Interviewer: Okay. So we'll get started on the questions, just let me say a few things. You have the – I forwarded the questions to you, and I'll probably on several of them come in with a follow-up question depending on – so there might be a few more that are kind of sub-questions if you will.

Interviewee: That's fine.

Interviewer: Part of the same topic. Before we get started, do you have any questions that you want to ask about the interview, or the mechanics, or anything here?

Interviewee: No, I feel comfortable. Go ahead.

Interviewer: Okay. All right, good. We'll launch into this. Just one other comment, my interest here really got started when I was at CORP1 and we actually tried to stimulate innovation; we were not very successful. When I came to the library I actually wrote a few papers for classes on innovation, so this is something I've kinda been tracking for awhile, and it does have the potential possibly of becoming a dissertation topic.

Interviewee: Good for you.

Interviewer: So we'll see how it goes. Anyway, so starting with question number one, this is just kind of a general question for you to just expand on your background, and your experience, and your management philosophy. And I will, when we move to each next question I will mechanically just site the number so it is on the recording, so I know what question we're dealing with. So, okay, just launch in to kind of your general background.

Question 1

Interviewee: Okay, good, sure. It is good that we know each other so you already know a lot of this information. You know that I trained as a musician and taught music for a number of years at a university in Country1. When we came back to the States during the revolution, and had some family changes and so on, I realized that I needed to get a library degree or get a degree where I could work as a professional. So I got my Library Degree in 1989 at BA University, and RA was my first professional job. I came to RA as a music librarian. I worked in that capacity for nine years, and then the last two years I was at RA I was intern AUL for technical and automated services.

From there I went to BB University, and my first post there for about the first year and a half or so was associate university librarian, or associate dean they're called at BB University, for technical services, as well as oversight for the Humanities Libraries at BB, which is a very significant set of responsibilities because those libraries are numerous and large in

scope. Then the last about three and a half years I was the executive associate dean at BB University, and I had oversight for all the operations of the library, except for technology. So the library IT was reported directly to the university librarian.

So I had good operational experience, I think broad understanding of operations, and also a good background in technology. I had worked on a number of grant projects, The Project1 project, when I was at BB University. Of course had done quite a lot of work on metadata and thesaurus building ontologies, and so on during that time and also while I was at RA. So when the job at BC University came open in 2005, I joined BC and have had a great time since I've been here.

Interviewer: Could you comment on how you would characterize your management philosophy?

Interviewee: Yes. I think that varies depending on the situation and sometimes even depending on the individual. There are times when I really need to press on a topic **[management style]**, or press a person individually **[management style]**, or a group. Other times I find that the best thing I can do is kinda sit back **[management style]**. For example, if people really know what they want to do but they just haven't quite put it together, I see my job as being one of asking questions **[management style]** and trying to get them to take that next step. There are other times it is clear to me that people don't have any idea what the direction ought **[uncertainty]** to be, and at that point I give it, whether it is right or wrong, I'll go ahead and say this is what I want you to do.

I think that people respond differently depending on their situations, and it is a mistake to imagine that we could have kinda one rule of thumb that would be effective in all situations. I probably do have more hands on **[management style]** than some people.

Interviewer: Okay. Just one other kind of follow-up as a part of this. This may seem obvious, but this is kind of a bench mark for me. How critical do you think innovation is to the success of the academic library?

Interviewee: Well, I not only think it's critical to the success **[innovation perspective -critical]**, but I think it is critical to the longevity to the library. We really cannot continue to do what we're doing, and do it in the same way. So innovation, that is kind of your next question, what is innovation and so on, but it does talk about change and whether that change is gradual or dramatic I think we have to look at what we're doing, and for the most part I think libraries are looking very carefully at themselves **[self-analysis]**. Doesn't always mean they make decisions to change but they do examine it.

Interviewer:	Okay, all right, good. Let's move on to number two, and this is again looking at your library, how would you characterize the management culture in the library in general as opposed to your specific philosophy?

Question 2

Interviewee:	One of the key distinctions for BC University is that for more than 20 years the previous university librarian was in place at BC, and the senior management at BC has also had a very extended career. So the university librarian was here for 23 years, and her AUL's were here for more than 20 years. One AUL has recently retired and I was able to hire a new AUL, but that was the first new AUL in this library in more than 20 years; which is quite remarkable and I think that it says a lot about what you might expect from the <u>kind of management</u> **[traditionalism]**. <u>Very kind-hearted, but maybe not very critical</u> **[library culture]**, and I don't mean critical in the sense of saying negative things, but thinking differently because they were both part of the success, and part of the lack of success of this library. So things have changed over time.
Interviewer:	Have you, again sort of part of question two, have you seen in your library management strategies that seemed to work for innovation?
Interviewee:	No. I have seen management strategies that <u>hold to status quo</u> **[Innovation – not occurring]**, that result in a kind of excessive processing with no escape. We have very smart people, people who use their analytical qualities not to find results, <u>but to continue the discussion</u> **[group behavior]**.
Interviewer:	All right. Great. Let's move on to number three.
Interviewee:	You can tell me also if I should go more quickly.
Interviewer:	Yeah. I think we're doing fine here and I'll try to sort of regulate it. I may sort of modulate how many follow-ups I come back with.
Interviewee:	Okay.

Question 3

Interviewer:	One of the things that I'm trying to do in my research is to understand sort of classes of libraries. So question number three, BC is similar to other universities, and BC University Library is similar to other university libraries, so when you look at other university libraries that are similar to yours what unique characteristics do you see in your library as opposed to others that are similar?
Interviewee:	Just to kind of answer the general question about BC, we have 6,000 undergraduates and 2,000 graduates. So this university, and the library,

is built more to serve an <u>undergraduate population</u> **[undergraduate emphasis]** than a graduate population. The university was founded in 1764, so the library is very old and the collections are old, but they're <u>not as deep in research</u> **[research emphasis]** as one might expect. I think I'm able to say that having come from RA and BB where both libraries are really significant research libraries.

The collection is quite good. Our special collections are exceptional and I knew that coming here, that was in fact part of the reason I wanted to come to BC. So the other thing that is important, I think, is that the <u>faculty are really more keyed in on teaching</u> **[teaching emphasis]** – I shouldn't say more than research, but they are really a teaching faculty. So the research dollars and so on that are brought into BC are less by comparison, maybe, with other schools of high stature; but teaching is very important at BC, undergraduate teaching.

Interviewer: One of the kinda related questions here is when you – this is sort of a way of doing innovation – when you look at other universities, let's say in your class, do you find that you are able to pull technology, pull processes, from other universities?

Interviewee: Yes. And another thing that is – people might be surprised, and you know a little bit about our technology staff, BC actually has a really good, <u>strong library-technology staff</u> **[technology emphasis]**; and a lot of things that other schools have purchased, such as an on-line reserve system, BC <u>built in-house</u> **[in-house expertise]** and it's really quite a terrific on-line reserves.

We also have just recently built a mechanism that enables us to force a search across the four different consortia, through which we might get ILL. In the past we would allow the user to select either borrow direct, or Person1 or whatever it is, but that seemed kind of senseless; so we actually had the expertise in-house to create an API that would enable this kind of searching. So there has been a lot of, sort of, interesting developments by the technology staff in the library.

Interviewer: Okay. One of the things related to innovation, again sorta part of question three, is you can innovate in lots of different ways, and the so called process innovation I'm looking for if you have had collaborations that have really been profitable, if you will.

Interviewee: Yeah. I think that is another kind of interesting characteristic of BC, especially of the library, and I would say especially before I came that it was very insular. There was a kind of pride, of this – nobody else could possibly understand because BC is so unique and so on. And there was much more in-house, we do it this way nobody else could probably think it this way, or do it this way, and many people didn't go to conferences, it was very surprising.

A good expertise inside, but not much sharing, and not much sort of understanding, and so on. We have begun to – you know we got over Amount1 worth of grants this year and I think it pushes it up. One was a statewide EAD grant for BD you know, documents, and so, and archives. So we're beginning to do collaboration, and you know that we want to work with you and other people on our development of Fedora. So there is kind of a <u>stepping across the boundary</u> **[collabortion – tentative]** that's happening.

Interviewer: Yeah. By the way I did see a very nice website; I saw the library grants, five or six of them that are listed on your website.

Interviewee: And that's huge for BC because there have been many years in which they didn't have any grants. Not because they weren't capable, but they just didn't push themselves out.

Question 4

Interviewer: Okay. Let's move on to number four. Here I don't expect you necessarily to be an expert on innovation, as I mentioned earlier I'm finding it to be a very complex topic, but just wanted to have you say in your own words how you would characterize, or define, innovation.

Interviewee: Well, I made some notes for myself so I may look down a few times, but I mean certainly the word innovation itself tells us about <u>change, something new</u> **[innovation – definition]** , but I think one of the really interesting things in any kind of work environment is that innovation might be <u>minor but really make a huge difference</u> **[innovation impact]**. So it might be a work process, a work flow, that is changed or innovated that makes a big difference on end result, or it might be something quite dramatic at producing a product that at the end says something big, or maybe it doesn't say anything big it might just be a product.

It could be an add-on to what already exist, I guess, or this kind of <u>complete shift in direction</u> **[innovation impact]**, or shift in the road. So those are kind of the thoughts I've had about what innovation means to me.

Question 5

Interviewer: Just emphasizing one of your points that typically when professionals define innovation they're looking for impact. In other words, a lot of people think of it as well, it's a creative idea but it's typically much more than that, it is a creative idea that really has impact. Okay. We'll move on to number five. What I'm looking for here is projects that you have seen either in your library, or other libraries, either historic or current, that you would actually consider to be really innovative.

Interviewee: Really innovative, that might be a problem –

Interviewer: Okay, innovative –

Interviewee: I'm sure if you've already interviewed other people most of us will probably refer to a lot of the same things as far as libraries are concerned especially things like cooperative cataloging, development of ILS systems, open source today, inner-library loans, chivalrous (Shibboleth?) open access, our digital library initiatives and so on, cooperative preservation, there are any number of examples that kind of push the envelope. They may not upset the apple cart entirely **[innovation – incremental]** but they have changed; kind of gradually the way we do things, and the ability to do them better, and sometimes not to have to do them at all. Out-sourcing is a great example of a kind of innovation.

Interviewer: Are there specifics that you can think of? Just to give you an example here I've done just some general searches in library indexes, and if you just do a search on innovation a lot of material, a lot of articles pop up, and so like using chat facilities for references – can you think of any specifics again in your library, or any other libraries, that you would site that seem to stand out? You've given me types of – like our on-line catalog, I guess that's really a specific, people don't think of it very much because it's been with us so long. Any current specifics?

Interviewee: Well, I think standards that are being developed. For example, the grant for the EAD finding aid, teaching those standards then applying them across and so on. Whether you think of that as innovative, the end result is actually quite changed then, otherwise we couldn't get access. The item that I mentioned earlier of creating an API that would send a search across the four different forums of searching.

Another thing we're working on is the use of something that it's a little bit like Zotero, so that we would be able to use HTML documents or just Word documents even, and then create citations and eventually find if those citations are available on-line, and then if they are to embed URL's that would not only be appropriate for our use, but for anybody else's use if they have a subscription to those materials **[innovation – citation linking]**.

Question 6

Interviewer: The standards is really an interesting one because that's innovation with, in many respects, process and people; which in some respects people may think is more difficult than let's say technological innovation. Okay. Let's move on to number six. What I'm really after here – let me give you a little background, when you look at the literature you rarely

	find discussions of innovation failures. Amazing, they're either we haven't had enough time to finish the innovation so it is still going on forever, or if it is maybe a failure it just sort of gradually blends into the background and people forget it. So I'm, here again, looking for if you've seen in your experience innovation, what you would consider an innovation failure? And if you could comment on what you think might have been the barriers, if you will, to that innovation.
Interviewee:	Well, I'm not sure these are the – I have two items, one is a cooperative collection development; now whether you consider that an innovation or not, it's an approach I guess, but for all reasons it sounds like a good idea but it never really worked. So what we've ended up with is a very vigorous inner-library loan and resource sharing system instead. But lots of people continue to try to <u>collaborate in their collection building</u> **[innovation –failure]**, but it generally is not very successful.
Interviewer:	Can I stop you right there? Can you go on with that and just speculate on what the barriers are?
Interviewee:	I can. I think there is the sense of ego, maybe ego is not quite the right word, but maybe image is a better word. When I was at BA, the BA Music Library and the BE Library collected – both of them were collecting almost comprehensively at that time, and they decided to split up the collection of one publisher of CD's and so one library would collect, I've forgotten, maybe classical music and another would collect ethnographical music.
	Then it was so irritating to the BA faculty to be told that we have access to this, but it's at BE. Then they decided they would both buy, and I think there is a lot of that. You know BF is building a new library storage, underground, so that they don't have to send materials away. Twenty-five million dollars to put their collection underground right on campus. It is a pretty remarkable thing. So this <u>sense of ownership</u> **[barrier to innovation]** –
Interviewer:	Yeah, okay. I just wanted to follow-up again on this because it's an institutional barrier I think, is that correct? It's not so much – let's say a professional librarian's issue here as opposed to just the institution, the library, says as a policy we need to own this stuff. Is that correct?
Interviewee:	Yes. And we see that a lot today. I mean, I think, we even see it when we're talking about preservation. Why does preservation not work, this sort of distributed preservation and so on of print copies, why doesn't it work better? BC has a huge off-site storage facility. We're keeping volume after volume of things that everybody else is keeping volume after volume of. That's what I was saying about BF, CRL is twenty minutes away from University of BF and has everything probably that BF wants, but they're putting all their stuff underground anyway.

Interviewer:	This is a really interesting point I think because it's fundamental to not only innovation, but to if I'm able to comment here on just success of academic life. Any other sort of failures if you will –
Interviewee:	I don't think it can be called a failure, but the whole concept of an institutional repository has not been successful, at least as it was initially conceived and so on. I think that most everybody who has an institutional repository and is trying to get faculty to contribute their materials have not had the kind of success that they have anticipated. So all of us are needing to rethink what that repository is and can be. So that's a kind of failed concept, maybe. I think the service overall is not failed, or the idea for providing that kind of service, but dictating how it would be used that perhaps was unexpected.
Interviewer:	Again, just sort of following up on what do you see as the barrier there?
Interviewee:	Yeah, I mean it's not just on the institutional repository but we see the same issues. The whole question of intellectual property rights. NIH **[collaboration – opposition]** today, how's pub med gonna get all those copies that the law is now mandating, but who will give it, and what kind of repercussion will there be if faculty, in fact, don't submit copies.
Interviewer:	I had one person tell me that one of the barriers – this was not in an interview but just in a casual discussion, one of the barriers was the name institutional repository.
Interviewee:	Yeah, right, right.
Interviewer:	If we were to come up with something that was connected to scholarship or had an administrative feeling if you will.
Interviewee:	I don't think it matters. BB called theirs the [university] scholar works, and that didn't help either.

Question 7

Interviewer:	Still didn't help? Yeah. Okay. Let's move on to number seven. Here I'm looking for, and you may have already touched on this a bit, but policies and practices within your library that you feel have either facilitated or have the potential to facilitate innovation.
Interviewee:	I actually think that a lot of this can't be captured in policy or practice, but it maybe goes to mindset **[professionalism]**. So the issue at BC, I think, is not lack of creative thinking, but it was kind of the lack of commitment to reaching outcomes, so the process was so important **[process orientation]**. And it's like who cares about the process if you never get to an end. Not that we need to turn our brains off and just jump

on the solution, but I think that the whole issue of <u>looking for solutions</u> **[problem solving]** rather than looking for or describing problems and there is a big difference between those two.

Interviewer: You're not seeing the focus on really coming up with the solution.

Interviewee: In the past, I think, you know that when I would hear discussions about issues they just went on and on about these are all the problems, and it is like use that same brain to find a solution. Because the brain was clicking the whole time, but it was that mindset that – I don't know if it was we have to live with this, we have to accept this; so what I've done with small groups is like <u>force questions</u> **[management approach – stimulate thinking]**, that they'll put out this stream of this is how things are, this is how they've been. And I'll say why what else could happen? That catches on, I think.

Interviewer: Okay, so that is actually a practice, if you will, it's not a policy, but I would characterize it as a practice that would facilitate innovation.

Interviewee: Yeah, and I think also <u>making sure that people have some time</u> **[management approach]** and maybe some particular solutions. When we worked on this issue of being able to search across all four of those individual ILL options we got together and said this doesn't make sense for users, so let's focus on how we can solve this particular problem, and that was really helpful. It took us about a year of working together, and we kept refining.

Interviewer: Okay. I've got a sense of, if you will, practices just coming back to your comment I think you said that innovation policies were maybe not appropriate or –

Interviewee: Well, it is kind of like can you <u>mandate innovation</u> **[environment]**?

Interviewer: Yeah. I don't know either.

Interviewee: You think so?

Interviewer: Well, I think there might be related things you could do that maybe – it is not really an innovation policy, as such, but has the potential of stimulating a policy that might stimulate innovation. So it probably wouldn't have, if you will, the label of – I mean I think you're right you can't mandate it. Just as an example here what we did at Corp1, which I don't know whether it is a practice or a policy, but we actually took a group of thirty-some people and moved them to a rented facility away from everybody else that was concerned about schedules. So the notion of getting them out of the production environment, again maybe more of a practice than a policy. That by the way didn't seem to work either in our case so –

Interviewee: Oh, interesting.

Interviewer: But those kinds of things. I don't know if I've seen an innovation policy per say, but policies are practices –

Interviewee: One kind of policy, I guess, is if you knew that you always had to improve your production, but you didn't have more people and you didn't have fewer items **[efficiency]**, then that would be a kind of policy, but there's a limit to how much you can force that.

Interviewer: Yeah. We had an interesting approach, again it works in the corporate world and maybe it has a place in academia, but we were looking at the amount of revenue generated from products that were less than three years old. Because we were getting most of our revenue from very old products, and so that gave you a sense of whether you were innovating to get new products that really had impact, impact being revenue. So I've been wondering is there an equivalent kind of indicator, there may be, in academia?

Interviewee: One of the big issues, as you well know, is accountability. So what is the measure of accountability **[measurement]**? And in the academy it is very nebulous.

Question 8

Interviewer: That's why it might not map to well into – okay let's move on to number eight. This is another fascinating area, and you've kinda alluded to it earlier, and that is how do innovations really start? And what I'm looking for here is characteristics of, if you will, innovation behavior by individuals or groups, and there are some interesting buzzwords by the way in the literature. There is one I picked up called creative-deviant; kind of a sense that an innovator is somehow a deviant of some kind or other. Another one is heterogeneous engineer. So, anyway, have you seen evidence of what you would consider innovative behavior?

Interviewee: Well, I think if you – the word deviant or heterogeneous refers to other. So people who are questioning, who are asking **[behavior]**, why does it have to be this way why couldn't it be another way? Of course, one of the things that happens in libraries, or other environments where a lot of the work is repetitive **[environment]**, is that people get into that habit of doing the same thing over and over. And it is both acceptable and also necessary to do some of the same things, but the question is: is there a better way to do it? And how we keep people turned on to that kind of possibility while they still get the work done **[conflict – efficiency vs. ideas]** that has to be done is kind of a question?

Interviewer: Have you thought about ways to do that? Let's say you have people that you perceive as being very creative but they have let's say a repetitive, more or less mechanical job, how do you sustain this creativity?

Interviewee: Well, I think it does kind of – I was going to say that it has to bubble up, it doesn't have to <u>bubble up</u> **[bottom-up]**, I think that's what your point is; is there a way to kind of pull that out and increase it. But one of the interesting things is that there are people throughout our organizations who actually do think about what they're doing beyond where's the next book to either shelve or to catalog or whatever.

So giving them some space in this whole sense of acknowledgement is really important. And making them feel important for what they have – that they've raised the question, even if we've chosen not to pursue their suggestion and so on. If you can create a <u>kind of competition</u> **[environment]**, and I think that competition is healthy, and of course it doesn't exist so nicely in our libraries especially, but I think that kind of competition for who can think of something, <u>who can figure out another way to do this</u> **[creativity]**, or something entirely different that we ought to do, and <u>give them money too not just a pat on the back</u> **[incentives]**.

Interviewer: Yeah. Just on the money, in some of the research I've been reading they say there are correlations with institutions that have lots of money and with institutions that have very little. In other words innovation is sometimes driven by just need. You have to do something, and innovation can also occur where you have lots of money, but it's sort of the middle range where you're sort of comfortable where you are, you don't see the innovation.

I've gotten comments about well you need lots of resources to innovate; I don't think that's true. Let me just follow-up on this. Have you seen innovation in groups? We typically think of it a lot of times individual creativity. Have you seen where it looks like groups are innovating?

Interviewee: Yeah. Actually this kind of group efforts is one of my favorite environments. I mean I'll refer back to the group that together put a plan for this API to search across, and it took everybody's point of view and some people were programmers, some people were circulation folks, other people were reference and so on. So that group effort.

I'm also right now involved in a group effort at BC that is looking at, and it is comprised of people from across the campus, some university IT people, some library people, some people from the BG Institute, and people from our university outreach who, you know, public, I've forgotten the name of the group, but anyway who are kind of formally responsible for BC's publicity and so on. That group is working together to create a presentation of what we're calling the global footprint for BC,

and I think it really does <u>take all of us coming at it from such different directions</u> **[group innovation]**, and that is really fun.

Question 9

Interviewer: Okay. I think we're pretty close to on time here. Let's move on to item nine. It's kind of related to the previous question. A little background here, in our academic and our library environment we have these traditional views that we have the major disciplines; humanity, social science, sciences, we have undergraduates, we have graduates, we have faculty, we have staff, and the question is: are these groups changing? Are new groups appearing in the academic environment? Are there any changes here in, sort of, these classic groupings?

Interviewee: Yeah, well, I think you can find all kinds of responses to this question in the literature. I mean the <u>net generation</u> **[new group]** and so on, the new scholarship, new media scholarship and so on. We actually talk about these things, and sort of write about them, maybe in kind of a more extreme than the reality of them. It seems to me, anyway, that even though we really do want to integrate media into teaching, and digital information and so on, we probably do that less, and do it less effectively, than we kind of project.

Libraries do have a lot of on-line materials, but we still also have so many print resources, and though we describe ourselves in these grand terms I think we're still catching up, and society in general is catching up with the capability that is actually there. So we don't use it as effectively, we still use it in the analog way. It is just a <u>replacement for having a book in your hand</u> **[lack of innovation]**.

Interviewer: Maybe I'm putting words in your mouth, but these classical groupings that I mentioned are still pretty much operational? We still use them?

Interviewee: Yes. At BC there's a lot of interdisciplinary study and work. So the kind of classic divisions between large-scale disciplines does not really exist here. In part because the departments are so small that they can't have the same kind of depth, so they reach across I think, and there is a real <u>tradition of interdisciplinary</u> **[environment]** work here. And we are certainly seeing research data, scientific data coming into the picture so much more, visual images and video and so on. I mean the future is, I think, very much in this kind of on-line images and on-line data.

Question 10

Interviewer: Okay. Let's move on to number ten. So in my reading here I've extracted three quotations. Jesse Shera has written a lot about libraries, and the future of libraries back in the '60s and the '70s, and his quote is directed at roles. The second one [Stoffle] actually is more directed at

organization and is an article written in 1996 addressing organization, and then Martel talks about services. So I open this up for you to comment on however you feel fit on these three quotations.

Interviewee: Well, the first one is something that people have kicked around a lot and it speaks of image, I think, and it reminds me that we're a service organization. And if you think of other service organizations, nurses instead of being a doctor, librarians instead of being an academic or professor. I don't know, I'm not sure that what's written here fail to see the deeper meaning of what they do. I don't know if I would say that –

Interviewer: It's a little off base, maybe?

Interviewee: Right. I don't know. The true profession – relative to what? Is kind of my feeling there.

Interviewer: I think with the profession business he was going a little bit at a comment you made earlier about much of the activity can be mechanical or routine. And if you get buried totally in that you tend to think of yourself maybe like a plumber or something like that. So I think that was kind of what he was getting at and maybe the librarians actually thinking about their roles. Okay, you want to – the second one?

Interviewee: Yeah. I would say there that we're certainly not alone. That many people face this same issue and certainly the academy in general faces it, and if their not facing it they should be. How do we move into the 21st Century and remain relevant?

Interviewer: The specific comment, "every assumption, task, activity, relationship and/or structure has to be challenged."

Interviewee: Well, I don't know. It seems a little strong. I think that this also can lead libraries into a kind of circling around. Again, it is this kind of processing that there is probably not an answer here. If you question too much you make yourself crazy **[profession – introspection]** and you then are no longer productive, or can find any kind of solution because then you question the solution that you thought of. So this needs to be tempered somewhat, I would say.

The whole idea of re-inventing libraries I think is not a wrong idea of re-inventing the space that we have, re-inventing the concept of collections, but the truth is that everything around us is, or should be, re-invented too. When you think about the university, I love it that university administrators can so easily tell libraries how they should be re-invented but what about the university itself **[external environment]**?

Interviewer: Yeah, it probably needs to be re-invented. I have just a process interruption. We'll probably finish up in five minutes. Okay, we were thinking about whether we needed to change the tape or not, I think we can just finish out here. Okay, on Martel's quote, I like the part "service is unthinkable in the 20ᵗʰ Century." Any comments on – I mean the implication is there are services that we haven't thought of, that we need to be creating, thinking, that are going to be quite different.

Interviewee: Well, actually, I read this a little differently. It says "services that were unthinkable in the 20ᵗʰ Century but mandatory in the 21ˢᵗ Century."

Interviewer: Okay.

Interviewee: It will need from its professionals – I mean I think this is the whole question of <u>what skills do librarians need</u> **[skills]** to have? I mean data curation, the ability to work with video, with audio, digital media of all sorts. The ability to think in that way, as well, and to think outside of a building, how are we delivering services and what kind of value are we really adding? And I think that those are legitimate questions but here it talks, at least in my mind, sort of the conduit as much as the content.

Interviewer: Yeah, okay. One of the – just to throw out a quick example, several years ago, you might have been – no you would've have been here, we launched this "E Journal Publishing" platform, and we published three journals but no more. And I think one of the issues is whether E Journal Publishing is too far field, if you will, for an academic library; although we really haven't had that discussion, so this is – there are going to be ideas that you can do which maybe shouldn't be part of the portfolio if you will.

Interviewee: Right.

Interviewer: I don't know if that was necessarily a service that was unthinkable, maybe it was unthinkable in the 20ᵗʰ Century, and maybe it should be a service in the 21ˢᵗ Century. Interesting question. Are there any services that you know that sort of fall in this category of what Martel is saying?

Interviewee: That was previously unthinkable?

Interviewer: Unthinkable, but mandatory in the 21ˢᵗ?

Interviewee: Well, I mean certainly electronic resources. The distribution of things on-line, if you think about on-line reserves alone that's like an incredible service that is so terrific that really we couldn't exist without it. Being able to answer question on-line so that people don't have to come to the library or students being able to check before they come to the library whether a computer is available for them and to be able to reserve that before they come. I mean all kinds of really incredible things.

Question 11

Interviewer: Okay. Let's just wrap up with number eleven here. The general question of where do you see the major threat or threats to the academic library? You've probably seen articles where people say academic library is not going to survive, everything is going to be on-line and you just go to Google, those kinds of comments are out there in various forms. So where do you see the threats?

Interviewee: Well, I think we're <u>our own worst enemy</u> **[internal threat]**. The big threat is ourselves. Especially being unwilling to accept and to sort of <u>project ourselves into new environments</u> **[risk taking]**. I mean this can be very small but also very significant. There was a discussion last spring from the medical students, who were having exams, and they needed more hours to study in the library, and if you can believe this there were a group of librarians who said we shouldn't open the library to these students, and I'm saying what's wrong? You're begging people to come into the library, here's students who want to.

So they were shooting themselves in the foot. We of course got that turned about, but many other areas like – I had a faculty member who wrote to me, and said he needed help with editing a chapter and doing page layout; well that may not be our work, it may be what you're saying, but if he needed that help then we should give it because maybe that leads to something else; so kind of <u>trying new things</u> **[experimentation]**. We don't have to have lifelong commitments, we'd have to sign our lives away that we're always going to edit his chapter, but we try things out.

Interviewer: Yeah. I think that's a very good, if you will, innovation practice. You don't necessarily have to commit the world; you can try something and see how it works. Okay. Any other threats – I mean I think, yeah, ourselves is probably one of –

Interviewee: Yeah, well allowing other people to do what we could do or maybe should do, and it kinda goes along with what I said before, but it is disturbing to me to think how much the university IT organization is in the library, for what **[functional overlap with other campus organizations]**? You know. In some ways why should they manage the clusters that are in the library? We eventually will have nothing to say to students in the library because they only come because they want to be quiet or they want to use the computer **[roles of librarians in the future]**. What is so bad about our helping students use the computer and saying "do you need any help with searching something?" So we should be careful what we're giving away.

Interviewer: Okay. I think we're through. I have two minutes till 3:00 p.m. so we're close to our – I will get this professionally transcribed. Would you be interested in looking at the transcription?

Interviewee: I would. Did you also tape this? The voice transcription, if you have the video that has the voice with it then you don't have to give me a transcription. Thank you.

Interviewer: Thank you again.

[End of Audio]

Duration: 61 minutes