

**To: Faculty Senate**  
**From: Denise Despres, Chairperson LMIS**  
**Concerning: Report LMIS Charges 2013-14**  
**Date: April 13, 2014**

**Dear Colleagues: The following is a summary of our responses to the Faculty Senate Charges. For your convenience, I have supplied appropriate websites for further information and encourage you to consult the LMIS minutes posted on SoundNet. For your convenience, I will simply address the issues by charges:**

**1.**

**Provide input and guidance to the Library during implementation of the new integrated library system (ILS).** The Shared Integrated Library System, set to go live in June 2014, will link Collins Library to eighteen other libraries that have already migrated, with all 37 libraries allied by January 2015. Some information about the shared system has already been disseminated in the *Technology Services Newsletter* (to Chairs), and to the campus community via email, but future recommendations include a LibGuide that provides further details about the project and answers FAQs; an email to the campus community via Open Line; and ongoing communication through email, drop-in times, and social media. The LMIS Committee has received periodic updates from Jane Carlin, Library Director and Wade Guidry, Library Systems Administrator. LMIS Committee has provided advice for communicating with faculty about this project. An all campus email and guide to the project has been distributed. Once the public interface is available, LMIS will be involved in providing some general feedback. Carlin informed the committee that the new library search platform will be rolled out in June, 2014, but fortunately, it can be tested beforehand. Carlin asked whether members of the committee would be willing to participate in the testing of Primo (the name of the program) before the rollout in June. Committee members agreed to participate in testing. **Assessment and testing will be completed over the summer and we anticipate that the Committee will continue to operate in an advisory capacity in the fall.**

In addition to updating us on this new system, Jane Carlin presented the LMIS with a report from a workshop that she attended at the University of Washington in Seattle. The workshop was convened by the Association of Research Libraries and was attended by roughly 30 people. Puget Sound was the only liberal arts college represented at the workshop. The purpose of the workshop was to brainstorm, share success stories, and discuss issues affecting research libraries in the United States.

One issue that was identified and discussed was the ‘competency trap,’ which occurs when organizations continue to use methods or approaches that worked in the past, but that may not be optimal or innovative. In the context of research libraries, the competency trap may lull universities into making only incremental changes rather than thinking ‘outside the box.’ Carlin stated that the moral of the story is that libraries should not get trapped into simply doing what has worked in the past.

Participants at the workshop identified three possible roles for libraries in the future, in light of the ways in which open access has revolutionized research, especially in the sciences, the need to provide access to information that is free of commercial messages and the switch to digital

information: first, the library as a means of creating new information access (Carlin mentioned the Cascade Alliance, which features 37 participating libraries); second, the library as a third space, away from home and work, where collaboration, exploration, discovery, and engagement can occur; and third, the library as archive, whereby digital information and cultural knowledge can be recorded, presented, and stored.

**The LMIS should continue to monitor and discuss the problem of the “competency trap” that faces the Collins Library, despite significant innovations. In particular, LMIS needs to revisit the use of space in ways that reflect contemporary library functionality, including teaching spaces, collaborative student learning spaces, small group faculty collaborative learning spaces, and hands-on, interdisciplinary project spaces.**

2.

**Review new technologies and their potential infringement upon student privacy. Recommend ways to improve faculty familiarity with FERPA and to encourage use of the resources available on campus to assist them with compliance.**

LMIS asked Cindy Riche and William Morse to update the committee on this issue and the way new technology on campus will impact FERPA. William has explained that, prior to our switch to PeopleSoft, we relied on Cascade, which is a transactional program that allowed for very little reporting or analysis. One of the advantages of PeopleSoft is that it can create a data warehouse, or as it is popularly known “big data.” In the near future, the University will be able to compile data on particular questions, and although the notion of the data can be daunting for some, we will be able to add data from Moodle or Admissions or external records and add this data to data being created in PeopleSoft. On the issue of privacy, Morse stated that much of the data produced by PeopleSoft is anonymous, and in those cases where data is not anonymous, access is limited to those who have access through PeopleSoft in the first place. The Office of Institutional Research will have access to, and manage, the data being compiled through PeopleSoft. Again, Morse and Riche stressed that access to the data warehouse will be limited to those who are given access through the PeopleSoft security systems, and therefore, access to the data being generated through PeopleSoft will not be open to the general public.

Morse indicated that the data warehouse has not been built yet, but will start soon with Admissions information (for example, data that is used to show which students are likely to enroll in Puget Sound, so that recruitment efforts can be targeted to those students). Another advantage of the data warehouse that will be created through PeopleSoft is that discrepancies across the University in definitions and data categories will be identified, which will allow better synchronization across different offices in the University.

LMIS has also discussed the second part of the charge listed above, namely “ways to improve faculty familiarity with FERPA and to encourage use of the resources available on campus to assist them with compliance.” Riche pointed out that FERPA is “owned” by the Academic Dean. There are many ways to violate FERPA, and FERPA is mentioned in many places on the university website, including but not limited to, the following sites:

- FERPA Tutorial: <http://www.pugetsound.edu/academics/advising-registrar/know-educational-rights/ferpa-tutorial/>
- <http://www.pugetsound.edu/academics/advising-registrar/resources/advisors-manual/first-year-advising-program/educational-records-policy/>
- <http://www.pugetsound.edu/academics/advising-registrar/resources/advisors-manual/academic-advising/records-confidentiality/>
- <http://www.pugetsound.edu/academics/advising-registrar/know-educational-rights/>
- <http://www.pugetsound.edu/academics/international-programs/study-abroad/parents/ferpa/>
- <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/records/>
- As it pertains to cloud services: <http://www.pugetsound.edu/about/offices-services/technology-services/help-support/using-cloud-services/>

Riche stated, and other committee members agreed, that some faculty are not aware at all of FERPA or that there are many actions that would violate FERPA (for example, leaving examinations out on a table outside a faculty member’s office for collection by students). Riche has asked LMIS about the best way to spread the word to faculty about FERPA. LMIS suggested that a brief presentation be made at a future faculty meeting informing faculty of ways in which to avoid violating FERPA requirements. Several members of the committee also suggested that a bullet point list of FERPA “dos and don’ts” be sent to faculty through campus mail. **Finally, we may be able to use the new PeopleSoft portal under design to spread FERPA information to faculty.**

3.

**Develop a preservation strategy for digital archives in order to preserve the electronic history of the university.**

Due to complex nature of the issue and the pending library implementation and the continuation of the Optimize Project, this initiative has not been actively addressed this academic year. Katie Henningsen, Archivist and Digital Collections Coordinator, did attend a digital archives course offered by the Society of American Archives and the Association of Research Libraries in late December. The course covered the following topics: digital curation, digital archives, and preservation of digital archives. This will provide a foundation for further discussions in the next academic year. **Both William Morse and Jane Carlin stress that this is a huge and complex topic that requires funding and university support.**

4.

**Continue to monitor the implementation of Optimize, solicit feedback on areas for system improvement, and keep the Faculty Senate informed about progress.**

The majority of our LMIS meetings were occupied with this issue this past academic year. Optimize Puget Sound, the university’s initial implementation of PeopleSoft, has focused over the past two years on getting the core pillars of the system in place. We are now in the next phase of the project, dubbed Maximize Puget Sound, which is focused on improving or adding

needed functionality. The Project Management Office section of the Technology Services website ([pugetsound.edu/pmo](http://pugetsound.edu/pmo)) details these ongoing efforts, including the recent implementation of new tools such as printer-friendly class rosters, enhanced functionality to return all sections when searching for classes, and the new My Advisees Hub where advisors can see advisee information (major, minor, GPA, etc.) in one place.

More improvements are to come, including added features in My Advisees Hub, a page for chairs and administrative assistants to see all students in a department, student alerts and person information, preferred name on self-service pages (including class search), improved waitlist swap functionality for registration, a university transcript based on the model previously available in Cascade, and the ability for students to change major/minor and select advisor. The rollout in the fall of the new portal, myPugetSound, will help greatly with the usability of PeopleSoft as it will streamline access to common applications and require sign-in only once. Users will also have the ability to group together commonly-used items on a personalized page. Technology Services continues to ask for faculty input and CIO William Morse and Travis Nation, Deputy CIO and project manager of the PeopleSoft implementation, are available to meet with departments and offices or with faculty and staff individually.

The [Project Management Office](#) section of the Technology Services website details all ongoing efforts to improve or add needed functions. The Implementing Officers understand that usability in the new system is currently less than ideal. Often several clicks are required to do simple tasks, and moving between the core pillars of the system (Campus Solutions, Financials, and Human Resources) requires multiple sign-ins. The rollout in the fall of **myPugetSound**, our new portal, will greatly help with this issue, as it will streamline access to common applications and require users to sign in only once. Users will also have the ability to group together those items most used in on a personalized page.

For information on the selection process that occurred for PeopleSoft, see the [ERP Selection Archive](#) on the Technology Services website.

## 5.

### **Continue to support initiatives to raise awareness and use of Archives and Special Collections, building on the 2012-2013 LMIS Committee report.**

The Library staff has done an excellent job of developing a new lecture series entitled “Behind the Archives Door.” Information about this series is distributed to faculty via email and posters as well as one on one invitations. In addition, many faculty have been working directly with Katie Henningsen to integrate primary source materials within their classes. As part of the LMIS committee’s charge “to continue to support initiatives to raise awareness and use of archives and special collections”, Peggy Burge, Humanities Liaison Librarian, and Katie Henningsen, Archivist and Digital Collections Coordinator, were asked to provide the committee with an update on student research skills, use of the Archives and Special Collections, and to discuss possible changes to the existing space to facilitate library activities, humanities classes, and curricular development.

Peggy Burge discussed student literacy with regards to discerning the differences between various kinds of source materials (scholarly, popular, primary and secondary sources) as well as the results of the research practices survey. The survey indicated that, although student research skills were improving, there is still work to be done in helping students to recognize and utilize different materials appropriately and effectively in their studies. Katie Henningsen noted that, since the beginning of the fall 2013 semester, 220 students have worked in the archives and special collections as either part of a class or on their own initiative. Henningsen also discussed the kinds of research skills and strategies and opportunities afforded by working with primary source materials. Both archivist Henningsen and LMIS member Amy Fisher, who frequently uses the archives in teaching her STS courses, have expressed concerns with the existing teaching space for the archives and special collections. Because of the number and size of classes taking advantage of archival materials, many classes spill out of the Shelmidine room into the hallway, creating conservation challenges as well as disruptions for other library patrons.

Henningsen also discussed initiatives to make faculty and students more aware of the variety of resources available in the archives and special collections. *Behind the Archives' Door*, a bi-monthly public lecture series, features the work of faculty and students in the collections. Also, there are a number of student workers in the archives and special collections, providing valuable work-study opportunities for students. Again, she noted that the existing space does not make it easy to facilitate the number of researchers and students interested in working with the collections.

**Last spring, Jane Carlin and Katie Henningsen along with members of 2012-2013 LMIS Committee and other faculty undertook an evaluation of the existing space. In conjunction with the group's recommendations, Henningsen reported that some of 2<sup>nd</sup> floor secondary source materials and shelving had been shifted to other parts of the library to make a larger and brighter space with more seating for use by the archives. This area, however, is outside of the formal special collections space and open to all library patrons. It had been recommended last spring that glass walls be installed to partition the space from the general stacks, to create more privacy, reduce noise, and to provide more protection for rare books and artifacts. A proposal was drafted, asking for funding to renovate the space. Because of other construction projects on campus, the archival renovation project was placed in hiatus. LMIS will continue to advocate for developing Archives space.**

**Unfortunately, despite an excellent foundational report that outlined opportunities for enhanced space for the Archives & Special Collections, we were unable to move ahead with any defined action steps associated with the project. Email correspondence with Sherry Mondou and Bob Kief indicated that there was no funding at the time and that the library project was not part of the building improvement programs underway. Despite this set back, the library staff should be commended for their ability to create a more open space for teaching upstairs with the removal of shelving, addition of seating and display of engaging graphics. In addition, the Shelmidine Room was reconfigured to serve as a classroom.**

**The LMIS Committee seeks input from the faculty senate on how we might continue to advocate for this important space that will support teaching and learning and enhance the**

**educational experience for Puget Sound students. Specifically, the LMIS committee needs a clear sense of whether or not its recommendations have any influence on implementation when the projects require even modest funding.**

7.

**In collaboration with librarians explore issues related to new publishing as they apply to Puget Sound and suggest ways to provide faculty with guidance on fair use, intellectual property rights, and management of their creative works.**

Ben Tucker, Business and Economics Librarian, provided an overview of Sound Ideas as well as created a short guide to this resource for faculty. Jane Carlin reminded LMIS that each fall the Library sends copyright compliance and author's rights information to faculty. In addition, all faculty were sent author's rights negotiation packets 2 years ago. The LMIS Committee recommends an update be scheduled for faculty in fall of 2014.

8.

**Collaborate with the Library to develop a prominent display for recent faculty scholarship in the library (or other campus venues).**

The Library current uses digital screens to showcase faculty authors through a program titled: Find Faculty Authors in Collins. The screen uses an image of the publication with call number of location. This program is updated on a semester basis. In May, The Library always organizes an exhibit of recently published items. A permanent display is difficult to maintain and only reflects printed books. This does not adequately reflect the diversity of faculty achievements such as electronic publications, art exhibitions, performances, and other digital/media related academic achievements. There is also physical display of faculty works and the Faculty Scholarship publication at the front of the Library. The Library purchases new faculty publications as soon as they find out about them but not all faculty or departments routinely share that information. In addition, the physical displays are not adequate for highlighting "the diversity of faculty achievements such as electronic publications, art exhibitions, performances, and other digital/media related academic achievements." This last has been partially addressed by having links to new materials in *Sound Ideas*. Suggestions from the ensuing discussion include: rethink the display locations, have a monthly spotlight highlighting recent works, announce the displays on the new University website with a link to the actual work, find a way to obtain a complete list of items in a timely fashion, invite faculty to talk about their work – perhaps with a radio show, share pertinent department links, perhaps on a rotating basis, on the University website and look into having a systematic collection of Curricula Vitae.. **Due to the complexity of the Library Implementation Project no additional action was taken on this topic for this academic year.**

"Sound Ideas" is an institutional repository of scholarly and creative work by both students and faculty. At present, there are 3910 total records (1100 from faculty), with 150,000 downloads so far. Among other things, "Sound Ideas" is designed to promote Puget Sound scholarship, support open access to scholarly information, and increase awareness of student research. LMIS had a presentation on Sound Ideas by Ben Tucker, who confirmed the success of this mission with examples of the most popular faculty and student records, with the number of downloads for each ranging between 100-400 so far. Ben finished his presentation by fielding questions about

related copyright issues, which may concern faculty who want to provide access to records already published in pay-subscription journals, or graduate students who might wish to publish material that had been open access on our site.

9.

**Collaborate with the PSC to assess the viability of using electronically-administered Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms.** LMIS discussed the possibility of replacing current paper course evaluations with an online system of gathering responses. William Morse introduced the discussion by asserting this was a policy matter rather than a media issue, before sharing from his experience at previous institutions that made a similar move. Accepting the significant savings of cost and time made possible by switching to electronic evaluations, the group raised questions regarding incentive and collection (how do we get students to respond? would they do these in class time dedicated to this purpose, or outside of class at their own convenience? if in class, what devices and bandwidth would need to be available?); quality of evaluations (are our communications substantively different online or with a smartphone than with pen and paper? similarly, if these evaluations would occur outside of class, what might be the effect of environmental contexts, such as writing an evaluation while with classmates who are sharing their opinions about an instructor or course?). Many of these issues need to be discussed by the PSC and then presented to the faculty formally before LMIS can move ahead with any kind of implementation. **LMIS redirected this issue to the PSC and sees implementation of it as the purview of the LMIS.**

10.

**Work with the PSC to assess the viability of a process for electronic submission of faculty evaluation files.** Despres consulted with the Professional Standards Committee and it is the PSC who are charged to “assess the viability” in Charges #9 and #10. If these are deemed viable, the Faculty Senate may charge LMIS with addressing implementation. Cindy Rich has already been consulted on using Moodle for faculty evaluations but argues that significant programming by IT would be necessary to have Moodle meet anonymity and other requirements. She also noted we are in contact with some schools that have implemented Moodle in this fashion. Both Riche and Morse noted that pilot programs are not obvious first steps since they essentially require developing the full infrastructure. Morse reminded us that policy should be decided first, followed by a determination of specific needs/requirements, and then beginning actual implementation.

11.

**Assess the possibility of eliminating due dates for non-Summit library materials checked out to faculty.** The Library purchases materials that are available for the entire user population of Puget Sound. Faculty have six month checkouts and we are part of a consortium that supports the concept of sharing. The LMIS Committee supports the current policy.

12.

**Consider raising the page limit in Print Green for students in graduate programs.** Our current print system offers no way to separate out and analyze printing by status of the student. It would take significant programming time to be able to pull out and compare the printing of graduate vs. undergrad, or different majors to other majors. This is programming time would require additional funding and will not be possible to even start for 18 -24 months, given other priorities for our programmers and TS staff. Ultimately, providing differential allotments based on student status is not possible given current resources. Additional resources would need to be provided to do this (via BTF or other budget process).

LMIS took into account the needs of classes with higher printing requirements by providing a very high print allotment to our students for each semester with the full knowledge that many will not use their entire allotment. Printing costs are due to paper and print use (and printer wear and tear). If 100 students don't use their full allotments, that money isn't "saved" so that it can be reallocated... it was never spent to begin with. In essence, we "overbooked" the printers, knowing that only a certain % of users would "show up" on a continual basis. And, the allotment is incredibly generous to cover the vast majority of our users' needs. William Morse has explained that because implementing different quotas for different groups of students was difficult and costly to implement, it was decided when the Print Green initiative went into effect that a blanket quota would be applied instead (he also indicated that Puget Sound's quota was generous compared to many other institutions). Morse informed the committee that Puget Sound students print 350 pages per semester, which is far below the 750 quota allocated each semester to all students. The committee recommended that due to cost of implementation, as well as equity in the campus community, that the page limit should remain the same for all students. One reason for this recommendation, aside from the cost and technical difficulty of applying different quotas, is that students would resent it if some groups were given higher printing quotas. However, after hearing about possible options for the printing of course materials, including on-demand printing of course packs, from Riche, the committee recommended that Riche and the other members of the Educational Technology team consult with particular programs on possible ways to reduce printing costs for students

### **13.**

#### **Recommend ways to educate the faculty about TurnItIn and devise methods for facilitating faculty use.**

So far, 52 instructors and 1129 students have used TurnItIn. There have been 2000 submissions with 260 of those making use of Grade Mark and 88 being graded on-line. Of the 2000 submissions, TurnItIn generate 93 alarms but 87 of those were associated with a science lab where it is plausible that there would be many common phrases used by the students. Carlin asked if the data could be filtered by department and Riche is looking into it. Carlin also noted there are broader issues associated with plagiarism that LMIS can address while looking at TurnItIn. The LMIS discussion has addressed: why are faculty being encouraged to use TurnItIn (because it is paid for), why use it if faculty have personalized methods for ensuring similar papers cannot be found on-line or for recognizing individual student's writing "signatures" (yet, without also using TurnItIn we don't know if that process is successful), and are there other useful ways to use it (it can be the backbone of an in-class lesson on plagiarism).



The committee agreed that workshops, perhaps during the semester and at Faculty Orientation, would be a good way to increase faculty awareness of TurnItIn and its capabilities. This would give faculty hands-on experience, provide a venue for highlighting current user's methods of practice, and illustrate how TurnItIn can be used to give students a more precise understanding of what is and is not plagiarism. It would also be a good topic for a Wednesday at 4:00 discussion. Cindy Riche volunteered to meet with Carlin and Lori Ricigliano about getting workshops on appropriate agendas.

Other possible charges or LMIS projects:

- 1) William Morse suggested that LMIS study student experiential learning portfolios, a repository of all student work collected in one repository over four years to be used for internships, job interviews. Etc. Currently, Moodle provides this option with a program entitled Mahara.
- 2) William Morse also expressed an interest in pursuing the option of cocurricular transcripts to maintain student and University records of the myriad activities (cultural, community service, etc.) for which we currently have no means to record.
- 3) Opportunities for LMIS to participate in the University's collaboration with the NW5.