

◆ DLS Newsletter ◆

Volume 12, Issue 1

ISSN 1522-1806

Fall 2002

ALA 2003
Midwinter Meeting
Philadelphia
Jan. 24-29, 2003

Fall 2002
Volume 12, Issue 1
Editor: Nancy Burich
© American Library
Association, 2002

DLS Web Page
[http://
caspian.switchinc.
org/~distlearn/](http://caspian.switchinc.org/~distlearn/)

Table of Contents

- Page 1
* Web Notes
* DLS Strategic Plan
- Page 2
* Electronic Reserves
D.G.
- Page 3
* Fiscal D.G.
- Page 4
* QuestionPoint
- Page 5
* E-Research
Companies
* How To Join DLS
* Editor's Note
* Transformational
Learning
Communities
- Page 6
* Bringing Resources
Together
- Page 7
* Media Resources D.G.
* RUSA/MARS D.G.
* Subscribe
OFFCAMP
- Page 8
* Crossing Our Own
Borders

Web Notes

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

*Certificate in Accessible
Information Technology*
[\[http://easi.cc/workshops/
certificate.html\]](http://easi.cc/workshops/certificate.html).

EASI (Equal Access to
Software and Information), in
conjunction with
the University of
Southern Maine,
has developed an
online certificate
program using
distance learning
technologies.
The courses are
offered by
EASI and
cover various aspects of
providing barrier-free access to
electronic information and
resources for students and
professionals with disabilities.

INTERNET SEARCHING

*The Internet Archive Wayback
Machine* [\[http://
web.archive.org\]](http://web.archive.org) allows you to
plug in a URL and get an
archived history of that web
site. The idea is to archive
electronic information that
would otherwise disappear

Complete Planet [\[http://
www.completeplanet.com\]](http://www.completeplanet.com) is an
index of more than 100,000
online databases that contain
information that doesn't get
indexed by search engines..
Search it by keyword or browse
their subject directory.

ONLINE COLLECTIONS

*Digital Library Federation
Public Access Collections*
[\[http://www.hti.umich.edu/
cgi/b/bib/bib-idx?c=dlfcoll\]](http://www.hti.umich.edu/cgi/b/bib/bib-idx?c=dlfcoll)

is a "clearinghouse" that
links to publicly available
collections
(currently 373)
that have been
digitized by
member
institutions.
It's high quality
digital
information
can be
browsed by
collection or
by institution or it can be
searched using their simple
or advanced search tools.

Newspaper Links [\[http://
www.newspaperlinks.com\]](http://www.newspaperlinks.com)
is a newspaper portal
sponsored by the
Newspaper Association of
America. It can link you to
daily or weekly, college,
U.S., Canadian, and
international newspapers.
You can choose to link to
the newspaper home page
or go directly to the section
you want. This is the place
to look for online
newspapers.

—Brian Mikesell, St.
Johns University

DLS Strategic Plan Is Coming

The Strategic Planning
Committee (SPC) of DLS has
been working to develop a
Strategic Plan for the Section.
The purpose of this document
is to help to focus Section
activities and to align them
with those of ACRL. The Plan
outlines six Strategic Initia-
tives, and the actions to
achieve them will involve all
members. If the Plan is
adopted, the charges of all
DLS committees will require
revision. Because of this,
member feedback on the Plan
is essential. The Executive
Committee of DLS is review-
ing the Plan this fall, and a
draft will be distributed to
Section members soon via the
Section Web page and OFF-
CAMP. The Plan will be
presented at Midwinter in
Philadelphia during the Dis-
cussion Group meeting, tenta-
tively set for Monday, Janu-
ary 27, 2003, from 8:30 until
11:00 a.m. Please plan to join
us then to share your
thoughts on this important
document. Otherwise, please
respond to the call for com-
ments posted on the Web and
on OFFCAMP.

--Nancy J. Burich,
Chair of SPC

Electronic Reserves Discussion Group ALA 2002 Annual Conference

The Electronic Reserves Discussion Group met on Sunday morning, June 16, at the ALA Annual Conference. Michele Ostrow, temporary head of the Digital Information Literacy Office at the University of Texas, Austin, presented a description of the e-reserves program she implemented while serving as the Access Services Librarian. The model she decided on could be described as a "faculty self-service" one, meaning faculty would handle their own electronic reserves. The library purchased the Docutek ERes system which has a fax component that converts a faxed document to a PDF document. The library provided the software, the server, the training and tech support, but the idea was for faculty to be converting and mounting the electronic documents themselves. The library chose this model through pure expediency: they only had 1.5 staff to handle e-reserves in a university with 2,000 faculty and 35,000 students. After two semesters of pilot projects, they began marketing their new program heavily. Reasons for success were 1) the library provided many ways for faculty to be trained (one-on-one, sign up classes, seminars for new and experienced faculty, departmental training during faculty meetings, online instructions, and now they are working on an online tutorial), 2) they offered continual customer support by phone or through email, 3) they offered to pick up documents from the offices of frustrated faculty and do it themselves. Overall, faculty very much liked being able to create and mount their own e-readings. They didn't have to come to the library, fill out forms, and wait. They liked the control and the spontaneity they had by being able to do it themselves.

Problems were mostly technical in nature. The fax line became tied up

quickly as more and more faculty participated. Even with tips about how to limit file size and faxing time, faculty would try to fax 50 page articles or give their secretaries stacks of pages to fax. The entire system crashed in the middle of the semester due to a virus that got to the NT server used for Dokutek software. The library admitted it had screwed up and they scrambled to get the system back up. Faculty appreciated the Library's candor and were very understanding. This incident showed the library how much the faculty appreciated the service.

This project has been looked upon as a very successful library effort on campus. While only hosting text documents on their server so far, they are starting to work with the art department (pictures) and are accepting audio files that they are streaming.

Next, Cheryl Truesdell, Assistant Library Director, Indiana University/Purdue University in Fort Wayne, Ind. (IPFW), related her library's experience with a project to convert print reserves into electronic reserves and manage the copyright issues. Their first step was to establish a copyright policy for e-reserves and then apply it to their print reserves collection and determine what needed permission and what didn't. Although Indiana University's (IU) policy specifically recommended against using guidelines that could limit fair use, IUPU decided to base their copyright policy on the CONTU guidelines. They reasoned that they didn't have the staff to do an "item-by-item fair use test" to determine if permission was necessary. They thought it would be easier to take the narrower path and just pay for permissions and they expected to simply pay a flat fee to the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC).

Needless to say, they were soon disillusioned about how simple this was going to be. Their implementation problems were many: there was no such

thing as a flat CCC fee, CCC didn't handle permissions for many items, they couldn't locate copyright owners, some publishers were unwilling to give permission for e-reserve use for any price, faculty argued that they were the copyright owners, faculty wanted them to scan everything including students' textbooks, etc.

After 1½ years, the IPFW Library staff re-assessed their earlier decisions. They felt their chosen process was too time-consuming, too expensive, and was an obstruction to the educational process. IU and Purdue had just formulated new copyright policies, steering away from the CONTU guidelines and back to the laws themselves, and both institutions had excellent copyright law support. The IPFW Library developed a new policy, based on the two new institutional copyright policies, which is more liberal and less restrictive than their old one. They also made the faculty responsible for determining what required permission (with the Library having the final say), and for obtaining and paying for copyright permissions.

--Susan Davis, Gallaudet University

“Bridging the Gap for Distance Learners” ACRL Fiscal Discussion Group

The ACRL Fiscal Discussion Group met on Sunday June 16, 2002, at the George World Congress Center. **Gale S. Etschmaier**, Assistant University Librarian for Public Services at George Washington University (GWU)’s Gelman Library, and **Robert Morrison**, Coordinator of Distance Education Library Services at Utah State University, both shared their experiences in providing traditional and fee-based document delivery services to distance learners.

Etschmaier shared some background on distance education at GWU, which started in 1994 with 10 off-campus sites in Virginia and Maryland with approximately 130 students in the surrounding metropolitan area. Today, there are off-campus centers in eight locations in Virginia, three in Washington, D.C., and two in Maryland. These centers serve around 3,118 part-time and 503 full-time distance students for a total of 2,095 FTE. As is common at many colleges and universities, library services were not planned when establishing the distance learning programs, with the exception of the Virginia Campus in Ashburn, established in 1991, which had its own library and served approximately 300 FTE Executive Program students. GWU already had a fee-based service in place for non-university library users, yet had no real services for distance learners.

A pilot program was planned for Fall 2001 at GWU, which would include document delivery, bibliographic instruction, and reference services. Funding was allocated for six months for one part-time paraprofessional and one part-time librarian, using a partnership of traditional library services providers as well as fee-based service. During the pilot, twelve instructional sessions were transmitted to remote areas. Handouts, a web site, and electronic forms were needed and developed. The library saw a dramatic

97% increase in email reference; however, virtual reference served both on-campus as well as distance learners. Interlibrary loan (ILL) and document delivery were the services least in demand, however, with a total of 100 items (82 articles and 18 books) obtained through ILL, and 47 items (36 articles and 11 books) provided via document delivery. This outcome was surprising since on-campus document delivery is an important service averaging 22 articles and 5 books per student per semester. This may be due in part to changes in the way faculty are teaching now, as electronic sources become more available and are emphasized. Document delivery for distance learners is likely not the market opportunity GWU anticipated for their fee-based service.

Rob Morrison from Utah State University Libraries (USU) noted that as a land-grant institution, USU has been providing distance education for over 100 years! USU has nine branch campuses. Students are not charged directly by the Libraries for services such as document delivery, but they do pay student fees that cover such services. Use of these services is tracked by course—students must indicate the course for which the service is being provided. However, this funding model is complex and challenging; for example, should services be funded per student, or per document? USU follows the ACRL Guidelines for Distance Learning Library Services, providing reference services and instruction, as well as document delivery. At this point, approximately 20-25% of USU students are off-campus, and this past year, 70% of distance learning services provided were for students enrolled in USU’s prison program. Electronic resources are emphasized

for off-campus students.

Some common themes arose during both presentations, such as the problem of how to define distance learners and the convenience of toll-free library phone numbers. Both presentations were thought-provoking as well as reassuring to attendees—all libraries face similar challenges and can learn from each other when planning traditional and fee-based services for distance learners. Gale S. Etschmaier of GWU may be reached at gale@gwu.edu. Rob Morrison of USU may be reached at robmor@cc.usu.edu.

--Cindy Kristof, Kent State University

Transformational Learning Communities

(Continued from page 5)

year initiatives, writing programs, minor study, major study, and graduate school programs. Additionally, specific learning community examples were presented and discussed at length. And throughout the session, the issue of information literacy was tied to the idea/implementation of learning communities.

--Melinda Dermody, St. Cloud State University

QuestionPoint: A Beta Testing Experience

One reason I came to City University in early 2001 was because I knew that our programs would be perfectly served by the new types of reference services being developed for delivery over the web. I was interested in watching our library grow as technology developed and new things became possible.

City U, based in Bellevue, WA, near Seattle, is a non-profit, non-traditional school that has always had as its mission to take education wherever people need it. We have teaching locations in 10 other cities in Washington, British Columbia, and Alberta, as well as programs in Slovakia, Bulgaria, Greece, and China. We also offer one-on-one distance learning, both online and by correspondence. Our students and faculty are literally all over the world. This patron base fascinated me. We already had a full suite of remote services in place, but I knew that we would need to use the new online delivery methods to keep pace with service expectations.

Because of my involvement with the Virtual Reference Service (VRS) Project, an LSTA-funded initiative sponsored by the Washington State Library, we had the opportunity to try the beta test of OCLC's virtual reference software. At the time we first saw it, it didn't even have a name. It has since been christened QuestionPoint (QP). QP has two modes—web form and chat. The original chat mode was very, well, *beta*. It has undergone improvements, but is still intended to provide only basic chat functionality and the ability to “push” web pages to the patron. This fall, QP will begin offering an enhanced chat mode, which requires installation of a plug-in on the patron's PC but offers richer features.

Both the web form and chat feed into the QP software, which is hosted on OCLC's computers. You don't need server space or expertise in server hosting—you just need to be able to get the forms onto your web page, and the rest is accessed over the web. You log in to the QP website to chat or to check on and answer web-form questions. Web-form responses are delivered by e-mail to the patron. The web-based model was a great benefit to us, since we have 4 library locations in 4 different Washington cities, all of whom could use the program with no installation of software necessary. Librarians could also access from home or anywhere else they have a web connection.

We found implementation easy. Our staff received online training in both modes. The interfaces are quite intuitive, so the learning curve is short. Many institutions have found that setting up the account profile, part of which is based on the ARL conspectus, was the most time-consuming task. We have a small collection in a limited number of disciplines, so found this less onerous.

Both the web form and the chat interface are provided to you as HTML code files. If you desire, the only thing that needs to be done with this file before mounting it is entering your institution code, so that the QP software knows which library a patron is contacting. On the other hand, considerable customization is an option. Add or delete required fields in the form, brand with your library logo—just about anything's possible if you have the knowledge on staff to do it. You can see our very basic form at <http://library.cityu.edu/questionpoint/questionform.htm>

We are using only the web form at this time, partly because we are waiting for the arrival of the slicker, enhanced version, and partly because we are not quite ready to implement chat yet, though we expect to get there in early 2003. Meanwhile, we are taking some

time to look at how we believe it will affect workflow and staffing patterns.

I have not mentioned here other benefits of QP—global question routing and the knowledge base. Routing allows you to send a question that your collection can't answer to another library. The knowledge base will be an archive of previously-answered questions or chat transcripts, with personally-identifiable information stripped to preserve patron confidentiality.

Though it is still a young product, we have seen many improvements in QP in the last few months, all in response to librarians' suggestions. My great hope for QP is that it will do for reference what OCLC's efforts did for ILL, and that it will be a strong tool in allowing libraries to stay visible and relevant to their ever-more-ethereal patron bases, all at a reasonable price. I believe strongly in OCLC's model—a non-profit run by and for member libraries. The pricing structure of QP reflects this—we will pay less than \$4000 this year for both modes, while getting started with one of the other chat softwares could have cost us \$25,000.

QP was rolled out at ALA in Atlanta and is gaining ground, with around 100 institutions now using it in several different countries, including Canada, the UK, Australia, and Hong Kong. There is strength in numbers in a cooperative system, and I look forward to seeing the product grow and mature. For more information, go to QP's homepage, <http://www.questionpoint.org/>.

--Verla J. Peterson (City University)

“E-Research Companies: Value Added or Virtually Redundant”

This year’s panelists for the ACRL Distance Learning Section program, offered in conjunction with the Community and Junior College Libraries Section, brought insight to the topic, “E-Research Companies: Value Added or Virtually Redundant?” Keynote speaker, James Neal, Vice President for Information Services and University Librarian, Columbia University, called for the development of electronic research tools with wide-ranging functionality and digital collections with interactive capability to meet today’s library users’ expectations. Neal asserted that e-research companies’ current products lack the sophisticated query language and richness of content to meet students’ research needs. The academic library community, according to Neal, is better suited to develop high-quality integrated research services and collections. Yet Neal challenged librarians to create internal and external partnerships with other information leaders and adopt more entrepreneurial business initiatives to achieve their goals.

Troy Williams, founder and CEO, Questia Media, maintained that he was motivated by his own blue-collar upbringing to provide students in resource-poor community colleges, rural areas, and global markets with a high-quality library collection. Williams noted that students value most the functionality, not the content of his product. He markets directly to students willing to pay \$20/month for his product. Williams is pursuing global markets where he envisions the Questia product bundled with required textbooks.

Morris Shephard, Chief Marketing Officer, Knowledge Ventures and retired teacher described his development strategy: to produce non-frustrating research tools that keep students interested at

teachable moments, and enable teachers to retrieve sources quickly, thus attaining credibility with their students. Shephard promoted emerging partnerships between libraries and knowledge industries, while blasting textbook publishers as wrong-headed old losers.

Susan Swords Steffen, Director, A.C. Buehler Library, Elmhurst College, reported on a pilot project with Questia at her library. Students who used Questia were disappointed with their search results, but they were unaware of the superior database products available to them via proxy campus-wide. Steffen implored librarians to market their services more effectively, and take a proactive role with vendors to make library database products more accessible and convenient to use.

-- Claudia Shorr, Gwinnett University

How to Join DLS

To join the Distance Learning Section, contact:
Membership Services
ACRL
50 Huron Street,
Chicago, Illinois 60611
1-800-545-2433 ext. 2521
email: acrl@ala.org

Editor’s Note

This *Newsletter* is available on the DLS Web site. Minutes of committee meetings and Strategic Planning documents also appear there.

Please submit corrections to the editor at nburich@ku.edu.

Transformational Learning Communities

Keynote Speaker: Barbara Leigh Smith. **Panel:** Theresa S. Byrd, Randy Burke Hensley, Joan K. Lippincott.

The ACRL President’s Program addressed and discussed “Learning Communities,” defined as “any of a variety of curricular structures that link together several existing courses – or actually restructure the curricular material entirely – so that students have opportunities for deeper understanding and integration of the material they are learning, and more interaction with one another and their teachers as fellow participants in the learning enterprise.” The keynote speaker began by discussing the fact that there are a variety of approaches that link classes together with existing themes and how this type of scenario works well for learning communities.

Important elements of these learning environments include intellectual coherence, active learning, collaboration (between faculty members and also between students) teamwork and shared knowledge. Learning communities work best when tied to large institutional goals. Also discussed were the needs that learning communities address. These needs include intellectual interaction, curricular coherence, issues with cross subject matter boundaries, move to a more learning-centered environment, active and collaborative learning, diverse perspectives, student retention and faculty development.

Finally, the session discussed how learning communities are often found in such areas as developmental studies, freshman

(Continued on page 3)

Bringing Resources Together: The Digital Library Meets Google! RUSA/MARS Program

Library users are accustomed to the flexibility of Google searching, which provides results in various formats--Word documents, PowerPoint slides, .Pdf, digital images, etc.—in a single result list from an easy-to-use interface. The speakers at this presentation explored the advantages and drawbacks of super-discovery, “Google-like” tools which act as gateways to a library’s multiple databases, web sites and OPACs. They discussed how these tools work, how well they are able to interpret the mix of results, and whether they simplify the research environment.

Roy Tennant, California Digital Library: “The Search for the Holy Grail: Why One-Stop Searching is Both *Essential* and *Hopeless*” (<http://escholarship.cdlib.org/rtennant/presentations/2002ala/mars/>). This keynote presentation gave thoughtful consideration to issues surrounding one-stop searching, and began by stating that “most users do not care where the information they need comes from, or who provides it (remember, only librarians like to search...). Nor should they have to. But our systems presently require them to know these things. How can we create systems that minimize what the user needs to know to get what they want?” Web metasearch engines, which search both a database of web sites and a database of select journal articles, provide the kind of one-stop search product that would increase ease of use. Examples of one-stop searching include the ARL Scholar’s Portal Project (see <http://www.arl.org/access/scholarsportal/>), Searchlight (see <http://searchlight.cdlib.org/cgi-bin/searchlight>), Northern Light @ Search Digital Librarian (a prototype from the University of California).

Bob Gerrity and Theresa Lyman, Boston College Libraries: “Enhancing

Resource Discovery and Access: MetaLib & SFX at the Boston College Libraries” (http://www2.bc.edu/~gerrityr/ala/ALArusa_files/frame.htm). The answer to the question “Why another interface?” is that the rapid growth of e-collections seems to require another search mechanism that can search cross-platform. Despite the huge investment made in them, e-collections are probably underutilized because access to them can be confusing to users (and staff). That being the case, re-examination of access and delivery mechanisms is warranted. Gerrity and Lyman acknowledged the need to make collections more accessible, to tie resources together, and to incorporate librarian input and expertise into the organization and delivery of electronic resources to users. Boston College Libraries created a Digital Resources position in reference to address these issues and MetaQuest grew from that organization. MetaQuest allows management and searching across multiple databases and library catalogs simultaneously to find articles, books, manuscripts, newspapers and much more. It can also create a personalized list of resources called “My Resource List”, and save, -mail, and download search results.

Surveys of users of MetaLib found it “Google-like” and they appreciated the ability to do quick searches and save time, though some felt that search options were limited. The speakers concluded that SFX and MetaLib are what users want in a “Google-like” world. The MetaQuest interface can be accessed at <http://metaquest.bc.edu/>. There is a guest sign in.

Jennifer Lucas, Meg Rheingold, and Jed Moffitt, King County Library System (KCLS): “Cool Web Tool: One Interface, Many Databases.” WebFeat was implemented in November 2000 in

the King County Library System (KCLS), a network of 42 libraries in the Puget Sound region serving 1.5 million people. KCLS wanted to create a simple way for patrons to get information. Statistics showed that 66.7% of the community had library cards; 98% used KCLS reference services, but 68.2% had no idea that there were databases or what they were. WebFeat was chosen because it is customizable and provided a seamless searching experience, a “prism” that searches web databases, OPACs and other information tools simultaneously with one interface. KCLS’ WebFeat currently searches more than 60 databases. A usability study conducted with 14 people indicated general satisfaction but also initiated some redesign to better meet patron needs.

Web link for the presentation: “Bringing Resources Together: The Digital Library Meets Google: A Selected Bibliography”: <http://www.ala.org/rusa/mars/brtbib.html>.

--Teresa Ashley, Austin Community College

Usability Testing: Doing It Cheap, Doing It Right, Doing It Yourself

This program was sponsored by the Local Systems and Services Committee, Machine-Assisted Reference Section, RUSA. Speakers included Teal Anderson, Johns Hopkins University; Martin Courtois, George Washington University; Mary (Molly) P. Freier, Carleton College. Web link: <http://www.ala.org/rusa/mars/usability.html>.

Overview: The three speakers discussed the principles and techniques of usability testing, emphasizing how testing can be done locally and inexpensively. The library home page is the portal through which distance learners become acquainted with library services and learn to access resources.

Teal Anderson presented an overview of usability, defined as (1) a measurable characteristic, involving ease of learning, ease of use, subjective satisfaction, and effectiveness of use, and as (2) a practice, with a focus on users and their needs, and observation of users interacting with the site. Usability testing as a practice involves looking at the site from the users' perspectives. Usability testing should be included at all stages of design and is a process that is repeated. Anderson listed several evaluation methods: (1) heuristic, cognitive walkthrough, (2) sorting and naming tests, (3) focus groups, interviews, surveys, (4) naturalistic observation, and (5) think-aloud, scenario-based tests, and described the strengths of each. She then presented the P Model, which, with "usability testing" as its center, relates People, Paraphernalia, Place and Paperwork at its axes. In addition to participants representative of the website's user groups or audience, a facilitator and observer are needed.

Doing It Cheap: The data recording method selected determines the cost. Pen/paper is the cheapest method and is an effective one.

Constructing Tests: The most important part of conducting effective

tests is dealing with participants. It is important to think of people as "participants" rather than as "subjects." Participants should feel free to ask questions at any time, and should have information for contacting staff after testing is completed. Use two researchers for testing: one as a facilitator, and the other as recorder. Testing instruments should consist of short, easy-to-understand questions or tasks, written in the second person. The situation should be set up in first sentence, and the task provided in the second sentence. Leading questions should be avoided. Decide what is to be measured in each task, whether the tasks are to be timed, and how to count errors and what counts as an error.

Recruiting Participants: All three speakers mentioned that recruitment of participants can be an initial problem, Marty Courtois offered these observations about participants: emphasize to participants that you are testing the web site, *not* their computer skills; check with your organization about informed consent; do a pilot test with one person first.

Applying the Results: It is important to keep track of user demographics, including status to ensure that you are getting a representative, but not random, sample.

Can Any Library Do It?: Courtois and Molly Freier suggested that any library can successfully conduct usability testing. Courtois reported on an effort at GWUA to design and conduct usability tests on the library website (<http://www.gwu.edu/gelman/>). The full report can be found at <http://www.gwu.edu/gelman/usability>.

Mary (Molly) P. Freier

coordinated usability testing of the Gould Library web site (<http://www.library.carleton.edu>).

Resources: Anderson recommended these usability resources: National Cancer Institute: Improving the Communication of Cancer Research (<http://www.usability.gov/>); Dumas, J.S., and Redish, J.C. (1993) *A Practical Guide to Usability Testing*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex; Norlin, E., and Winters, C. (2002) *Usability Testing for Library Web Sites: A Hands-On Guide*. Chicago: ALA. She also recommended two accessibility resources: *Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 1.0* from the World Wide Web Consortium (<http://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10/>) and *Federal Electronic and Information Technology Accessibility*.

--Teresa Ashley, Austin Community College

Subscribing to OFFCAMP Listserv

The OFFCAMP Listserv has been established for "discussion about all aspects of service to remote users, including but not limited to branch campus service, state regional, national, and international academic programs and their associated constituents."

To subscribe to OFFCAMP, send an e-mail message to:

listserv@listserv.utk.edu

In the body of your message type:
SUB OFFCAMP YOUR NAME

See the Web interface at: <http://listserv.utk.edu/archives/offcamp.html>

“Crossing Our Own Borders: Partnering With Faculty and Instructional Designers in the Online Environment”

As more and more universities and colleges develop and deliver online and distributed learning courses, the role of the library is often called into question. Can librarians contribute effectively to course development and delivery in an online environment? How can librarians instigate and sustain new relationships within the context of the new reality of cyber-courses? For practical, action-oriented answers to these questions, be sure to attend the DLS program at the ALA conference in Toronto on June 20, 2003.

The 2-hour program will bring together four panelists who will provide us with valuable information and practical advice on effective collaboration strategies among faculty, instructional designers, and librarians. Representing a balance of viewpoints on this critical issue, our panelists will (tentatively) include:

- William J. Gibbs, Coordinator of the Eastern Illinois University Center for Academic Technology, a (non-librarian) instructional designer;
- Howard Carter, Head of Instructional Support Services, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, and Chair-elect of the LITA Distance Learning Interest Group, an academic librarian;
- Dr. Jeremy Mouat, Professor of History, Athabasca University, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, a (non-librarian) faculty member teaching in an online environment; and
- Marian Press and Carol Calder, academic librarians from the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), University of Toronto, Canada.

Because of the broad and balanced approach of our panel, "Crossing Our Own Borders" will help all DLS members understand how to initiate and maintain the academic partnerships that will position us as leaders in institutional change.

Reports from Annual in Atlanta

In This Issue...

DLS Newsletter
ACRL/ALA
50 Huron Street
Chicago, IL 60611



Nonprofit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
American
Library
Association