If assistance were available, would you use it for the following: preparing bibliographies, acquiring sources, data collection, analysis/synthesis, creating presentations/websites, editing, indexing, general organization, saving and storing materials?**

	Humanities	Area Studies	Social Sciences	Grad Students	Faculty	Total
a. Acquiring sources	91.4%	100.0%	94.0%	93.3%	93.4%	93.3%
b. Indexing	75.2%	87.1%	71.5%	72.5%	77.0%	73.7%
c. Preparing bibliographies	75.6%	83.9%	71.6%	69.6%	85.0%	72.8%
d. General organization of sources	71.5%	71.0%	71.9%	72.4%	69.8%	71.7%
e. Saving or storage of sources	70.0%	74.2%	74.0%	73.1%	71.0%	72.6%
f. Data collection	54.9%	71.0%	75.1%	65.1%	73.0%	67.2%
g. Analysis or synthesis of sources	47.8%	45.2%	56.5%	54.3%	48.3%	52.6%
h. Creating	61.5%	74.2%	70.0%	67.9%	64.9%	67.1%

presentations or websites						
i. Editing	60.4%	51.6%	60.3%	65.0%	46.3%	59.9%
j. Analysis or synthesis of sources	47.8%	45.2%	56.5%	54.3%	48.3%	52.6%

**Q13. In what ways is your research interdisciplinary?**

	Humanities	Area Studies	Social Sciences	Grad Students	Faculty	Total
Draws on literature from multiple disciplines	88.0%	94.1%	85.4%	85.2%	91.6%	86.9%
Draws on methods from multiple disciplines	56.3%	82.4%	65.2%	61.2%	66.9%	62.8%
Collaboration with colleagues in other disciplines	35.6%	41.2%	36.4%	32.1%	48.1%	36.5%
a. Not interdisciplinary	9.1%	2.9%	10.1%	10.6%	5.8%	9.3%

**Q16. How would you characterize your collaborative working group?**

RESEARCHERS WHO WORK COLLABORATIVELY WORK WITH:

	Humanities	Area Studies	Social Sciences	Grad Students	Faculty	Total
Single colleague	55.7%	40.0%	51.4%	52.0%	52.5%	52.2%
Colleagues at other institutions	52.3%	30.0%	53.1%	37.6%	77.2%	52.2%
Colleagues w/in discipline	52.3%	60.0%	48.0%	41.0%	65.3%	50.0%
Colleagues outside discipline	40.9%	60.0%	37.1%	32.4%	51.5%	39.4%

**Q17. Which of the following are obstacles to working collaboratively: Distance from colleagues; distance from resources/libraries; lack of workspace; lack of rewards/incentives; other?**

**MAJOR OBSTACLES TO WORKING COLLABORATIVELY**

	Humanities	Area Studies	Social Sciences	Grad Students	Faculty	Total
Distance from colleagues	44.2%	20.0%	40.4%	37.6%	46.4%	40.8%
Lack of rewards or incentives	45.3%	40.0%	36.3%	37.1%	43.3%	39.3%
Lack of workspace	25.6%	10.0%	22.2%	26.5%	16.5%	22.8%

**Q18. How important are the ULs for the following aspects of your research process: Resource for finding and retrieving; place for research or study; collector and purchaser; repository/preservation; developer of technology?**

**LIBRARY IS VERY IMPORTANT/IMPORTANT AS:**

	Humanities	Area Studies	Social Sciences	Grad Students	Faculty	Total
Resource for identifying & retrieving	88.7%	76.5%	74.4%	81.7%	75.5%	80.0%
Place for research or study	29.6%	15.2%	22.5%	29.1%	13.1%	24.7%
Collector, purchaser, etc.	93.0%	94.1%	93.7%	95.1%	89.0%	93.4%
Repository, preservation	72.8%	61.8%	59.5%	65.0%	63.9%	64.7%
Developer of technology	48.6%	38.2%	33.2%	38.6%	40.9%	39.3%

**Q19. How often do you visit the University Libraries buildings for the following reasons?**

**DAILY/WEEKLY VISITS TO UL BUILDINGS**

	Humanities	Area Studies	Social Sciences	Grad Students	Faculty	Total
a. Check out	37.3%	41.2%	47.5%	49.7%	25.8%	43.1%

books						
b. Browse stacks	25.1%	17.6%	23.3%	24.7%	20.8%	23.6%
c. Access print journals	28.3%	8.8%	25.3%	27.8%	19.0%	25.4%
d. Seek research assistance	3.3%	2.9%	1.6%	2.7%	1.3%	2.4%
e. Use computers	16.5%	11.8%	13.6%	17.3%	7.1%	14.6%
f. Study or read	24.1%	5.9%	25.2%	29.4%	7.9%	23.5%
g. Use archives & special collections	6.6%	8.8%	8.8%	0.2%	1.3%	0.5%
h. Request ILL	17.1%	8.8%	14.2%	1.2%	2.6%	1.6%

**Q20. How often do you visit the University Libraries website for the following reasons?**

	Humanities	Area Studies	Social Sciences	Grad Students	Faculty	Total
a. Renew books	29.4%	17.6%	27.0%	29.2%	22.1%	27.3%
b. Access online indexes	71.4%	76.5%	83.3%	80.3%	73.6%	78.4%
c. Access online journals	61.8%	58.8%	79.4%	74.5%	63.7%	71.6%
d. Seek research assistance	3.3%	3.0%	1.6%	2.0%	3.3%	2.4%
e. Request ILL	30.6%	20.6%	22.7%	25.2%	26.9%	25.7%

**Q22. How do you primarily manage citations of books and articles?**

	Humanities	Area Studies	Social Sciences	Grad Students	Faculty	Total
Reflows, Endnote, etc.	8.2%	9.4%	36.4%	26.9%	17.1%	24.2%

Word-processing program	76.0%	81.3%	53.5%	62.5%	66.4%	63.6%
Paper-based system	10.1%	3.1%	7.0%	6.9%	10.5%	7.9%

**Q23-24. How do you store the following physical materials?**

		Humanities	Area Studies	Social Sciences	Grad Students	Faculty	Total
File or Store Hard Copies	Print materials	97.1%	100.0%	98.4%	97.8%	98.7%	98.0%
	Audio/Visual materials	57.1%	81.3%	41.3%	45.7%	59.9%	49.5%

		Humanities	Area Studies	Social Sciences	Grad Students	Faculty	Total
Store Digital copies	Print materials	11.0%	6.3%	12.3%	11.8%	10.5%	11.5%
	Audio/Visual materials	20.0%	9.4%	15.5%	16.9%	16.4%	16.8%

**Q26-29. How do you store the following digital materials?**

		Humanities	Area Studies	Social Sciences	Grad Students	Faculty	Total
Make Hard Copy	Digital documents	66.2%	54.8%	57.5%	62.0%	57.4%	60.7%
	Image Files	19.2%	16.7%	13.6%	15.4%	16.9%	15.8%
	Sound/video recordings	13.6%	13.3%	5.4%	7.8%	11.6%	8.8%

		Humanities	Area Studies	Social Sciences	Grad Students	Faculty	Total
Save as Digital File	Digital documents	76.2%	80.6%	80.5%	79.3%	78.1%	78.9%
	Image Files	79.3%	83.3%	78.9%	79.9%	77.7%	79.3%
	Sound/video recordings	49.2%	60.0%	38.7%	45.1%	40.4%	43.9%

**Q34. How valuable do you consider your unique collection to be to other researchers?**

	Humanities	Area Studies	Social Sciences	Grad Students	Faculty	Total
1. Very valuable	9.4%	16.7%	16.8%	15.1%	13.3%	14.4%
2. Somewhat valuable	53.1%	41.7%	47.2%	42.0%	59.0%	49.0%
3. Not very valuable	15.6%	41.7%	20.8%	21.8%	18.1%	20.3%
4. Not at all valuable	3.1%	0.0%	0.8%	2.5%	0.0%	1.5%
5. Don't know	18.8%	0.0%	14.4%	18.5%	9.6%	14.9%

**Q35. How accessible to other researchers is your unique collection?**

	Humanities	Area Studies	Social Sciences	Grad Students	Faculty	Total
1. Very accessible	9.4%	0.0%	4.0%	5.0%	6.1%	5.5%
2. Somewhat accessible	14.1%	0.0%	15.2%	14.3%	13.4%	13.9%
3. Not very accessible	29.7%	36.4%	29.6%	25.2%	36.6%	29.9%
4. Not at all accessible	46.9%	63.6%	51.2%	55.5%	43.9%	50.7%

## ***Appendix 5: University Libraries' My Field Prototype: User Feedback***

### Part I. Feedback Survey - Results

#### **1. Please rank the top five tools (in terms of importance, usefulness; 1 is most important) of My Field:**

##### ***Summary of Important Tools***

###### *Most Important*

- E-journal access
- Annotation tools
- Collector's tools

###### *Very Important*

- Archival research support
- Dial a Discipline
- Email delivery of journal Table of Contents
- Recommendations of related sources
- Tagging capability
- Refworks access
- Saved bookmarks

###### *Important*

- UGoals (project planning tool)
- Communication tools

###### *Less Important*

- Graphic representation of research (visual flowchart of research topics and materials collected)
- Analysis tools
- Copyright assistance

#### **2. What features of an online research environment are most attractive or important to you?**

##### *Summary of Important Features*

- Usable for ongoing research
- Easy to use
- Privacy
- Shareable with select audiences
- Ability to receive recommendations



### **3. How would you use an online research environment:**

All uses are important: collaborative work, multiple projects, works in progress.

### **4. What would make an online research tool most useful for your research?**

- I just really like the idea of being in conversation with others doing similar research; establishing and maintaining an online community would be great.
- Ease of use and interface ability with other software and computer tools.
- Ability to link up with scholars at other institutions but in my field of interest.
- Use after graduation.
- Simpler user interface.
- One that serves as its own mini-database: a place where I can store different kinds of files (Web site links, .pdf articles, Word documents about them). It will really only be useful to me if I can create an account in MyField despite not being a student at Minnesota, but I understand the project will be open to researchers regardless of home institution.
- Archival resources.
- Archival resources updates; ongoing research; organizing data.
- The ability to collect, bookmark, and store my research / links in a central server location would be ideal, and having access to journal contents continually updated as part of that centralized, personalized database would be excellent.
- We need to be trained in this to use it.
- Being able to 'hyperlink' or otherwise create a web of connections between texts of work in progress, pdf files or full-text of articles we're using, images, etc.

### **Please add any other comments:**

- This looks great; extremely useful; wish I had this going through grad school. Especially helpful is having everything organized and not having to replicate work I've already done.
- Giving users control over how research tools are set up and work is very important.
- Great so far.
- I hope my comments about privacy were clear from the meeting. I think it is very important that this site/tool be designed from the perspective of the academic researcher and not the web designer. By that I mean to say that the vast majority of time spent in researching is independent and prone to impossible detours and unusable resources. If there is a shared web space that one could do some of that in, I think that is great, but it would need to be primarily private and secure and secondarily open to the web. My point here is to ask you to think about what type of research you would

like private in your own project and what type you would like to hear feedback on, and set up the site in such a way that it was easy and extremely clear which stuff was in private storage and what went out to the web. I think this will be a great tool and I'm envious of the students who get to use it in what ever format it ends up.

- This site looks so promising. I hope it receives ongoing funding and launches relatively soon!
- Virtual stack browsing.
- Generally a very useful project.
- Consider ways it could become a teaching tool for undergraduates; esp. Honors students.
- Wonderful beta-site; I see a lot of possibilities here.
- Please design interface to work with non-Roman scripts and with diacritical fonts in transliterations; this is a really important issue for many of us.

## Part II. Responses and suggestions from meetings on specific tool features.

### **DISCOVER**

#### *Dial-a-discipline (metasearch tool)*

- Looks great; I'd love to be able to search different databases at once for interdisciplinary research.
- Searching multiple databases at once is crucial.
- Combining databases is great.
- Could you rank resources?
- Doesn't this reflect a traditional way of thinking about information? Is there another way to organize information rather than around subject headings?

#### *Recommender service*

- Information overload. Sometimes I think I get too much information. Sometimes I am inundated with information. I'd have to be able to prioritize and filter things as they come in.
- Notion of "popularity" for resources/recommendations is bad scholarship. I find recommender services unhelpful and obnoxious.
- If we had a WikiRecommends feature (for ranking journals or making recommendations about search engines, etc.) this would have to be signed and named, not anonymous. I'd like to know who is saying what. It would also help build a campus community of scholars interested in that subject.

- Could the Wiki sentence be tagged to the scholar's name who wrote it? And linked with a profile page of that faculty member's publications, areas of interest, etc.? Again to produce some campus community/networks among scholars.

### *News*

- Great feature.
- Is the News tool too overwhelming? I can only keep up with about 5-15 headlines a day; only about 5% of these turn out to be useful; I need a filter feature.
- What about when I have a new project? Can I easily turn off or change my interests?

### *RSS feeds*

- At one meeting, 0 of 9 familiar with RSS.
- Looks like too many steps, maybe have a link directly to articles so I don't have to cut and paste links?
- RSS feeds would be very useful.
- Archival Resources
- Need to keep up with the digitization of manuscripts.
- Need help finding archives; include links to other libraries that have search engines/resource guides.
- It's often clunky to find archives; I'd love to see a better search engine.
- Could we add more search terms and layers?
- Ejournal and Citation Indexes
- I use Ejournal all the time; this is great.
- FindIt tool needs upgrade.
- Citation indexes are great; can they be linked here as well?
- At one meeting, 1 of 9 students familiar with tool; person quit because of difficulty.
- Can't get it to work.
- It would be amazing to IMPORT Refworks to this tool, so that it becomes more a data manager in addition to citation repository. I'd love to be able to have tags in my Refworks.
- Search filters
- Can this be done via sources already found in the bibliography?
- Can we have searches selected for key words and chapter tags?

## **GATHER**

### *“Gathering Tool”*

- Think of this like Flickr for scholars
- “I would use this yesterday”
- Can there be a bibliography reminder?
- Collector’s tool
- I would love to be able to see and share my data and research visually/graphically.
- Organizing my resources is a huge problem. I am constantly shuffling my resources.
- Synchronizing my resources is a huge problem. Can I migrate my older research to this format easily? (i.e. if my work is dispersed over various computers, home and work offices, etc.).
- Can there be a clipboard to take clips from articles to upload and annotate just those pieces?
- Can there be a hyperlink connecting one object to several folders (i.e. in addition to tags)?
- This is a good feature; I keep creating Power Point presentations using the same materials, so the ability to tag my presentations rather than keep storing images would be great.
- 0 of 9 students familiar with Del.icio.us bookmark tool.
- Can there be a “what’s this?” button or pop-up teaching tool for help as I go?
- Can there be a partition feature so that various sections have various access (some private, some shared with only certain participants, some public)?
- There needs to be contact/link information via every page.
- As tool gets deep it needs to be easy to find what page another user is referencing or location of information.
- Storing and organizing feature would be very useful—I can save information but I never know where.

### *Tags*

- Difficulty naming tags—tags themselves become self-serving.
- What if I organize my research according to chapter (i.e. tags are named ‘chp 1’)? Can I later make other tag terms so that I and other scholars can reference what I have there?

## **SHARE**

- More information on publications so I can keep up with journals and university presses.
- Note up-and-coming online journals of scholarly interest. This is where a recommender tool would be great to tell me what journals are important outside my field (and with named recommenders for credibility).
- Note online journals/websites that are not strictly academic but might be useful for publishing.
- A ranking system of important publishers, peer-reviewed journals, explanation for distinctions between university and vanity presses would be helpful for publication; for preparing P&T documentation; etc.
- Power-point server space to store research.
- Copyright assistance feature is excellent.
- Citation indexes and links to people on campus of interest would be great here too.

## Part III: General Comments about My Field Site (arranged by theme):

### **EDUCATION AND TRAINING**

- When you organize data you have to think from the beginning what you want out of it first: Libraries will need to educate users (i.e. go to each department, identify students finishing exams/beginning writing stages, give workshops on tool) so they can begin using tool at the outset of research process.
- Extensive training (i.e. library fellowships for learning tool, implementing and maintaining research there; teaching releases for faculty; training for departmental graduate students to work with faculty as research assistants in order to migrate their work from other formats, or to work with research groups to maintain collaborative tool).
- Better online tutorials for training myself to use it.
- Perhaps collaborative pedagogy to train (i.e. use already-existing research groups to pilot the tool and train each other on its use).
- The humanities doesn't think about data; doesn't understand itself as using data; doesn't know how to manage data. This is a very conservative audience. Using this tool will require a shift in academic culture for humanities scholars.

## **APPEARANCE**

- First page/screen seems very busy and overwhelming; break down information into smaller steps, make more 'child-friendly.'
- I don't like to have to scroll down on the first screen.
- I don't like the My Field metaphor; too hokey.
- Graphics seem okay.

## **PRIVACY**

- As a researcher this feels too open and too shareable.
- Tool should be inverted: PRIMARY is my organization of my work, gathering of my resources, and my access to resources and the web; SECONDARY is what I will share.
- I don't want to be giving my stuff away.
- Recommender service is great (i.e. I use Amazon recommendations all the time) but I want it to be anonymous.
- Research is personal, difficult, part of the creative process; changeable and not ready to be seen by others.

## **SUSTAINABILITY**

- Can I use this after I graduate or leave for another position?
- Looks hard to set up.
- Is there enough space for all my stuff online? Can we trust security of server space?
- How do I know in five years another tool won't come along and make this obsolete? Will my work be compatible or exportable?
- How can I migrate all my stuff already in different format/s to this online environment?
- I'd like to see this tool begin by featuring community collaborations on campus.

## **OTHER FEATURES AND USAGE**

*Can you design:*

- Archival research/resources in other languages.
- Interactive mapping.
- Suggested keywords so there is some sharing of research that makes sense (my tags/keywords don't make sense to someone else; I may want to change my tags as my research progresses).

- “Revise” tool so I can easily change tags, organization, etc. as my research evolves.
- Perhaps use as template for Writing Intensive undergraduate courses; a kind of low-intensity profile for undergrad research papers.
- Separate page/links for courses/materials/syllabi. Undergraduates could access this page as course is taught.
- Virtual Stack Browsing; this seems very appealing.
- Methodology section would be helpful with examples of research methods/types.
- I would love to be able to track my previously checked out books.
- Can there be a link to Word to put documents into Word formats (both for storage of materials and of found resources)?
- Perhaps departments could have collaborative pages of important resources, publishers, research groups on campus, etc.?
- How amenable would this be to non-Roman texts? Diacritical marks in general? Make sure this tool works for other languages.
- It would be nice to freeze the research process; make sure I know where I left off.
- Can we have a save search strategy feature? A way to map our previous search strategies?
- It would be great to have this site foreground tools we already have on campus/at the library.
- It would be great if this tool had a place to highlight search strategies from users (i.e. hidden aspects or tricks people have used to find things via databases or indexes that are not readily obvious).
- A site map would be necessary.

**Appendix 6: Design Event Participants, Agenda, and Discussion**

Design Review Event – Mellon  
 May 11, 2006  
 Andersen Library, 120C  
 University of Minnesota

**Some themes for the day:**

- U of M’s research, prototype development and priorities, functional goals, and feasibility issues
- Social computing for scholars and community intelligence tools -- requirements for success
- Extra-institutional interoperability, identity and authorization challenges
- Component-based tools and flexibility of assembly
- Low barrier tools and user uptake; hybridization with formal tools and systems
- Personal information management: beyond bibliographic data

Agenda

Time	Agenda Topic	Topic Leader/Presenter
8:30AM – 8:50AM	Welcome and introductions Review of the agenda	John Butler and Eric Celeste
8:50AM – 10:00 AM	U of Minnesota’s “Multi-Dimensional Framework for Academic Support” – overview, findings and discussion of the research: From a broader perspective, do these findings and Minnesota’s intended response resonate?	Cecily Marcus and Kate McCready
10:00AM – 10:15AM	Break	
10:15AM – 12:00PM	Presentation and Discussion: Minnesota’s prototype: Overall trajectory = disciple-oriented environment shaped by users, highly collaborative, community intelligence strategies, low barrier information management tools (for individuals, groups, and scholarly communities	Shane Nackerud



	<p>Are we on the right track?                  Are these the right tools?                  Is there potential for cross-institutional collaboration and impact on disciplinary fields? What are the key feasibility challenges?</p>	
12:00PM – 1:30PM	Lunch and continued discussion	
1:30PM – 2:15PM	Design Issue #1: Information collection and management tools with community attributes	Paul Bramscher and Shane Nackerud
2:15PM – 2:25PM	Break	
2:25PM – 3:15PM	Design Issue #2: Cross-institutional tools: interoperability challenges	Paul Bramscher and Shane Nackerud
3:15PM – 3:25PM	Wrap-up and next steps	John Butler and Eric Celeste
3:30PM	Adjourn	

## Mellon Design Event Participants

Paul Bramscher  
 Web Applications Developer, Digital Library Development Lab  
 University of Minnesota Libraries  
 brams006@umn.edu  
 (612) 626-2098

John Butler  
 Director, Digital Library Development Lab  
 University of Minnesota Libraries  
 j-butl@umn.edu  
 (612) 624-4362

Eric Celeste  
 Associate University Librarian for Information Technology

University of Minnesota Libraries  
efc@umn.edu  
(612) 624-4126

Chad Fennell  
Assistant Librarian, Health Sciences  
University of Minnesota Libraries  
fenne035@umn.edu  
(612) 626-4186

Jeremy Frumkin  
The Gray Chair for Innovative Library Services  
Oregon State University  
Jeremy.Frumkin@oregonstate.edu  
(541) 737-9928

Susan Gibbons  
Associate Dean for Public Services & Collection Development  
University of Rochester  
sgibbons@library.rochester.edu  
(585) 275-6320

Wendy Pradt Lougee  
University Librarian/Principal Investigator  
University of Minnesota Libraries  
wlougee@umn.edu  
(612) 624-1807

Cecily Marcus  
Postdoctoral Research Fellow  
University of Minnesota Libraries  
marc0082@umn.edu  
(612) 626-4618

Kate McCready  
Library Project Coordinator/Reference Librarian  
University of Minnesota Libraries  
mccre008@umn.edu  
(612) 626-4357

Shane Nackerud  
Webmaster, Digital Library Development Lab  
University of Minnesota Libraries  
snackeru@umn.edu  
(612) 625-7880

Matt Nutall (tentative)  
Information Technology Specialist  
College of Liberal Arts Office of Information Technology  
University of Minnesota  
nutta003@umn.edu  
(612) 626-0350

Roy Tennant  
User Services Architect  
California Digital Library  
University of California  
roy.tennant@ucop.edu  
(510) 987-0476

Karen Williams  
Associate University Librarian for Academic Programs  
University of Minnesota Libraries  
kaw@umn.edu  
(612) 626-4190

## Design Review Event Reactions/Notes

### **Deployment of Tools and Services:**

- When offering many discrete services, we need to move our users through the tools and services based on a customized "just in time" workflow.
- Research is not a linear process. It is comprised of many, complex paths. What tools can we give researchers to help them with points along their way? A researcher's desktop is very personal and idiosyncratic. They don't want an omnipresence imposed upon them. They don't want to learn new paths.
- The model, as is, is perhaps monolithic in a portal-like way (one-stop idea), but malleable (i.e., I can add and subtract). It might find greater appeal with grad students who are not established in their ways and whose receptors may be more open to packaged service model.
- We need to find ways to insinuate opportunities for using discrete service components into existing workflows (this is the whole point of Dempsey's "Into the Flow" concept). This was referred to as a "dynamic integration of services."
- We need to create tools that operate behind the scenes - not something that requires layers of management to use. How can we integrate our new process - what value are we going to add that you can expect a researcher to go through the learning/adoption curve?
- How to create a discrete service that can communicate with other tools and services. Create something that is customizable for the researcher.

- When selecting tools as priorities for development - find the 20% on the list of development items that will have the 80% return in uptake of usage.
- Identify requirements that scholarly processes bring to information tools--provenance, citation lineage, connection to formal systems, precision in search, more granular authorizations, etc.

**Authentication:**

- Have a sponsor invite someone to go to the site; that person self authorizes; the "sponsor" then says it is ok to let this new person in. People know to expect each other.
- Important Question: How to incorporate tools with authentication? We need standards for authentication. Federated authentication - open document format/xml format.
- How to negotiate needs of extra-University users/collaborators—the global—while addressing the local

**My Field Reactions:**

- Building the overlapping aspects of primitives (discover, gather, create, share) into the environment seamlessly
- Keep the model simple, abstract. "Create complexity only when users are screaming for it."
- Consider design of a global environment with local services.

**Gathering Tool Reactions:**

- Can it bring the metadata along with the item? How to join traditional library metadata and cataloguing standards with folksonmic idiosyncracies
- Organize by projects/themes? need to capture citation data, resource history, provenance.
- Privacy and intellectual property concerns

**Shared File Space/Project Management System:**

- Researchers need shared file space. Lots of folks are doing this, but what services are attached to it that support the researcher?
- need for project management within this system that is simple (no learning curve). Easy to select/invite/include people.

**Tagging/Bookmarking/Social Tools:**

- How can we weight the tags?
- Is there anything to be gained from attaching tags to LCSH? Mapping similar to OVID's interface.
- Libraries should search for middle ground - many similar tags cause too much redundancy w/out judgment. Can we collapse individual (similar) tags?

- Text - does it need tags? Has so many "tags" that can be searched.
- Library-centric - analyze tag description - see what people are adding to make more specific. Start with a query - what the researcher came to search with and then what they walked away with.
- Tags -- may be weak beyond personal uses; have value in "refinding." How to extend/map the use of tags to richer controlled vocabularies? Could the study of query logs aid in the development of a tags-to-vocabulary map? Tagging will only happen at the time of capture. Need to seek research on the efficacy of tagging for discovery purposes.
- We should think very carefully about how to improve the quality of bookmarking and other "2.0" or user-contributed data
- tagging seems more appropriate in cases for which an object doesn't already have a formal record associated with it (typically multimedia) or full-text keyword index. At the same time, A source of information means different things to different audiences & use-contexts, so some redundant tagging (i.e. tagging of things which have already been formally cataloged) doesn't seem entirely wasted effort -- at least theoretically.

**Partnerships for Development:**

- Potential for a partnership with scholarly societies.