I2NY:

Envisioning an Information Infrastructure

for New York State

May 2013

Condensed Report

Final Report 2013

Table of Contents

Preface

IN 2012, The New York 3Rs Association, Inc. engaged Tom Clareson, Senior Consultant for Digital & Preservation Services, LYRASIS, to work with library leaders throughout the state in the development of the "I2NY" project, formulating an Information Infrastructure for the State of New York. Clareson and a NY 3Rs Association Planning Committee designed a program that included a Summit on library and archival collaboration, a web survey on current trends and future needs of libraries and archives, and a series of meetings with leaders from the state's library and archival community to gather and synthesize information for the development of a new collaborative framework for library and archival innovation and service delivery in New York.

I2NY Mission:
Ensure that all New Yorkers have seamless, unfettered, and affordable access to information, through the creation of a New York statewide information infrastructure that encourages collaboration and joint enterprises among the libraries and archives.

I2NY Goals:
- Introduce the concept of a New York Statewide Information Infrastructure among the state's academic and research libraries and archives.
- Explore the current landscape for the creation, storage, and dissemination of information in New York.
- Explore existing exemplary models within and outside of New York State for the creation, storage, and dissemination of information.
- Develop a New York Statewide Infrastructure model that builds upon successful programs, creates alternative programs and services where needed, and encourages collaborations and partnerships among New York's libraries and archives.
- Empower users with the ability to access and process information and resources in ways which are customized to their specific needs within a larger geographic framework.

Executive Summary

Observers of library culture in New York State often note that academic and research libraries have historically existed in vacuums that create information silos. Similarly, some claim New York libraries lack an overall coordinated information infrastructure that reduces duplication, preserves historic content and ensures optimal storage of unique materials, preserves last copies of monographs, and ensures perpetual access to research developed by faculty and staff.

There is certainly great veracity to those observations, but they are not entirely true. Many academic and large public research libraries in the state are successfully exploring collaborative models for the creation, storage, curation, and dissemination of information to their users in a more cost-effective manner. Because there is so much new thinking taking place, it is now important to audit the current New York library landscape to formulate an overall framework that pulls together the information components that comprise library services into a cohesive infrastructure that enhances the development of collaborative opportunities and joint enterprises —an *Information Infrastructure*.

In response to this need, the NY 3Rs Association developed an Information Infrastructure planning process that included –these key components:
- A two-day I2NY Summit focused on library and archival collaboration (September 2012).
- A web-based survey distributed to academic, research, and large public libraries throughout the state focused on the technological and collaborative needs of these libraries as well as current practices (October, 2012).
- A focus group of school library system directors to query the needs of the state's school libraries (February, 2013).
- A Reality Check focus group of library leaders to assess work to date, draft recommendations, and help determine future steps (May, 2013).

As the result of these processes, several I2NY initiatives were identified as being the highest importance. Those initiatives include:
- Immediate access to paid electronic journals, e-books, and other materials at the level of best value, and the development of a framework for a united and collaborative statewide group to pursue negotiations with vendors to achieve these access and value goals.
- Development of methods for greater collaboration among libraries of all types, including transactional exchange models, incentives to grow successful local or regional projects statewide, and greater support for the sharing of information about innovative projects and ideas.
- Innovative development and deployment of staff to deal with the new technologies and the changing expectations of users.
- Connecting library services to patron and student outcomes at every level of school and academic libraries, and in public libraries for lifelong learners and researchers.
- Improved communications across all library types through a number of avenues, including continuing the work begun at the I2NY Summit, development of working groups to facilitate particular projects.

Respondents consistently requested more clarity around what is meant by "New York Information Infrastructure." For the purposes of this report and all activities moving forward, we are defining *Information Infrastructure* as a series of processes, relationships, and tools that:

- Improve the ability to electronically share information, services and expertise from one user, location, region, and/or library, to another user, location, region, and/or library over an openwork structure or foundation comprised of interconnected networks.
- Foster connections among people or groups with similar interests.
- Leverage existing local assets, services, data sets, information resources, and expertise by connecting them to other assets, services, data sets, information resources and expertise through a statewide network to enhance collaboration.
- Encourage shared staffing and services virtually and in-person through an openwork structure or foundation.

Collecting Data

There have been several published reports on the changing role of academic libraries in research and instruction. ACRL has produced white papers on a variety of topics, the most recent of which having focused on the intersection of scholarly communication and information literacy and the value of academic libraries.

Another report, "The Idea of Order: Transforming Research Collections for 21st Century Scholarship" from the Council on Library and Information Resources, Washington D.C, June 2010 (www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub147/pub147.pdf) examined the concept of a research library being all-digital, the cost of keeping a book, and the use and value of a large scale text digitization project to contemporary humanities scholarship.

There is one report that generated a great deal of discourse – the 2011 report, "Redefining the Academic Library: Managing the Migration to Digital Information Services" from the Advisory Board Company, Washington, DC. The report, commissioned by college provosts, challenged academic institutions to rethink and redefine the academic library.

The report found that due to a confluence of changes in technology, user expectations and demands, and budget pressures, the academic library's traditional role as physical repository is decreasing. Large physical collections are no longer sustainable due to budgetary constraints, documented usage, and the changing landscape of scholarly research. Traditional library metrics no longer measure an academic library's success or value to funders and their constituency. Major obstacles to a redefined academic library include the inflexibility of complex licensing, usage restrictions on ebooks, legal constraints surrounding copyright, declining user demand for traditional library services such as reference, large commercial online competitors, and rising costs of journals and databases.

The report pushes the "Just-in-case" to "Just-in-time" library model – not a new concept for libraries. It recommended several strategies that academic libraries can deploy to avoid obsolescence.
- Leverage digital collections by adopting ebooks, challenge the vendor's stranglehold on usage restrictions, and adopt more patron-driven acquisition and delivery models;
- Rethink the scholarly publishing model by centralizing purchasing through consortial partnerships, investigate pay-per-article as an alternative to the "Big Deal," support open access initiatives to disrupt the current publishing model by investing in infrastructure;
- Repurpose the library space to allow for collaborative learning spaces and optimize facilities and establish collaborative storage and collection development partners to avoid duplication and allow for higher demand activities;
- Redeploy library staff by shifting away from traditional activities and services such as cataloging and the traditional reference desk and move towards collaborative relationships and embedded librarians, sharing staff expertise with other departments or libraries particularly those with specialized knowledge and experience.

Many New York academic libraries are already implementing several of the recommendations from this report by redefining their current library practices and increasing their collaborative partnerships. The ConnectNY and IDS Project initiatives are two examples of libraries working together to provide innovations in service delivery. "The Power of SUNY Libraries" strategic plan (http://scld.wordpress.com/2011/04/18/the-power-of-suny-libraries-adopted-41511/) provides directions for SUNY Libraries to implement the vision of "SUNY libraries (working) together to provide

quality services and to expand access to emerging and recorded knowledge in support of teaching, learning, research, economic development and public service, " and promotes "working actively with public and private sectors of higher education…" Still, there is no overreaching infrastructure to support collaborations on a state wide level.

According to the December 12, 2012 Ithaka S+R report "Supporting the Changing Research Practices of Historians" by Jennifer Rutner and Roger C. Schonfeld (http://www.sr.ithaka.org/research-publications/supporting-changing-research-practices-historians), researchers interviewed for the report utilize the same underlying research methods that they have in the past (organize and manage research notes and use of primary resources), but the day-to-day research practices of interacting with archival materials have fundamentally changed.   The use of digitized finding aids, digitized collections, and digital cameras have altered the way historians interact with primary sources. As one respondent put it *"the publisher then digitized the entire collection. Immediately, I went from traveling to see this material to being able to search everything from my computer."* The report also found that the challenge now for many researchers is to "gain intellectual control" over the content they have collected throughout their research process.

While the interviewees viewed the library in a collections-centric way and valued their digitization efforts and online finding aids, on-site visits to archives remain a vitally important part of nearly every history research project. The report found that historians were concerned about whether librarians, in particular, had sufficient command of the field to provide more focused support for their research. An additional concern the historians expressed was adopting new practices and tools and incorporating technology into their research indicating a need, perhaps, for additional support libraries can provide through training and instruction or the sharing of staff with a specific subject expertise.

The report provided recommendations to several audiences: archives, libraries, providers of digital and digitized sources, providers of citation and research notes management systems, history departments, scholarly societies, and funders. For the libraries and archives, the list below is a summary of the recommendations to both of these groups:

- Online finding aids
- Continue digitization
- Cross institutional discovery tools
- Cultivate collection expertise
- Allow digital cameras and scanners in reading rooms
- Provide training to PhD students
- Provide secondary sources in digital format
- Provide access to collections not available locally
- Pool staff expertise from other institutions and make accessible to others
- Digitize other formats such as audio, video, oral histories, etc.
- Improve discovery services
- Include foreign language materials in digitized collections
- Google is an important tool to this group so libraries and archives should coordinate their digital efforts to compliment rather than compete with Google.

In 2012, the New York State Board of Regents endorsed a comprehensive plan for libraries titled <u>Creating the Future: A 2020 Vision and Plan for Library Service in New York State</u>. This document provides a broad range of recommendations pertinent to the I2NY initiative, including

- The development of a statewide/national digital library of shared use, freely accessible digitized books and research materials through the *HathiTrust* and similar organizations. Active participation by New York's libraries in the Digital Public Library of America and the Internet Archive's Open Library initiative, in order that New York's freely available but disparate content can be accessed by all our residents.
- The acceleration of digitization of special collections and their integration into curricula; and making those materials freely available for research.
- The publication of academic research generated by faculty that would be universally available at no cost to the user.
- Leadership in the preservation of digital resources and advocacy for open access and reduced copyright restrictions in the support of digital preservation. The continuation and strengthening of collaborations with other communities in support of life-long learning, information literacy and research.
- Collaboration among all academic libraries in the development of print repositories designed to reduce redundancies within collections while maintaining high levels of access and stewardship.
- Advancement of the primary role of academic librarians in fostering the integration of information literacy competencies into teaching and learning on their campuses to support student academic achievement and to prepare students for the global information economy that will shape their professional and personal lives.

These reports and others provide a broad picture of how libraries are changing and how they need to change in order to meet the challenges of user needs and expectations, competition, increased costs and decreased funding. Data gathered from the I2NY Summit, the Survey, and the focus groups provided insights into how these same environmental factors are affecting New York's libraries and archives.

The I2NY Summit
The NY 3Rs Association, Inc. sponsored the New York Information Infrastructure (I2NY) Summit, an interactive two-day discussion and learning event, focused on meeting the needs and expectations of New York's library and archival users through collaboration. The conference was held in Saratoga Springs, NY, on September 23-24, 2012.

At the Summit, library, archival, and information leaders from around the state explored existing programs and services, and discussed desired components and enhancements which could lead to a statewide information infrastructure. Eighty-eight library directors and top administrators from representative New York libraries participated in the Summit, including Executive Directors from the New York Regional Library Councils (NY3Rs), the State Library, New York State Higher Education Initiative (NYSHEI), New York Library Association (NYLA), City University of New York (CUNY), State University of New York (SUNY), Public Library System Directors Organization (PULISDO), IDS Project, ConnectNY, and several subcontractors that support and implement statewide programs.
The I2NY Summit featured both programmatic and discussion group activities. The first day of the event featured presentations to set the context of the I2NY activity and to feature new and important information initiatives within the state.

Opening speaker, Sheryl Knab, Executive Director of the Western New York Library Resource Council (WNYLRC) spoke on building connections, collaborative initiatives, and resource and expertise sharing.

She posited that many of the library and archival initiatives discussed at the Summit can scale from local to statewide. Knab suggested that the group undertake five steps:

1. **Discovery** –identifying existing collaborations which can be scaled up. Knab mentioned some current New York models of collaborative library and archival activity, and pointed to national models such as the California Digital Library, Orbis Cascade Alliance, Florida Virtual Campus, Utah Academic Library Consortium, and Massachusetts Library System.
2. **Defining Challenges** – Knab suggested that the group "create an environment of trust by rethinking the obvious, laying old theories to rest, and developing new approaches to collaboration." Doing so, she asserted, would require the group to "overcome institutional, geographic, and philosophical barriers that prevent collaboration across regions, library types and disparate organizations so we can adopt 'my library is your library' as a new paradigm of service." She also urged the group to "put away legacy services that hurt access" and adopt new access methods to get materials into the hands of the users quickly by considering issues of access vs. ownership, buying vs. borrowing, considering the costs of sharing and storing a title, and considering collaborative methods to reduce costs and improve services.
3. **Identifying Stakeholders** – the I2NY collaborative environment of academic, public, and research libraries across the state recognizes that the beneficiaries of their work are first and foremost New York State residents. Cultural heritage institutions (including school libraries, corporate libraries, public library branches, and other small repositories) also stand to benefit from scaled coordination between libraries throughout the state. Knab urged development of a plan including priorities, immediate actions, and future developments through the Information Infrastructure. Through this collaborative work, individual institutions and the overall collaborative can demonstrate their value to their constituents.
4. **Testing Ideas** – encouraging regional, multi-regional, and multi-institutional pilot projects to explore the best service models for New York State libraries.
5. **Implementing What Works on a Larger Scale** – assessing which programs can be expanded to become part of a statewide New York Information Infrastructure.

The I2NY Summit featured five brief presentations on new and noteworthy information initiatives from around the state. Each of these projects presented the possibility of scaling up to statewide level and beyond.
- Shared Collection Repository Working Group at University of Buffalo
- Migrating Media - The Upstate Preservation Network
- Manhattan Research Library Initiative (MaRLI)
- 2CUL, Columbia and Cornell University Libraries collaboration
- NY3Rs Demand-Driven E-Book Pilot Project

The majority of the I2NY Summit schedule was devoted to group discussion in developing plans and priorities for future activities of the New York Information Infrastructure project. The Open Space Technology meeting methodology (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open-space_technology) was used to facilitate the planning process. Open Space uses a self-organizing approach to meeting planning, with the participants setting the agenda, leading discussions, and developing recommendations. Facilitated by consultants Liz Bishoff (The Bishoff Group) and Tom Clareson (LYRASIS), the discussion at the meeting was based on a central question: How does the New York library and archival community create a New York Information Infrastructure?

More than fifteen self-directed discussion groups at the I2NY Summit yielded nearly 120 recommendations for future statewide action. Following recommendation development, of those 120+ recommendations, summit participants voted the following as the top priority activities:

1. Develop a framework for statewide negotiations, inclusive of goals, stakeholder involvement and boundaries for terms (common principles)
2. Leaders continue conversation about achieving common goals/objectives. Stakeholders include NY 3Rs (Regional Library Councils), State Library, SLSA (School Library System Association), NYSHEI (New York State Higher Education Initiative), NYLA (New York Library Association), CUNY (City University of New York), ConnectNY, SUNY (State University of New York), IDS (Information Delivery Service), PULISDO (Public Library System Directors Organization)
3. Build a transactional model by which libraries can trade, barter, or sell services and staff time to each other
4. NY3Rs take a leadership role in convening library, cultural heritage, economic positions in regions to develop an action plan that will lead to robust library/information delivery systems
5. Create a clearinghouse for initiatives & ideas and sharing
6. Develop a Return on Investment (ROI) model for each type of library (public, academic school, etc.)
7. Identify major challenges/opportunities that require federated IDM to solve
8. Develop best practices—identify structure, roles, training, processes for creating, preserving, discovering and distributing content, including templates for success
9. Develop collection practices including last copy, service and delivery policies (e-delivery?), de-duplication

I2NY Summit Evaluation
Over half of the attendees at the I2NY Summit (45 people) completed an evaluation of the event. Participants were asked which presentations they found helpful. Sheryl Knab's opening remarks and the lightning round presentations on MaRLI and 2CUL were rated "most helpful." One respondent felt that the first day's presentations "set the stage for the thinking and brainstorming the next day."

The most prevalent comments when meeting attendees were asked "what significant insights or information will you take away from the I2NY Summit Meeting" were on both the number of recommendations generated, but also on "the lack of knowledge among the attendees of what is already going on around the state." Of all of the questions asked in the evaluation, this one generated the most positive comments, including: *"After 35+ years in the field, I'm still struck with the amount of work there is to do, prompted by the new needs of each successive generation (of users and of technology) – and yet how universal and pervasive the themes still are. The most important step forward all of these changes have wrought is the renewed emphasis on collaboration and cooperation at all levels and among and across all sections of information seekers and providers. It also seems to me that the 3Rs are incredibly well-positioned to carry this standard forward for the State, and should use every muscle to do so."*

I2NY Survey
The second phase of this project included the distribution of a web-based survey on current and future library services to meet the needs and expectations of New York's library and archival users. The survey was distributed to 436 institutions within the state via New York's nine 3Rs regional library councils, and 134 surveys were returned, for a response rate of 31%.

The survey focused on online library services, important services to patrons/users, collection types held by responding institutions and their preservation management concerns, use of offsite storage services, collaboration with other libraries or organizations, sustainability issues of collaborative/statewide projects, implementation of patron-driven purchasing programs for print and e-book resources, support for self-publishing and local publishing, and important components and benefits of a statewide information infrastructure.

The survey respondents represented a healthy cross-section of the diverse member library types in the 3Rs council memberships.
- 4-year Academic libraries, with 37 or 27.8% of the total respondents
- Academic libraries in community colleges 26 or 19.5% of the respondents
- Special libraries (22 or 16.5%)
- Academic Research libraries (18 or 13.5%)
- Archives (4 or 3%)
- Public Library Systems (3 or 2.3%)
- Public libraries (2 or 1.5%)
- Twenty-one institutions categorized themselves in the "Other" category; the largest respondent groups among these were medical/hospital libraries (5 respondents) and 2-year for-profit colleges (3 institutions)

The I2NY Survey provides some clear direction on the actions which many New York libraries and archives would like to take as well as directions for the NY3Rs in moving the information infrastructure initiative forward.

Key areas for cooperation highlighted in the survey results include:
- Improving access to electronic resources through united statewide negotiation for electronic resources and licensing agreements that produce economies of scale; statewide portals to paid databases and digitized collections; electronic and physical delivery; and direct patron and universal access;
- Training/re-training/re-purposing of staff; and
- Demonstrating the value of library services to funders: through information literacy instruction, connecting and assessing library services in relation to student outcomes, and the development of other models that show a return on investment.

New avenues of communication among all library and archival types which have been created as a result of the I2NY project must continue to be expanded and enhanced to meet the challenges of information stewardship and delivery in the immediate future and beyond.

Top Responses for Shared Components of NYS Information Infrastructure
Group leverage power in license negotiation and purchasing was by far the top response, which makes sense for an important statewide service, and is related to the needs expressed in Question #5 (Access/best pricing, etc.). Professional development and training, provision of statewide portals, and a focus on student learning outcomes also ranked high (1.84) as important components of a statewide information infrastructure. The focus on connecting library services to student learning outcomes was ranked as important or very important (1.97) by nearly three quarters of academic respondents and was particularly highly rated among four-year academic and community college library respondents. This was further affirmed in responses to Question #5, which rated "information literacy instruction"

(certainly related to student outcomes) highly. Additional priorities that could be the basis for future initiatives include:

- Statewide portal to digital collections (1.97)
- Statewide portal to paid databases (1.99)
- Universal access (2.02)
- Information exchange (2.05; highest ratings among community college libraries)
- Increasing patron/user knowledge about library services (marketing) (2.10)
- Leaders of all types of library organizations work together to achieve common goals and involve all stakeholders (2.15)
- Assessing the value of library services for funders (2.15)
- Coordinated collection management (2.64)
- Development of a clearinghouse for existing projects and services, to promote collaboration (2.69)
- Statewide federated identity management system (i.e., having a common set of policies, practices, and protocols in place to establish user identities and enforce rules about access to digital resources across organizations) (2.81)

Other Constituencies: School Library System Directors Focus Group
In order to include the viewpoints of leaders from the school library community on New York's information infrastructure needs, project consultant Tom Clareson conducted a telephone focus group with selected School Library System Association (SLSA) leaders in February, 2013.

While noting that the school library systems across New York State are different from each other in many ways, and there are a limited amount of programs that are similar "across the board," the I2NY planning group felt it was important to have their perspective discretely represented in this conversation. The SLSA representatives spoke of trends in the school library systems in New York, 37 of which are in organized within Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES).Many school library activities are provided through cooperative service agreements, or "Co-Sers," which focus on activities such as library automation and management, online databases, and instructional media, although different districts may have different Co-Sers.

An example of a successful collaborative program of note from the school library system environment is "SCORE" (SLS Consortium of Online Resources for Education) which provides for coordinated negotiation and consortial purchasing of e-book and online resources for K-12 schools. A majority of New York's school library systems have been participating in this model of collaborative statewide activity for the past 5-6 years.

When asked about the most important services to their patrons/users/audiences, the school library system representatives echoed much of what was discovered in the Summit and the Survey:

- Professional development
- Access to paid electronic databases
- Best pricing and licensing for databases
- Information literacy instruction
- Training (computer, information resources) for support staff

The school library system representatives noted NY 3Rs Association leadership on work to increase borrowing privileges, with a goal of allowing high school students to borrow materials directly through

academic libraries. Another area of note is the work being done under a SUNY grant to look at trans-literacies, including the development of a badging system for information literacies.

The focus group closed with a discussion on the sustainability of collaborative initiatives, and the aforementioned SCORE project was noted as a good model of sustainability. In general, the school library system representatives noted stable, predictable funding for innovative programs is critical. While school libraries may not always be able to afford to develop large-scale collaborative projects on their own, mutually beneficial relationships around innovative collaborative projects greatly increases the projects' likelihood of success.

Data Analysis

Across all of the information-gathering methods (summit, survey, focus groups, etc.), there were some key issues that appeared as universal needs in the development of New York's Information Infrastructure:

Access to e-resources, including databases and ebooks at a reasonable price was a top concern and the desire for a **framework for statewide vendor negotiations a top priority.** Development of a framework for statewide vendor negotiations, inclusive of goals, stakeholder involvement, and boundaries for terms/common principles, could result in a coordinated and united statewide method of negotiation for electronic resources and licensing agreements, and was seen as a way to achieve cost-containment through group purchasing. This need is borne out by one of the strongest comments from the Summit: *"Far and away, the need for New York State librarians of all types and all organizations to join together in addressing the unsustainable price increases for scholarly content,"* and receives further emphasis from the School Library System discussion of the inaccessibility of important content due to publisher limitations.

Access is also the underlying component of other important needs/concerns articulated by the participants:
- Immediate access to resources
- Coordinated delivery, including direct delivery to patrons – print and electronic
- Universal access
- Access to digital materials, including audio and video.
- Statewide discovery system
- Statewide portal to digital collections
- Preservation of print and digital resources

Developing a cadre of quality library workers was a key issue identified across all data components. Maintaining and enhancing the library and archives staff to make a growing array of library and archival services available to patrons was seen as key. Training and re-training, particularly through a coordinated, statewide approach, is seen as a way to help libraries and archives address the growing workflow and workload issues resulting from technological advancement and growing patron expectations. Training was the one component of a statewide information infrastructure widely agreed upon by the survey respondents.

Adoption of innovative uses of staff (as exhibited in the 2CUL initiative) or even new approaches such as building a transactional model by which libraries can trade, barter, or sell services and staff time to each other are ways to enhance the staffing available to libraries and archives.

Assessment of how well library services are connected to patron needs and student outcomes was seen as important at every level of school and academic libraries, and is also important in the public library for lifelong learners and researchers.

Continue the work begun at the I2NY Summit through group discussions and a range of other methods of communication was identified as a key priority at the Summit (and evaluations), in the I2NY Survey, and in the focus group discussions. Summit recommendations included the NY3Rs taking a leadership role in convening library, cultural heritage, and economic leaders in regions to develop an action plan that will lead to robust library/information delivery systems. The will to continue this important work is

strong – many participants left the Summit with, as one attendee stated, *"a renewed sense of hope in the collective wisdom and spirit of cooperation among the libraries in New York."*

The need for greater funding for libraries was a strong and consistent message in each of these discussion settings. Programmatically, libraries and archives cannot rely simply on gaining more money/funding, especially from cash-strapped governments or parent institutions. For that reason, the I2NY initiative is looking, through its methods of collaborative work, at ways to use *current funding* more effectively and efficiently, including ways to repurpose funding. As one I2NY participant noted: *"Sustainable funding models for the New York library community may include shared services, collaborations, and economies of scale; none of these require increased funding."*

Next Steps and Strategic Directions

A number of programmatic activities can be used to address the major needs identified in the Summit, survey, and focus group results. These needs fall into three major areas: **Access, Training, and Assessment**. Each of these on their own includes several complex components lending themselves to "solutions" that would help meet user demand/need.

Access
- Collaborative purchasing - best prices for e-resources including e-books
- Shared e-book collection
- Shared print books via a repository
- Enhanced resource-sharing
- Enhanced delivery including direct delivery to patron
- Universal access
- Discovery system
- Virtual reference
- In-person reference and one on one consultations

Training/Re-training
- Coordinated approach to training and professional development
- Shared staffing arrangements or staffing "exchanges"

Assessment
- Connecting library services to student outcomes
- Information literacy
- Assessing and reporting the value of library services for funders

Many, if not most, of the programmatic responses listed above are already being addressed by consortia within the State, but these consortia are working in isolation. Building I2NY activities on that existing collaboration makes sense. One suggested path is to identify those areas above of greatest importance and/or for which significant work is already underway. I2NY can create Working Groups that can bring together those interested in addressing these programmatic responses.

Activities of Working Groups
The Working Groups should be convened and led by the NY 3Rs Association, but should consist of an "alliance of the willing." The Working Groups should develop a business plan to move the initiative forward. Steps could include:
- Conducting market research: What is already being done on this issue and by whom
- Determining what is not being done, but is desired
  - Partner input
  - User focus input
- Convening meetings of potential partners
- Determining the benefits for the partners to work together (for those consortia or groups already engaged in "solutions")
- Determining how to expand to bring benefits to others (for those currently outside the consortia or group)
- Discovering a way for increased collaboration
  - Include financial projections

   o Resources needed
- Developing a path for implementation and a time frame.

Possible Scenarios

To further these discussions and provide an idea of what could be accomplished, a list of possible projects or pilots has been compiled:

Access: Reducing Costs
1. Aggregate purchases for maximum discounts through the development of a statewide acquisitions cooperative.
2. Pursue open access vigorously and determine methods to reward participants;
3. Reduce dependence on the "big deal" by pursuing an article-on- demand model as an alternative. Develop a purchase on-demand pilot for on-demand journal articles by working with 2-3 publishers that agree to a short term feasibility study and business model that tests the benefits to both the library and the publisher. This would include reasonable purchase rates per article and a willingness to work with large and small libraries (perhaps even multi-type).
4. Challenge illegal confidentiality agreements and red-lining* by vendors. Use available methods for making vendor pricing more transparent.
5. Educate purchasers of their rights, options, historical pricing, and other matters through statewide training and awareness.
6. Reward publishers' and aggregators' good behavior by giving them more business.
7. Develop a statewide e-textbook model that can be utilized by more than one campus.
8. Expand the NY3Rs and ConnectNY E-book patron driven models to leverage greater buying power
9. Investigate shared technology applications such as collaborative e-books servers, streaming audio and video servers, online scholarly repositories, and shared virtual services for special collections.
10. Increase physical access to collections by expanding the use of libraries borrowers' cards.

Redlining: refusal of vendors to participate in collaborative or aggregated demand purchases

Training/Retraining: Shared Expertise
1. Create a central knowledge base of individuals across the state with subject and sub-field expertise that is managed in a distributive model but sits on a separate platform.
2. Create a system for sharing expertise, through which an individual with expertise in a subject field spends a few a few hours or a few days providing assistance in-person or virtually at another institution on a rotating basis as a consultant, adjunct, or part-time staff member. Example of model: IDS Mentor Program.
3. Outsource a specific task or group of tasks to other organizations better equipped to handle volume: cataloging, information services, acquisitions programs, accounting, managing continuing education, etc.

Assessment: Connecting Library Services to Student Outcomes
1. Establish a state-wide High School to College Continuum committee to review current information literacy programs offered by academic libraries and high schools throughout the state to identify best practices, collaborations, and models as they address Common Core learning standards.

2. Establish a state-wide group to develop a set of standardized information literacy outcomes and work to develop a common instructional assessment program that connects to student retention and student achievement after college.
3. Partner with ACRL and others to develop a statewide initiative to assess the value of academic libraries in New York State.

Conclusions

Like many others throughout the country, New York libraries and library systems have been tasked with providing more essential services with less financial resources; an equation that is simply unsustainable. Instead, we must focus on doing *more* with *more*, a plan of action that requires scalable models of collaboration that help identify and address inefficiencies, remove barriers to cooperation, and prove that working together ultimately improves the services we provide to our constituent communities. To do so also requires diligent examination of and experimentation with the numerous opportunities for collaboration that have been outlined herein. We hope this report sparks numerous conversations in that spirit and provides a roadmap for realizing a true information infrastructure for New York libraries.

Reality Check Meeting Report
From Tom Clareson, 5/17/13

On May 13-14, 2013, Consultant Tom Clareson of LYRASIS and the Executive Directors of four of the NY 3Rs councils met with twelve library leaders from across New York to review the Final Report of the I2NY Project and to discuss and plan projects related to the findings of the report.

There were no changes suggested to the project report during the discussion, but there were some areas in which meeting participants expressed concern that more emphasis was not given by I2NY Survey respondents and in the project report.   In particular, the group at the meeting was interested in work on patron-driven acquisition and open access issues. These and other topics were discussed during the meeting.

Collaboration
Discussion at this "Reality Check" meeting touched a number of times on potential collaborative projects in New York among various library types, or among libraries and other types of cultural heritage institutions. The group discussed moving from some current "silos" in library practice to a collaborative working methodology, and came up with a number of points on this topic:
- New York Libraries should build on contracts that are already in place. Delivery (ELD) was an example discussed here.
- The group must address political barriers.
- Institutions interested in collaboration must align collaborative projects with local (campus or city) priorities.
- Models of collaboration discussed included inter-institutional combined technical services work, the SCORE project among school libraries, and the 2CUL project between Cornell University Libraries and Columbia University Libraries.
- An important area for collaboration is in licensing and contracting issues.

One way to move collaboration forward quickly is by the development of "affinity groups" to focus on a specific area of library practice, or on development of groups to address specific projects. Affinity groups were seen as a way to "aggregate intent" and move projects or ideas forward.

Key Topics
Discussion of collaboration led directly into conversation on the cost of E-Access/E-Access Issues. Key topics in this discussion were: aggregating demand, terms and legal conditions, confidentiality, educating purchasers, the need for transparency from vendors, developing a "Library Negotiation Toolkit," and the work that school libraries in New York have done to address this issue via the SCORE project

Participants felt that the lack of standing for Patron-Driven Acquisition (PDA) in the survey results did not reflect the level of implementation and success which NY pilot projects on this topic have been experiencing. Discussion on PDA centered on establishing definitions for Patron-Driven Acquisition, consideration of the formats in which material is acquired, concerns among some libraries about the loss of control when PDA is implemented, and potential staff redeployment allowed by PDA. It was mentioned that PDA might free up funding which could be spent for other library activities.

In discussion of open access issues, there was commentary on the fact that the survey results did not focus strongly on open access, although again, there are some successful open access projects and initiatives in New York State. While the group felt that open access issues may not be an area where libraries have complete control over the issue, many organizations within New York State are already participating in this type of activity, and there is an opportunity for libraries to establish themselves in a leading role.

Additionally, the group felt that there are opportunities for many types of libraries, including academic and public libraries, in fulfilling the "library as publisher" role. The library's role might include providing aid to authors – services including editing and peer-review, and opportunities for collaboration among libraries and other partner groups abound.

Digital projects lend themselves to collaboration between all types of cultural heritage institutions (academic libraries, public libraries, museums, archives, and even collaboration with for-profit organizations). However, there are platform issues, considerations about discovery layers, harvesting practices, digital preservation issues (including preservation of large and small datasets), institutional repository implementations, and interest in a New York Statewide newspaper digitization project with a broad scope comparable to NY newspaper microfilming initiatives.

Priorities
At the end of Day 1 of the meeting, the group identified some priorities for additional discussion and project planning. In some cases, two issues were drawn together into a single priority for action. These priorities served as the areas of focus for discussion and project planning on Day 2 of the meeting.

1. E-Resources Negotiations and Patron-Driven Acquisition issues
2. Digital Collections
3. Library as Publisher and Open Access Issues

Patron-Driven Acquisition
There is already activity occurring in this area through the NY3Rs E-book Project. The group suggested marketing/packaging information about this project to build further awareness and understanding.

E-Resources Negotiation
A number of project ideas were generated on this topic:
- A working group will be developed to study if pricing reflects actual costs of publication and distribution, plus reasonable profit.
- A "manifesto" will be developed which suggests specific licensing terms that should be included in future contracts.
- A Library Negotiation Toolkit will be developed, and will include templates of library agreements; it will include information on SERU (Shared Electronic Resource Understanding, a NISO-recommended practice) and will be available to all libraries in New York through the NY3Rs Association.
- E-resources negotiations shall continue to be a central topic in education and information sessions within the New York library community.

Digital Collections

Discussion focused on the creation of a New York statewide service hub for the Digital Public Library of America (DPLA). Steps to reach this goal will include a Statewide Digital Summit, Regional Promotion/Education, work focused around DPLA Metadata and the DPLA Application Profile, continued regional support for digitization activities, outreach and communication to partners, and identification of sponsors/funders. The group at the meeting feels this initiative needs to be a grassroots effort which is inclusive to smaller cultural heritage organizations.

Library as Publisher/Open Access Issues

This small discussion group saw the role of libraries moving from transactional to transformational by working in the area of "Library as Publisher." Libraries can cultivate the creative process (culture and research), and library activity on this topic will improve the quality of publication and research, and add to the public record. The group suggested inserting the library as early as possible into the creative process. A first action step is to create an affinity group around this topic. Additionally, work in this area can build upon already-created tools, such as the Library as Publisher Toolkit. In the area of Open Access, the group suggested initial steps including assessment of the need for research data infrastructure for libraries without it, and, through education, gaining national public access policy awareness.

Following the conclusion of the May 13-14 meeting, NY3Rs representatives will be in contact with meeting participants and other library leaders in New York to establish formal working groups on these projects. While NY3Rs organizations will assume a coordination/facilitation role, it was understood by the group that these projects will be most successful through the continuing participation of many members of the library and cultural heritage communities.