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President’s Column: Summer 2019

“Summertime and the livin’ is easy” according to the lyrics of “Summertime” by George Gershwin. In regard to SELA, I would suggest the “livin’ is busy” - which is not a bad thing.

Several Sections, Roundtables, and Committees are either gearing up or are already actively involved in plans for everything from organizing webinars to programs for the forthcoming joint conference with the Arkansas Library Association. Don’t forget to register for that joint conference taking place in Hot Springs September 27-29 (see http://www.selaonline.org/sela/conferences/2019.html).

I’d like to thank Michael Hooper, Co-Chair of the Website Committee, for addressing an important problem that came up recently. Because of some policy changes regarding the hosting of “outside websites” on the Austin Peay State University Library server, it was necessary to locate a new home for the SELA website. Michael worked competently and rapidly after getting SELA Executive Committee approval, and the SELA website now resides in the GoDaddy cloud. Everything is functional and looks good. As a very non-technological relic (MLS, 1980), I am most appreciative of Michael’s good work in making this important transition since so much SELA business is done online and via the website.

You may recall I have an interest in having SELA become more involved in the area of library advocacy whether it’s on behalf of libraries in general or library employees. The SELA Board generated 19 advocacy ideas, I am happy to report. I boiled these down to what I hope is a manageable six. Several Board members (including myself) have come forward to work on at least several of these ideas. Even if the end product is fairly modest, I feel encouraged, since some advocacy efforts are definitely better than none. I believe the development and implementation of these advocacy ideas will better help fulfill the objectives stated in the SELA Constitution: “to promote and foster library and information services in the southeastern region of the United States through cooperation, research, and the encouragement of staff development.” (See Article II, page 7 of the SELA Handbook at http://www.selaonline.org/sela/contacts/SELA_Handbook.pdf).

Tim Dodge
Auburn University
Academic Library & Athletics Partnerships:  
A Literature Review on Outreach Strategies and Development Opportunities  
A. Blake Denton

A. Blake Denton is currently the Special Collections Librarian at the Fred J. Taylor Library and Technology Center at the University of Arkansas at Monticello and can be reached at DentonA@uamont.edu. This paper received the Alabama Library Association College University and Special Libraries Division Research Award.

Introduction

In recent years, collaboration between academic libraries and non-academic departments in higher education has emerged as a popular trend in practice and is a frequent topic in contemporary scholarly literature. Recent research suggests that there are at least 180 academic libraries involved in a wide variety of partnerships with non-academic departments at colleges and universities across the United States. Academic libraries have forged collaborative relationships with writing centers, international student services, veterans support departments, and chaplain services, to name a few (Wainright & Davidson, 2017). While there is a growing interest in scholarship concerning these various types of partnerships with non-academic departments, arguably one of the most neglected of these arrangements are academic library-athletics partnerships.

Relationships between academic libraries and athletics are not a recent phenomenon. The earliest of these partnerships were forged in the 1970s and 1980s. According to Wainright & Davidson (2017), there are at least 50 of this particular type of partnership found at various American institutions of higher education. Since the late 80’s, academic librarians have written about the emergence of these partnerships between academic libraries and campus athletics departments. Relatively little scholarship, however, has been produced about this niche field. The common observation made by Rothenberg & Thomas (2000), Robinson & Mack (2004), Davidson & Peyton (2007), Caniano (2015), and Sapp & Vaughan (2017) concerning the scarcity of literature about student-athlete centered library outreach partnerships also applies more generally to the state of scholarship on academic library relationships with athletics departments.

As O’English and McCord (2006) observe, the existing literature can be divided into two general categories: library outreach provided to student-athletes and partnerships forged with athletics departments for marketing/development purposes. Literature concerning the former appeared in scholarly publications first, but these efforts seem to have emerged concurrently. Significantly, O’English and McCord were the first to discuss the literature of both categories. While useful, their overview is very brief. Their article, published over a decade ago, remains the only holistic attempt to review both trends. The purpose of this literature review is to provide an updated, more comprehensive analysis of all scholarship pertaining to academic library-athletics partnerships and to highlight related issues.

Outreach Partnerships with Athletics: Assisting an Underserved User Group

According to the ALA Glossary (2013), an outreach program can be defined as a “program designed for and targeted to an underserved or inadequately served user group.” Jesudason (1989 & 2000), Ruscella (1993), Puffer-Rothenberg & Thomas (1999), Forys, Forys, Ford, & Dodd (2000), Lorenzen & Lucas (2002), Robinson & Mack (2004), Davidson & Peyton (2007), Caniano (2015), and Sapp & Vaughan (2017) have all documented the unique challenges that student-athletes face: many individual of this particular demographic, through no fault of their own, are academically unprepared for higher education when they enter college. They are often the victims of dubious recruiting methods and are classified “at-risk” shortly after they start their freshman year. To make matters worse, student-athletes have little time to devote to their studies because of their demanding schedules. Outside of class, these students’ schedules are filled with long, arduous practices/workouts and extensive traveling to participate in games and matches. These athletes are also confronted with unflattering preconceived notions held against them by members of the faculty, student body, and general public. As Caniano aptly suggests, “these underserved students need every tool that higher education and the academic library can furnish them in order to excel academically.”

An examination of the literature revealed 15 documented student-athlete centered outreach partnerships between academic libraries and athletics departments in the United States: the University of Central Florida (Ruscella, 1993); Hofstra University (Caniano, 2015); Indiana University (Jesudason, 1989; Lorenzen & Lucas, 2002); the University of Iowa (Forys, Forys, Ford, & Dodd, 2000); James Madison University (Sapp & Vaughan, 2017); Kutztown University (Robinson & Mack, 2004); Michigan State University (Lorenzen & Lucas, 2002); Mississippi State University (Davidson & Peyton, 2007); Pennsylvania State University (Robinson & Mack, 2004); the University of Texas at Austin (Robinson & Mack, 2004). The nature of the relationship between the libraries and athletics at the University of Texas at Austin and what services the former provides for the latter is unclear. Robinson and Mack simply state that, “The University of Texas at Austin
mentions the library on its ‘Academic Excellence and the University of Texas’ Web page publicizing sports at that campus.”); Valdosta State University (Puffer-Rothenberg & Thomas, 1999); Vanderbilt University (Costin & Morgan, 2019); Virginia Wesleyan College (Erdmann & Clark, 2016); Washington State University (O’English & McCord, 2006); and the University of Wisconsin, Madison (Jesudason, 1989 & 2000).

Historical context is key to understanding the emergence and evolution of these unique partnerships. In the early 1980s, collegiate athletics came under intense public scrutiny because of rampant unethical practices among coaches, student-athletes, and other stakeholders. Many athletes were recruited solely for their athletic ability without regard to their academic capabilities. In 1983, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) responded to this by instituting Proposition 48. The intent of Proposition 48 was to remedy these problems by raising the academic standards for student-athletes. Entering freshman were required to have a 2.0 minimum GPA in eleven core classes and a score of 15 or higher on the ACT (700 minimum on the SAT). In order to participate in their sports and keep their scholarships, these student-athletes were required to maintain certain grades (England & Knight, 1982; Jesudason, 1989 & 2000; Ruscella, 1993; Puffer-Rothenberg & Thomas, 2000).

Against this backdrop, the earliest of the academic library—athletics outreach partnerships emerged. Indiana University Libraries allegedly had a partnership in place with athletics as far back as 1982 (Jesudason, 1989; Lorenzen & Lucas, 2002); In their respective articles, Jesudason and Lorenzen cite D. England & B. Knight’s (1982) Athletics, academics, and ethics: An interview with Bob Knight. The Phi Delta Kappan 64(3), 159-63. This particular source, however, does not mention Indiana University Libraries or any type of partnership between the libraries and athletics programs). Later in the decade, the University of Wisconsin, Madison (Jesudason, 1989 & 2000); the University of Iowa (Forys, Forys, Ford, & Dodd, 2000); and the University of Central Florida (Ruscella, 1993) established their own. In 1992, the NCAA raised the minimum grade point average to 2.5. Following this decision, Valdosta State University’s Odum Library implemented a similar outreach partnership for its student-athletes in 1996 (Puffer-Rothenberg & Thomas, 2000). It is worth noting that in 2002, the NCAA decided to modify their rules by allowing high school grades to substitute for low test scores. See Robinson and Mack, 2004).

With the turn of the 21st century, a shift occurred in the focus of these particular outreach partnerships as the internet became more pervasive in higher education. The early partnerships described above transitioned from exclusively teaching their student-athletes how to use print/physical resources and services to incorporating instruction on electronic based library resources and services. In particular, articles concerning this development at the University of Iowa (Forys, Forys, Ford, & Dodd, 2000) and the University of Wisconsin, Madison (Jesudason, 2000) describe these evolutionary processes. In the late 1990s, College Library at the University of Wisconsin, Madison gradually established an email reference service for their student-athletes (Jesudason, 2000). In 2004, Robinson & Mack conceptualized the unique circumstances that student-athletes face within the evolving landscape of higher education in the early 21st century: “For many colleges and universities, the football team might well have been the original group of ‘distance learners’ because even early team members were movable students who changed locations frequently, traveling to fulfill sports competition obligations while maintaining campus residence and presence when not on the road.” More recently, librarians at Hofstra University developed an online information literacy course tailored specifically for entering student-athletes (Caniano, 2015).

Whether the impetus for these outreach partnerships with athletics was Proposition 48 or the rapid changes that have transformed higher education in the early 21st century, all of these arrangements have the same timeless mission in mind: to serve the special needs of the student-athlete. These outreach partnerships have come in many different forms. Orientation sessions have been offered at the University of Wisconsin, Madison (Jesudason, 1989); Valdosta State University (Puffer-Rothenberg & Thomas, 1999); the University of Iowa (Forys, Forys, Ford, & Dodd, 2000); Michigan State University (Lorenzen & Lucas, 2002); Pennsylvania State University (Robinson & Mack, 2004); Mississippi State University (Davidson & Peyton, 2007); and James Madison University (Sapp & Vaughan, 2017).

Whether as part of an orientation session or offered independently, academic libraries have provided a diverse range of services to their respective student-athlete populations. Valdosta State University (Puffer-Rothenberg & Thomas, 1999), the University of Iowa (Forys, Forys, Ford, & Dodd, 2000), Michigan State University (Lorenzen & Lucas, 2002), Pennsylvania State University, Kutztown University (Robinson & Mack, 2004), Washington State University (O’English & McCord, 2006), and Vanderbilt University (Costin & Morgan, 2019) have all planned and given tours tailored specifically for this user group.

Sessions on bibliographic instruction, information literacy, and/or research skills have been offered to student-athletes at the University of Wisconsin, Madison (Jesudason, 1989 & 2000); the University of Central Florida (Ruscella, 1993); Valdosta State University (Puffer-Rothenberg & Thomas, 1999); the University of Iowa (Forys, Forys, Ford, & Dodd, 2000); Michigan State University (Lorenzen & Lucas, 2002); Pennsylvania State University (Robinson & Mack, 2004); Mississippi State University (Davidson & Peyton, 2007); Hofstra University (Caniano, 2015); Virginia Wesleyan College (Erdmann & Clark, 2016); James Madison University (Sapp & Vaughan, 2017); and Vanderbilt University (Costin & Morgan, 2019).
It is worth noting that in two different partnerships, coaches or librarians astutely harnessed their athletes’ competitive nature to make their research training meaningful. Following the library workshop for Virginia Wesleyan College’s field hockey team, the coach invited the librarians to a team banquet where the players competed for best research presentation (Erdmann & Clark, 2016). At Vanderbilt University, the librarians decided to design their instruction session as a competitive game. As Costin and Morgan (2019) explain, “This choice intended to capitalize on the student athlete’s competitive nature, while ensuring they demonstrated understanding of library services and resources.”

In at least one case, library instruction has transcended informal sessions. As part of its partnership with athletics, Washington State University librarians began teaching a mandatory one credit seminar on library instruction to students attending on scholarship (O’English & McCord, 2006). Some institutions have gone a step beyond providing library instruction to student-athletes. Librarians at the University of Wisconsin, Madison (Jesudason, 2000) and at Vanderbilt University (Costin & Morgan, 2019) have offered training to athletic academic advisors/counselors while tutors for student-athletes have been targeted at Michigan State University (Lorenzen & Lucas, 2002) and Mississippi State University (Davidson & Peyton, 2007).

While library instruction is the heart of most of these outreach partnerships, academic librarians have also offered other valuable services to student-athletes as well. Recognizing the demanding schedules of these users, academic librarians at Michigan State University (Lorenzen & Lucas, 2002), Washington State University (O’English & McCord, 2006), Hofstra University (Caniano, 2015), and Vanderbilt University (Costin & Morgan, 2019) have provided weekly or periodic on-site reference assistance at athletic centers directly to students. At Pennsylvania State University, librarians established a web page specifically for their student-athletes, which was well received by students and advisors alike (Robinson & Mack, 2004). As a part of their efforts to provide service to their student-athletes throughout their tenure at Michigan State University, the library has offered sessions designed to teach outgoing student-athletes how to research businesses as they begin looking for employment (Lorenzen & Lucas, 2002).

While these practitioners undoubtedly established their respective outreach programs with ensuring student-athlete success in their studies as the primary objective, some have noted how these arrangements can serve the cause of the academic library as well. In her first article, Jesudason (1989) observed that these partnerships, “will bring the libraries more recognition from the academic and local communities and from powerful alumni groups, since sports generate a significant amount of the income that enables educational institutions to expand other programs.” In a similar vein, Davidson and Peyton (2007) warned that, “With declining budgets, libraries must embrace partnerships, networking, and collaborating now more than ever.”

**Cash-Strapped: The Need for Academic Library Fundraising**

For nearly fifty years, fundraising has been a perennial subject of scholarly interest for academic librarians. Eaton (1971) published an article that set the stage for future scholarship. He argued that though academic librarians had largely disregarded fundraising in the past, they could no longer afford to forfeit untapped development potential in an age where the financial burden of maintaining academic libraries continued to mount. In the decades since, Fischler (1987), Burlingame (1987), Alexander (1998), Rader (2000), Dewey (2006), Cuillier & Stoffle (2011), Dilworth & Henzl (2017), and many others have contributed to this discussion, often echoing Eaton’s call to action as well as examining several development strategies in place at academic libraries across the United States.

**Development Partnerships with Athletics: A Review of Limitless Opportunities**

All combined, a total of 20 partnerships have been identified and described from the existing literature: California State University, Fresno (Gilbert, 2000; Rockman, 2001; Rockman 2002); Clemson University (Gilbert, 2000); Duke University (Cuillier & Stoffle, 2011; Free, 2011; Dilworth & Henzl, 2017); the University of Georgia (Gilbert, 2000); Indiana University (Neal, 1997; Dewey, 2006); the University of Kentucky (Cuillier & Stoffle, 2011); Louisiana State University (Neal, 1997); the University of Louisville (Gilbert, 2000; Dewey, 2006); the University of Michigan (Neal, 1997); the University of Nebraska (Dewey, 2006); the University of New Mexico (Trojahn & Lewis, 1997; Gilbert, 2000); the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill (Gilbert, 2000); North Carolina State University (Cuillier & Stoffle, 2011); Ohio State University (Cuillier & Stoffle, 2011); the University of Oklahoma (Dewey, 2006); The Pennsylvania State University (Neal, 1997; Gilbert, 2000; Dewey, 2006), the University of Tennessee (Dewey, 2006), Texas A&M University (Marshall, 1996; Neal, 1997; Gilbert, 2000); Texas Tech University (Dewey, 2006), and Washington State University (O’English & McCord, 2006).

The particular types of development partnerships that academic libraries can forge with their athletics departments is as diverse as the number of actual examples. The earliest example provided in the literature began in the late 1970s with Indiana University basketball coach Bob Knight. Later in 1989, he established the Knight Library Endowment and collected over $1 million for the university’s libraries with major fundraisers such as a film premier and Knight’s 50th birthday party roast. Knight was also involved in library fundraising efforts when he later coached at Texas Tech University (Neal, 1997; Drape, 2001; Dewey, 2006). The renowned relationship between the academic libraries and athletics department at The Pennsylvania State
University is easily one of the most successful partnerships. Much of its success is due to the active involvement and advocacy of long-time football coach Joe Paterno. In the 80’s, the football coach established the Joe Paterno Library Endowment to provide funding to Penn State’s libraries. In addition, Paterno aggressively fundraised for the libraries and personally contributed himself. In the early 90’s, he helped rake in $13.75 million as chair of the Campaign for the Library. Joe and Sue Paterno’s $250,000 contribution was designated for a humanities reading room. In 1995, the couple donated half a million for the construction of a new library, which was named in their honor. In 1998, the Paternos gifted Penn State $3.5 million, a portion of which was allocated for employing an additional librarian (Neal, 1997; Gilbert, 2000; Dewey, 2006). There is little wonder why Gilbert considers this alliance at Penn State the “best-known” academic library-athletics partnership.

In 1988, former University of Georgia football coach and athletic director Vince Dooley and his wife organized the Dooley Library Endowment Fund. Furthermore, Dooley launched a fundraising campaign that amassed over $2 million for the libraries’ electronic databases and computers. The former coach personally contributed $10,000 for a new library building, helped purchase historical documents for the library’s collection, and served on the library board of visitors. Starting in the 80’s, basketball coaches and their wives have actively fundraised for their libraries at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. This has included appearing in an ad for the libraries in a UNC alumni publication and providing endowments for them. Bill and Leesie Guthridge personally contributed to the renovation drive for the R. B. House Undergraduate Library and also created a fund to support that particular library (Gilbert, 2000).

In the early 90’s, a relationship was forged between the football program and libraries at Texas A&M University. Proceeds from the Aggie Kick-Off Camp (an annual summer camp for the team’s wealthy adult supporters) were donated to the libraries. By the end of the decade, this fundraiser had amassed more than $100,000 for the libraries. Capitalizing on this momentum, library dean Fred Heath initiated a public relations campaign for the Sterling C. Evans Library with football coach R. C. Slocum when Texas A&M was assigned to the Big 12 Conference. Both fundraising and public relations partnerships earned the Sterling C. Evans Library the John Cotton Dana Library Public Relations Award in 1996 (Marshall, 1996; Neal, 1997; Gilbert, 2000).

When Ron Cooper began coaching football at the University of Louisville, the libraries reached out to him about establishing a partnership. Cooper agreed and organized a library fund for undergraduate programs. He was able to convince patrons of the Cardinal Athletic Fund to donate to this new library fund. Local business Fischer Packing contributed by establishing an award on behalf of the team member with the longest run in every home game. This initiative eventually grew into the Cardinal Campaign for the Libraries and involved all coaches and staff. This particular library fundraiser was also incorporated into Louisville’s annual fund drive (Gilbert, 2000).

The dynamic relationship between libraries and athletics at the University of New Mexico has also featured prominently in the literature. According to Gilbert, New Mexico has “one of the broadest-based partnerships with athletics. Many of its programs are true partnerships in that the proceeds are shared by the library and athletics.” In the mid 90’s UNM basketball coach David G. Bliss chaired the library annual fund campaign. The Books and Baskets drive resulted in contributions that totaled $100,000, which was evenly divided between the libraries and athletics. A number of other joint campaigns have been undertaken, including arrangements with private businesses. St. Joseph’s Healthcare System’s sponsorship of the “Hustle and Heart” award and the Intel Scorers for Scholars were both campaigns that generated funding for UNM Libraries.

Of all the fundraising initiatives achieved, the partnership between the First State Bank of New Mexico, the University of New Mexico’s Athletics Department, and the UNM Libraries is arguably the crown jewel. New Mexico’s First State Bank decided to reach out to UNM’s athletics department about starting an affinity credit card that would target Lobo fans and generate new customers for the bank. A three-way partnership emerged between the bank, athletics, and the academic library where new customers were given the option of donating their $25 initiation fee to the libraries or athletics. In addition, one percent of the debt each customer charged every month was divided and given to both athletics and the libraries. For the first year of this partnership, the libraries received an estimated $40,000 donation. Including the libraries in this agreement attracted a wider base of cardholders, particularly, among UNM faculty, that athletics alone could not entice. This partnership was a resounding success for all three parties. (Trojahn & Lewis, 1997).

In 1998, basketball coach Jerry Tarkanian and his wife Lois contributed $100,000 to organize a book fund for Madden Library at California State University, Fresno. In 1999, the couple established the “Basket for Books Program,” where individual and corporate sponsors agreed to give a certain dollar amount for every point scored by the basketball team. Because of this campaign, Madden Library received $10,000 in contributions in one year alone (Gilbert, 2000; Rockman, 2001; Rockman, 2002).

Around the turn of the 21st century, Ohio State University Libraries began receiving a cut of their institution’s licensing and trademarks sales (approximately 25% annually). The athletics department has also directly contributed funding for library construction projects. In 2007 and 2008, for instance, head football coach Jim Tressel served as a co-chair for a library capital campaign. The athletics department was responsible for providing $9 million of the $30 million dollars raised for the Thompson Memorial Library (Cuillier & Stoffle, 2011; Stinson, 2017).
In the early 2000’s, Washington State University Libraries developed a successful marketing partnership with WSU Athletics and the university’s marketing and communications division. During football season, the libraries launched a three part advertising blitz that included announcing “Fun Sports Facts” at home games, recognizing a “Student Athlete of the Week” (determined by the Athletics Department), and frequently sponsoring ads in the campus newspaper that highlighted sources available at the library while enticing readers to go to the libraries’ website to be entered into a drawing for complimentary tickets (O’English & McCord, 2006). In 2011, the Friends of the Library at North Carolina State University were fundraising with their institution’s football and basketball programs. The objective of this partnership was to raise $35,000 through the “Touchdowns for Hunt” and “Threes for Hunt” drives to name a study group room in the James B. Hunt Jr. Library in recognition of the university’s student-athlete population (Cuillier & Stoffle, 2011).

Duke University Libraries’ partnership is the most recent of all. In 2011, the athletics department began donating a portion of the proceeds from regular home ticket sales (beginning with the 2011-12 soccer seasons) to the Duke Athletics Library Fund. One dollar per ticket sold was set aside specifically for the library fund. The only exception for that first year were football tickets because those had already been released for sale to the public. It is worth noting that Duke’s partnership is one of the few to include fundraising from other programs besides football and basketball. Yet the relationship between the libraries and basketball program is renown among practitioners. In addition to the dollar proceeds from ticket sales, the libraries enjoy free marketing at games, in basketball publications, and even from the players (Cuillier & Stoffle, 2011; Free, 2011; Dilworth & Henzl, 2017).

Academic library-athletics partnerships need not be ambitious or elaborate. There is no shortage of simple arrangements that have generated much needed revenue for the libraries involved. Athletics-organized “Fun Runs” have benefitted the libraries at Louisiana State University, the University of Tennessee, and the University of Nebraska, (Neal, 1997; Dewey, 2006). On at least one occasion, revenue generated from a spring football game was donated to LSU Libraries (Neal, 1997). At the University of Oklahoma, the library and athletics department teamed up to raise a $1 million endowment campaign (Dewey, 2006).

Patches of old turf at the University of Michigan’s football stadium were sold with proceeds going to the library (Neal, 1997). Gilbert reported that every time a member passed away, Clemson University’s athletic booster club would contribute $100 to the library in honor of that member (2000). The Athletics Association at the University of Kentucky donated $3 million annually for the retirement of bonds used to establish one of the university’s new libraries (Gilbert, 2000; Cuillier & Stoffle, 2011). There are also numerous academic libraries that benefit from donations taken from profits generated by post-season basketball tournaments and football bowl games (Neal, 1997).

**Archives, Athletics, & Outreach Partnerships**

The *ALA Glossary* (2013) also defines an outreach program as one that “encourages users to utilize library services.” As the existing literature suggests, archives and digital libraries are well positioned to form partnerships with athletics programs and other non-academic departments when the projects involve an institution’s sports history. At the University of Oregon, the archivists undertook a digitization project designed to preserve the institution’s sports history, particularly the university’s track & field legacy. Briston (2007) makes it apparent that the purpose for this project was to appeal to and raise the profile of the archives among the university’s fan base. While no formal partnership with athletics is mentioned, employing a former student-athlete and MBA candidate led to the development of a partnership between the library and archives department, the Warsaw Sports Marketing Center, and the Lundquist College of Business.

Most recently, the Baylor University Libraries Athletics Archive (BULAA) was established as a partnership between Baylor Athletics, the Electronic Library, and the Institute for Oral History. The purpose of this partnership and archive is to preserve and digitize Baylor University’s storied sports history. Former Head Football Coach Grant Teaff was a crucial figure who assisted the library faculty with launching the archive and raising awareness of its existence among his former players, fans, and the Baylor University community (Ames, 2012). The examples at the University of Oregon and Baylor University demonstrate how archives and digital libraries at other institutions can establish similar projects that capitalize on the enthusiasm of their respective sports fan bases in order to increase information services usage. Raising the profile of the archives or digital library through outreach partnerships like this may prove essential to ensuring their longevity in the future.

**Non-Partnership Outreach & Development Opportunities**

There are also ways in which the library can become involved with athletics short of establishing partnerships that raises its profile on campus and among potential donors. McDonald, Sears, and Mitchell (2000) demonstrate the possibilities of marketing the academic library at home sports events in the absence of a formal partnership with the athletics department. In the late 1990s, Auburn University Libraries started marketing their digital resources and services by giving away promotional merchandise and performing on-the-spot reference interviews at a gameday tent to sports fans entering the football stadium.

In his article about Faculty Athletics Representatives (FARs), Lombard (2015) explores why few academic librarians serve in this capacity and weigh the positives and negatives of having a librarian fulfill this role. While he
does not specifically address fundraising. Lombard does suggest that an academic library can gain from having one of its own serve as a FAR because (according to one interviewee) the reputation of the library can rise among administration and faculty and that the FAR librarian can gain a greater knowledge of how the university is managed. Considering Lombard’s article through the lens of outreach or development, the librarian appointed to this position has the potential to either help establish a partnership with athletics or persuade administrators of the need for other fundraising opportunities for the library.

**Ephemeral or Perpetual?: A Question of Longevity**

At the conclusion of their literature review on marketing/development partnerships, O’English and McCord suggest that, “These approaches have tended to relate to single events, teams, or opportunities and generally have not had a long term or programmatic focus” (2006). When considering the examples of the “Fun Runs” or turf sale at the University of Michigan, that characterization seems appropriate. Yet Wainright and Davidson’s (2017) recent research on partnerships between academic libraries and non-academic departments suggests otherwise. Though they also recognize that the existing literature implies “one-time” partnerships, an analysis of their results paints a different picture.

Wainright and Davidson conducted an anonymous survey for practitioners at American academic libraries. They received and examined 180 responses. According to the Figure 1 chart, there are at least 50 academic library-athletics partnerships in the United States. Table 6 breaks down the longevity of different types of partnerships into four categories: “less than 1 year,” “1-3 years,” “3-5 years,” and “5 or more years.” Of the 50 academic library-athletics partnerships, 43 of those arrangements are classified by longevity. Only one had been established within a year prior to the survey. The remaining 42 were fairly evenly distributed with 16 in the “1-3 years” category, 15 in the “3-5 years” category, and 11 in the “5 or more years” category. The results of Wainright and Davidson’s survey suggests that most of these partnerships are not ephemeral in nature.

The literature review above, however, clearly demonstrates that the term “partnership” is a relative one, particularly for the marketing/development relationships. These twenty arrangements range from one-time events to active, ongoing relationships. It is possible that some of Wainright and Davidson’s participants may have listed both outreach and marketing/development partnerships that have become dormant over time. Thus, new research is needed that will address this ambiguity.

**Future Research**

In addition to providing an updated, more comprehensive analysis of both outreach and marketing/development partnerships forged between academic libraries and athletics departments, this literature review raises many questions that require new research. Most of these arrangements were established over a decade ago. Research is needed to determine the current state of every partnership, outreach and fundraising alike, in order to eliminate the ambiguity that currently exists concerning use of the term “partnership.” While the literature concerning outreach partnerships describe the services academic libraries provide to athletics, the same cannot be said for the scholarship concerning the development partnerships. Secondary research questions include determining what services (if any) academic libraries provide as part of these fundraising partnerships as well as determining how they have used the funding they received from these arrangements. Between this literature review and future research on the questions raised herein, it is hoped that academic librarians who are interested in forging an outreach or marketing/development partnership will find both informative and useful as they plan to establish their own.
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Introduction

The evaluation of academic library space and its use is not a new concept within the world of academic libraries. For a number of years, librarians and libraries have been asked to prove their worth by documenting services and use within their physical library buildings. Space within the J.D. Williams Library, the main library at the University of Mississippi, became a concern due to consistent and, for several years, increasing freshman enrollment. Library staff reported hearing students complain about lack of space and electrical outlets. Much of the information available to library administration about the use of library space by patrons was anecdotal. In order to provide a more accurate image of student use of library space, an observational study using a modified version of the Visual Traffic Sweep (VTS) method was used to collect patron actions within the library.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine how patrons use library public spaces. The idea for the study evolved from decisions that were being made or considered in regard to removing desktop stations from public use rather than upgrading them. The general assumption on the subject is that most patrons are using their own devices (i.e. laptops or tablets). If this is the case, the library would not need to maintain its current number of public computers and could create more public study space. While there is data on public computer use within the J.D. Williams Library, there is no data that could represent the number of patrons using their own devices within the library. The previous year’s library patron survey pointed to library desktops as being important to patrons and particularly to students. Within the survey, there were many comments related to library space or lack of space for students trying to study. Feedback from the library patron survey about library spaces stated: “More space! And those wooden chairs are terrible to sit in for more than 30 minutes!”, “Sometimes I have a hard time finding somewhere to sit. Need more seats/desks”, “I study at the library for about 2 hours every day and most days, it is very hard to find an empty table or space to study. If I find an empty table it is usually not close to an electrical outlet so I can charge my laptop while I study.” Another impetus for the study is that public library spaces are constantly being rearranged by students. Librarians notice soft furniture being dragged up to wood tables, into group study rooms, and even moved to different floors. With all of this in mind, a team set about observing, collecting, and analyzing patron actions so library administration could have the appropriate data to make informed, evidence-based decisions. The goal of the research was to accurately record the use of public library spaces and patron actions within the spaces.

Research Questions

- **RQ1**: Can patron feedback about library facilities and spaces be backed up by observational evidence?
- **RQ2**: Which public library spaces are used the most?
- **RQ3**: Which public library spaces are used the least?
- **RQ4**: How are patrons using the most-used spaces?
- **RQ5**: How are patrons using the least-used spaces?

Literature Review

**Visual Traffic Sweeps Method**

Given and Archibald (2015) describe the Visual Traffic Sweep method (VTS) as an approach that allows researchers to obtain a view of how patrons interact within a particular space. Several studies such as Xia (2005), Dominguez (2016), and May and Swabey (2015) have used this or similar methods to evaluate the use of library and non-library spaces. The method uses observational data gathered most often through seating sweeps along with tools to visualize the observational data. Pre-testing is suggested prior to the commencement of the actual data collection period; this should serve to catch any mistakes so that the process of collecting the data goes smoothly once the project begins (Given & Archibald, 2015).

As mentioned by Lindsay (2016), when assessing space and usage of said space within the academic library, the reliance solely on gate counts can be detrimental. Gate counts can be inaccurate and simply do not tell the whole story, so to rely on those counts for usage data alone is doing a disservice to your library. This study used a similar method to the Visual Traffic Sweep method mentioned in Given and Archibald (2015), Xia (2005), Dominguez (2016), and May and Swabey (2015). While seating sweeps methods are valuable in allowing a capture of the number of people in an area, they do not easily and quickly allow...
for accurate documentation of student actions. Therefore, the current study decided to use photographs instead of the standard VTS method. Various forms of technology are often used along with this method. In the case of Lindsay’s (2016) study, Google forms were used on an iPad to record the seating sweep counts as they were taken.

**Evaluation of Library Services and Spaces**

Academic libraries’ facilities come in a variety of sizes and shapes. No matter the square footage, many libraries have encountered space and related technology issues. Academic libraries frequently find themselves dealing with older buildings and a scarcity of electrical outlets that make the use of mobile technologies such as laptops, tables, and smartphones difficult. Ramsden (2016) mentions various ethnographic methods that can be used in libraries “to discover how others experience library services and environments, utilizing methods including, but definitely not limited to, observation, interviews, and mapping of experiences” (p. 356). It is important that librarians recognize that an academic library should not be modeled after what librarians want it to be but instead should be modeled after how it can best serve and support its campus communities. The assessment of library spaces fits into three categories according to Ramsden (2016): “assessment of new builds/designs, assessment of old spaces to feed into new design plans, and learning” about space use to “create space or usage pattern typologies” (p. 360). Montgomery (2014) used ethnographic surveys to gain insight on user’s space needs. According to Montgomery, “the importance of library space is shifting from the content on our shelves to how students use and learn in our space” (p. 70).

Lopatovska and Regalado (2016) used ethnographic methods to collect observational data of library users’ behavior and actions within four different academic libraries. The authors collected data over a one-week period when it was concluded that the libraries would not be experiencing extremely high or low usage. This short period of data collection time is a recurring aspect of many observational studies. In the current study, it was decided that a longer observation period was important to record busy and slow periods of use within the library so that a more complete view of library usage could be recorded.

Lopatovska and Regalado (2016) observed that most students appeared to be occupied with some type of study behavior such as reading or taking notes. The authors also noted that an array of relevant related resources were used by library users and that user preference for print or digital resources varied by the type and current stage of the project the user was completing. Overall findings showed that students came to the library and used a variety of resources regardless of a requirement to do so in their assignments. The authors suggest that when designing library spaces, libraries should include the need for appropriate space and access to resources beyond simply the library collection. Many academic libraries have encountered issues related to reallocation of library spaces to other non-library units. In such cases, libraries have studied the available space in their buildings and how that space is then being used. Lux, Snyder, and Boff’s (2016) case study of library and non-library units is an example.

Matthews and Walton’s (2014) case study of Loughborough University library reflects the assessment process of many academic libraries. The authors describe a process of general user surveys every three years and specific space related surveys given to the university community. Included in their assessment was the process of using photos and videos to capture visual evidence of library space use and changes. Houlihan (2005) states that students want an environment that is designed for the way that they “study, research, and communicate” (p. 9).

In the article, “The library is for studying: Student preferences for study space,” Applegate (2009) asks how students use library “soft spaces” (p. 341). Applegate defines soft spaces as “carrels, tables, soft chairs, and study rooms” (p. 341). Applegate’s method was similar to the VTS method. Collection times for observational data were recorded during specific weeks of two separate semesters. Those weeks were chosen due to information showing the last two to four weeks as the busiest of the semester. Applegate states that an “effective library is one that addresses the entire spectrum of student needs, does so as part of the entire student space-use ecology on campus, and has the capacity to meet needs that increase over the course of a semester” (p. 345).

Oliveira (2016) used a blended method of traditional and ethnographic methods to learn what types of spaces students wanted in the library. For a two-month period, observational data was collected from multiple locations within the library. Similarly to this study, Oliveira noted that an administrator mentioned the lack of need for the library to continue to provide so many public library computers to users as most users now have their own laptops or tablets. Findings from Oliveira, however, show that public computer usage in the library is high. Further findings by Oliveira showed that 50% of users were studying individually and, if users on computers are included, it increases to 90%. The author concludes that if a library creates spaces to serve student needs, students will use the library.

Surveys are one of the most commons ways libraries use to identify the needs of their users. Zhang and Maddison (2016) found, via surveys, that more study space was a high priority for students, specifically, spaces for collaborative and quiet study. Public computers were also seen as a high priority for students, which clashes with the popular idea that publicly available computers in libraries are no longer important as most students have laptops and/or tablets.

**Methodology**

For this study, data were gathered from three floors within the library. The first floor consisted of six locations, the second of three locations, and the third of three locations. The visual traffic sweep method was adapted to include the use of a camera to take photographs of each location. The adaptation allowed for each location to be broken into...
sections and photographed in order to collect patron counts and their actions. Gaffer tape was affixed to the floor in the shape of an arrow with an area code and section number written on it (Figure 1). The creation and positioning of the arrows was important to the project as it ensured the photographs would remain consistent throughout the semester regardless of the team member taking the photograph. A team of four, which included librarians, library staff, and a graduate assistant, took photos of all 12 spaces over the course of the spring semester. A schedule was created to capture library use in those spaces Monday through Friday during the times of 9am to 5pm. These times were chosen as they are the times the library reference desk is operational and have previously been determined to be the library’s busiest hours. The schedule was established and staggered so that it allowed for photos to be taken two days per week two to three times a day. This ensured that all days Monday through Friday and hours 9am through 5pm were captured for the entire semester. By drawing out the data collection process for the entire semester, it allowed data collectors to capture days and times throughout the semester therefore getting a more accurate picture of library use over the semester instead of a small snapshot of use over a smaller time period. The photo method was determined to be the most efficient as photographs could be captured in all 12 library spaces within a 15-minute time period. This also meant that data collectors did not then have to devote large amounts of time to data collection. A checklist was created to be used by each data collector as they moved through the building documenting each of the 12 spaces (Appendix A).

As photographs were taken, one team member downloaded the photos, labeled each one with the proper area code and section number, and then transferred the data with the number of patrons and actions to a paper form. A code was developed in order to quickly label the various patron actions that were taken from the pictures (Tables 1 and 2). It should be noted that patron actions can be combined in multiple ways depending on what the patron was doing. For instance, a patron (P) could be on a desktop (DT) using a cellphone (CP). This action would then be coded at PDtCp. In order to ensure consistency, the same team member transferred all data from the pictures to the paper forms. The data from the paper forms were then plugged into an excel spreadsheet. Data were analyzed using Microsoft Excel and data visualization tool, Tableau.

### Library Spaces

The library is composed of three main floors. Each floor has a designated noise level. The first floor (Figure 2) is the talking floor and has the most public space, the second floor (Figure 3) is the quiet talking floor and has the second most public space, while the third floor (Figure 4) is the no talking floor and has the least amount of public space. The 12 public library spaces in this study were of a variety of types.

The first floor spaces were the:

- **Ainsworth Commons**: Composed of 27 desktop stations, three group study rooms, four pieces of soft furniture at tables, and 12 pieces of soft furniture
- **Government Documents**: Composed of one desktop station and six four-person tables
- **Microfilm Area**: Composed of 1 four-person table, six pieces of soft furniture, and six microfilm machines
- **Information Commons**: Composed of 40 desktop stations, 10 four-person tables, and five group study rooms
- **Sky Light Area 1**: Composed of 6 four-person tables and eight coffins
- **West Circulation Cubby**: Composed of 13 desktop stations and five pieces of soft furniture

The second floor spaces were the:

- **Baxter Room**: Composed of 10 desktop stations, three group study rooms, 6 four-person tables, and 12 pieces of soft furniture
- **Sky Light Area 2**: Composed of 10 four-person tables and one group study room
- **Pilkington Room**: Composed of 34 four-person tables, 2 two-person desks, and 17 pieces of soft furniture

The third floor spaces were the:

- **Retro Room**: Composed of 5 four-person tables, two single-person coffins, and one piece of soft furniture
- **Sky Light Area 3**: Composed of 18 coffins and one group study room
- **Graduate Reading Room**: Composed of four desktop stations, 4 four-person tables, and six pieces of soft furniture

### Results

**RQ1: Can patron feedback about library facilities and spaces be backed up by observational evidence?**

Observational evidence backed up only part of patron feedback. Feedback received from the library patron survey in regard to library spaces indicated that there were not enough seats or tables in the building to accommodate all of those who wish to study. Results from this study found that there were no observed times in which all seats within the public areas of the study were full. However, there were times when all available tables within a specific area were occupied.

**RQ2: Which public library spaces are used the most?**

During the study’s observable times of Monday through Friday from 9am to 5pm, the Pilkington Room (second floor) was determined to be the most used space with an average weekly use of 1,580 people. The Information Commons (first floor) was determined to be the second
most-used space with an average weekly use of 1,151 people. The third most used space was the Ainsworth Commons (first floor) with an average weekly use of 913 people. The average weekly use of all 12 public areas in the study can be seen in Figure 5.

RQ3: Which public library spaces are used the least?

The Microfilm Area (first floor) was determined to be the least-used space with a weekly average of 92 people. The Retro Room (third floor) was determined to be the second least-used space with an average of 159 people each week. The Graduate Reading Room (third floor) was determined to be the third least-used space with an average of 191 people using the space.

RQ4: How are patrons using the most used spaces?

In the most-used space, the Pilkington Room, 28 different types of actions were observed (Figure 6). The most observed action was single patron laptop use (PLt), followed by group study laptop use at the four-person tables (PGLt), and single patron study (PSdy).

In the second most-used space, the Information Commons, 37 different types of actions were observed (Figure 7). The most observed action was single patron desktop use (PDT), followed by group study room laptop use by patron groups (PGGsrLt), and single patron laptop use (PLt).

In the third most-used space, the Ainsworth Commons, 40 different types of actions were observed (Figure 8). The most observed action was single patron desktop use (PDT), followed by single patron laptop use at tables with soft furniture (PLtSfTb), and group study room use by patron groups (PGGsr).

RQ5: How are patrons using the least used spaces?

In the least-used space, the Microfilm Area, 16 different types of actions were observed (Figure 9). The most observed action was single patron microfilm use (PMf), followed by single patron laptop use (PLt), and single patron laptop use at soft furniture (PLtSf).

In the second-least used space, the Retro Room, 10 different types of actions were observed (Figure 10). The most observed action was single patron laptop use (PLt), followed by patron group laptop use (PGLt), and single patron study (PSdy).

In the third-least used space, the Graduate Reading Room, 21 different types of actions were observed (Figure 11). The most observed action was single patron laptop use (PLt), followed by single patron study (PSdy), and patron group laptop use (PGLt).

Discussion

Findings show that while the team approached the study with the idea that there was not adequate seating in the library, the study showed instead that the library did not have the correct type of seating. When usage data was overlapped with table occupation rates in the most used library space, the Pilkington Room, the team found that there were very few times throughout the day/week where no open seats were available. The problem appeared to be that due to the nature of the four-person tables, patrons would not sit down at a four-person table that was already occupied even by one person. These findings were similar to the findings of Applegate (2009), who concluded that library users prefer to sit alone unless they specifically come with someone, a group, or know someone with whom to sit down. Figure 12 shows the average number of open seats at tables in use and not in use per hour in the Pilkington Room on a Wednesday. The Wednesday example was chosen as Wednesday was determined to be the busiest day on average in the library. Figure 13 shows the percentage of tables in use along with the number of people at each. From the figure, one can see that the most frequent situation was a single person occupying a four-person table. This, once again, coincides with Applegate’s (2009) finding that most vacant seats are at tables occupied with at least one person.

One purpose of the study, was to provide library administration with appropriate data to make informed evidence-based decisions. Upon completion of the study, the findings were presented to library administration and the author was asked for suggestions to improve public library spaces based on the findings of the study. The idea was to take patron feedback along with the results of the survey and use this to design spaces where noise was less of an issue while optimizing seating capacity. The findings were first used to make changes to spaces on the second floor. In the Pilkington Room, the room with the heaviest use, soft furniture was moved to one side of the room, closest to the elevators. This was done to create a defined area for the soft furniture in hopes that it would no longer be dragged up to the four-person tables and in order to act as a noise buffer between the table area and the elevators. In another section of the room, there were three different styles of wood tables; rectangle four-person tables, square four-person tables, and blue top rectangle four-person tables. The blue top tables were moved from the space and more four-person square tables were added from Sky Light Area 2. The section of the room with the four-person tables was broken up into two sections. The rectangle tables were pushed together to create communal seating to mimic a reading room atmosphere. The reasoning for this action was to create a space where it would not be unusual or socially awkward to sit next to an unknown person. In the middle section of the room between the rectangle tables and the soft furniture, the square tables were organized into neat rows. All of the chairs for the four-person tables, whether rectangle or square, were matched. After the changes were made to the area, librarians monitored the area for furniture movement. At the end of the first semester after the change, it was found that only one additional wooden chair had been added to the area. All the soft furniture had remained in place.

In Sky Light Area 2, the four-person square tables that were moved to the Pilkington Room were replaced with
two person tables. This made the aisle wider as the two-person tables were narrower than the four-person tables. Additionally, the library hoped that the removal of the four-person square tables would dissuade group work in the space, reducing the noise patrons complained about via the annual surveys.

In the Graduate Reading room, the computers were taken out of the area as study showed little use and computer use data backed up this finding. The blue top tables from the Pilkington Room were moved into this area as a substantial number of the tables in this area were matches to the blue top tables. Matching chairs were arranged in the area to give it a finished matching appearance. The movement of furniture in this area was performed for matching purposes.

Conclusion

More changes are incrementally being made to various spaces included in this study. The guiding thought going forward for improving public library spaces is that students recognize spaces created with a clear and defined use in mind. The problem with the various library spaces before was that they were a hodgepodge of different styles of furniture and each space did not appear to have a defined use. In addition, the layout of the furniture on each floor did not conform with the appropriate noise level assigned to each floor. Furniture within the library will be moved from time to time. The library should, however, make the effort to put the appropriate furniture on each floor with respect to the floor’s noise level (Figure 14). This should continue to encourage various types of study within the library while providing the appropriate furniture for each space. The goal is to decrease excessive furniture movement, improve the ability to find open seating, and to decrease noise complaints by redesigning public spaces to fit students varying needs.
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Figure 1. Arrows with area code and section number

Table 1. Patron action codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patron Actions</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cellphone</td>
<td>Cp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on desktop</td>
<td>Dt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on desktop &amp; laptop</td>
<td>Dtl1t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Study Room</td>
<td>Gsr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on laptop</td>
<td>Lt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desktop station on laptop</td>
<td>Ltdts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>microform machine</td>
<td>Mf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pring Station</td>
<td>Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on Scanner</td>
<td>Scn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studying not computer</td>
<td>Sdy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Furniture</td>
<td>Sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleeping</td>
<td>Slp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at Table</td>
<td>Tb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on Tablet</td>
<td>Tbit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Patron codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of patron</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 person</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more people</td>
<td>PG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2. First floor map

Figure 3. Second floor map
Figure 4. Third floor map

Figure 5. Average weekly patron use by area

Figure 6. Pilkington Room use by number and type of action
Figure 7. Information Commons use by number and type of action

Figure 8. Ainsworth Commons by number and type of action

Figure 9. Microfilm area by number and type of action
Figure 10. Retro room by number and type of action

Figure 11. Graduate Reading room by number and type of action

Figure 12. Pilkington Room open seats at tables on Wednesdays
Figure 13. Pilkington Room tables in use on Wednesdays with number of patrons

Figure 14. Furniture placement structure
## Appendix A

Visual Traffic Sweep Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visual Traffic Sweep Checklist</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Time:</th>
<th>Initials:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1ST FLOOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Documents Room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD1</td>
<td>Sk(1)1</td>
<td>Bx1</td>
<td>Rtr1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD2</td>
<td>Sk(1)2</td>
<td>Bx2</td>
<td>Rtr2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD3</td>
<td>Sk(1)3</td>
<td>Bx3</td>
<td>Rtr3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD4</td>
<td>Sk(1)4</td>
<td>Bx4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ainsworth Commons</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bx5</td>
<td>Grd1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC1</td>
<td>WCC1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grd2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC2</td>
<td>WCC2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grd3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC3</td>
<td>Sk(2)1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC4</td>
<td>Sk(2)2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC5</td>
<td>Sk(2)3</td>
<td>Sky Light Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC6</td>
<td>Sk(3)1</td>
<td>Sky Light Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC7</td>
<td>Grd3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfilm Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pilk1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Pilk2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>Pilk3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Commons</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pilk4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC1</td>
<td>Pilk5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC2</td>
<td>Pilk6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC3</td>
<td>Pilk7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Undergraduate Student Works in Institutional Repositories
An Analysis of Coverage, Prominence and Discoverability

Angel Clemons and Tyler Goldberg

Angel Clemons is an Electronic Resources Librarian at Ekstrom Library of the University of Louisville and can be reached at angel.clemons@louisville.edu. Tyler Goldberg is the Head of Technical Services & Collection Development at the Ekstrom Library of the University of Louisville and can be reached at tyler.goldberg@louisville.edu.

Introduction

Institutional repositories (IRs) have evolved to showcase a wide variety of authors and types of material. The early years of IR development focused on collecting and presenting faculty research, primarily in the form of research papers. Graduate theses and dissertations soon began to be incorporated into the scope of IR collection policies and have become as common in IRs as faculty research. Undergraduate research, however, appears to be much less common than faculty or graduate work. This paper examines the extent to which undergraduate student works (USW) are represented in the IRs of U.S. colleges and universities that use bepress’ Digital Commons product. Types and sizes of collections, span of coverage, prominence, and discoverability are considered. The authors hypothesize that USW are underrepresented in IRs and are not easily discoverable due to lack of available cataloging.

Literature Review

The history of IRs in academia begins, essentially, in the year 2000 with an agreement between Hewlett Packard and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) “to create an infrastructure for storing the digitally born, intellectual output of the MIT community and to make it accessible over the long term to the broadest possible readership” (Baudoin & Branschofsky, 2003, p. 32). This resulted in DSpace, a software that would preserve and enable “easy and open access to all types of digital content including text, images, moving images, mpegs and data sets” (DuraSpace, 2018).

A few months prior to the launch of DSpace in November 2002, the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC), released its position paper on IRs in academic institutions that defined an IR as “a digital archive of the intellectual product created by the faculty, research staff, and students of an institution and accessible to end users both within and outside of the institution, with few if any barriers to access” (Crow, 2002, p. 2). SPARC further noted that the content of an IR should be “institutionally defined, scholarly, cumulative and perpetual, and open and interoperable” (p. 2). Clifford Lynch (2003), in his article Institutional Repositories: Essential Infrastructure for Scholarship in the Digital Age, similarly defined an IR as “a set of services that a university offers to the members of its community for the management and dissemination of digital materials created by the institution and its community members” (p. 2). He went on to state that “a mature and fully realized institutional repository will contain the intellectual works of faculty and students—both research and teaching materials and also documentation of the activities of the institution itself in the form of records of events and performance and of the ongoing intellectual life of the institution” (p. 2).

During the years 2005-2007, four major studies emerged on the overall landscape of IRs in academic institutions. The first was a survey in early 2005 conducted on behalf of the Coalition of Networked Information (CNI) by Clifford Lynch and Joan Lippincott that was designed to provide an overview of the current status of IRs (Lynch & Lippincott, 2005). The survey, which consisted of eleven questions, was sent via email to 124 member academic institutions that were CNI members, and an additional 81 consortia members. The response rate was 78.2% of the 124 member institutions, all of which were doctoral granting universities, and 43.8% of the consortia member institutions (Lynch & Lippincott, 2005). Of the respondents, 40% had an operational IR and 88% of those who did not were in the planning phase of implementing one (Lynch & Lippincott, 2005). Lynch noted several emerging trends that might increase participation in IRs over time, including the adoption of student portfolios and electronic theses and dissertations. Of the survey respondents, nine already included student papers other than theses or dissertations, while another 14 respondents planned to include these materials (Lynch & Lippincott, 2005). Lynch noted that “because the outreach to faculty can be a slow, incremental, somewhat piecemeal process, some institutions begin populating their IRs with the work of their students, rather than their faculty, as a quick means of acquiring a substantial body of a specific type of content. An electronic theses and dissertations (ETD) program is one such approach” (Lynch & Lippincott, 2005).

The following year, the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) published a SPEC Kit detailing an extensive survey that it conducted in 2006 of 123 ARL member libraries (Bailey, 2006). It was designed to collect “baseline data about ARL member institutions’ institutional repository activities” (Bailey, 2006, p. 23). Of the 87 responses that ARL received, 37 institutions had an operational IR (70% of which came online in 2004-2005), 31 were planning for one in the following year, and 19 had no immediate plans (p. 13). At the time of the survey, the authors wrote that “while the growth rate appears to be leveling off at this
point, IRs will continue to be developed and implemented in the near future” (p. 13) with the top three priorities being “to increase global visibility of, preserve, and provide free access to the institution’s scholarship” (p. 14). The surveyors found that “respondents place a wide variety of materials in their repositories” (p. 17) with the most common type being electronic theses and dissertations, followed closely by articles (including preprints and post prints), and to a lesser extent, conference presentations, technical reports, working papers, data sets, learning objects, and multimedia materials (p. 17). At the time of the survey, 73% of respondents with IRs included student produced materials.

Also in 2006, a large scale census of IR activities in the US was conducted by staff of the MIRACLE (Making Institutional Repositories and Collaborative Learning Environment) Project, a project funded by the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) (Markey, Rieh, St. Jean, Kim, & Yakel, 2007). Project staff contacted 2,147 academic libraries and received responses from 446 (20.8%) institutions. The study focused on answering thirteen questions ranging from what kinds of educational institutions have and do not have IRs, to what progress have respondents made on IR policies, to what are the benefits of IRs? When looking specifically at the type of content found in IRs, MIRACLE project staff identified and collected data on 36 document types. Those related to student works included doctoral dissertations, senior and master’s theses, undergraduate and graduate student e-portfolios, undergraduates’ and graduates’ class notes, outlines, assignments, papers, and projects, and raw data files that result from masters and doctoral research (Markey et al., 2007). Doctoral dissertations and master’s theses appeared among the top five most common types of document types in both pilot test IRs and operational IRs (Markey et al., 2007). Senior theses appeared in the top ten document types for both pilot test and operational IRs, while student e-portfolios and student class notes, outlines, assignments, papers and projects appeared among the least common document types (Markey et al., 2007). Undergraduate students were authorized contributors to IRs in 48.5% of the institutions surveyed (Markey et al., 2007).

In a follow-up to Lynch and Lippincott’s 2005 survey of IRs, McDowell utilized a more sophisticated method of information-gathering to expand on the baseline data created by the original survey (2007). The author used several online resources (e.g., DSpace Instances Wiki, Registry of Open Access Repositories, etc.) to monitor the addition of American IRs over a two-year period (McDowell, 2007). McDowell argued that the projects undertaken by ARL in 2006 and Lynch and Lippincott in 2005 underrepresented the growth of IRs in US academic institutions, as her method uncovered a much larger number of implementers (2007). McDowell’s study focused on repository size and growth as well as types of materials found within. Interestingly, McDowell found that “student work accounts for the largest percentage of items in IRs. Approximately 41.5% of all items in American academic IRs were student-produced, including over 93,000 ETDs. Another 11,000 items, or 4.5% of repository contents, were other student-created works, primarily senior honours theses” (2007). Like Lynch and Lippincott, and the ARL survey, this study revealed that nearly from the beginning, student work played a prominent role in the creation of IRs.

In the midst of this three-year period that produced sweeping studies on IRs, Nolan and Costanza wrote about a joint project between Trinity University and Carleton, Dickinson, and Middlebury Colleges to develop a consortia level IR that was designed to promote student work, specifically undergraduate theses (2006). Although promoting and archiving were “sufficient reasons to justify an IR”, they also wanted their students “to develop some conception of the issues surrounding copyright, fair use, licensing, and alternative publishing models” (Nolan & Costanza, 2006, p. 92). These libraries, which formed the Liberal Arts Scholarly Repository (LASR) consortium, contracted with Berkeley Electronic Press (bepress) to create an IR called Digital Commons CDMT (Nolan & Costanza, 2006). Nolan and Costanza noted that “our student thesis project has a substantial advantage over faculty-oriented archives: students understand the benefits of the online repository much faster than faculty and staff” (p. 97).

While the literature reveals several articles written in the years following the 2005-2007 period of large-scale studies (Markey, St. Jean, Rieh, Yakel, & Kim, 2008; Xia & Opperman, 2010; Nykanen, 2011; Owen, 2011; and Connell, 2011), it wasn’t until 2014 that two more studies were published that focused primarily on undergraduate work in IRs. In order to determine where undergraduate theses were being cited, Stone and Lowe identified 49 IRs with undergraduate research collections containing a total of 20,024 undergraduate theses (2014). Using the forward citation feature of Google Scholar, they first eliminated 895 theses that had no citations in Google Scholar. For the remaining undergraduate theses, they determined that 24% of citations were in peer-reviewed or refereed journals and 33% in dissertations and theses (Stone & Lowe, 2014, p. 345). Like Nolan and Costanza in 2006, Stone and Lowe concluded that “making theses available to the wider scholarly community brings students into the conversation about vital information use, publishing, and scholarship issues” (p. 356).

The second article that focused on undergraduate research in IRs was a case study in which Eleta Exline outlined the benefits, challenges, and concerns of collecting undergraduate research based on the University of New Hampshire’s experience with extending their UNH Scholars’ Repository to include undergraduate honors theses (Exline, 2014). While the initial purpose of their project was to “eliminate collecting paper copies of theses and to give students searchable access to past projects” (Exline, 2014, p. 25), UNH soon found that there was “stronger campus support and fewer barriers to collecting undergraduate research than for faculty and graduate student scholarship” (Exline, 2014, p. 16). Exline noted that “the process [of collecting undergraduate honors theses] was unexpectedly straightforward and relatively
easy in comparison with our efforts collecting faculty and graduate student work” (p. 19). There were concerns however “about the ability to publish from previously deposited work, the potential for plagiarism, and exposure of confidential or proprietary research when students worked on ongoing faculty projects” (Exline, 2014, p. 26). The benefits outweighed these concerns though as Exline pointed out that “the Scholars’ Repository can help us make and sustain connections across the university, contribute more broadly to the teaching and research mission, and support students in their aspirations as undergraduate scholars and beyond graduation” (p. 25).

Despite the seemingly steady increase in inclusion and availability of USW in IRs, Fagan and Willey conducted a study of “the web visibility of award-winning history papers written by undergraduate students” to determine the level of accessibility of this type of research (Fagan & Willey, 2018, p. 164). The researchers used Google, Google Scholar, Microsoft Academic, America: History and Life, Historical Abstracts, and the institution’s IR to gauge discoverability. The results of their study suggested that “the discoverability of undergraduate history research is limited and that it is more discoverable on the public web than within the scholarly network” (p. 175). Fagan and Willey pointed out that because “undergraduates are becoming recognized as emergent authors” (p. 179), academic libraries need to improve the visibility and accessibility of undergraduate research. The easiest way to do that is to continue to strengthen the support for inclusion of undergraduate research in IRs and “to prioritize structuring of those repositories for discovery by web search engines” (Fagan & Willey, 2018, p. 179).

Institutional repositories began as a simple system to store the digital output of a single community. Over the last 20 years, IRs have morphed into more elaborate digital archives that play a vital role in preserving the scholarly output and events and activities of an academic institution. Early proponents called for a scholarly system of preserving the research and teaching materials of both faculty and students, with few barriers to access, that was cumulative and perpetual, open and interoperable. In their infancy, institution’s began populating IRs with student work to supplement the slower growing output of faculty. Student produced electronic theses and dissertations became a common type of material found in IRs, due to the availability of a large amount of content with few barriers to accessing and uploading it. Institutions benefitted by growing their digital archives quickly, while students benefitted by being engaged in a scholarly process that encouraged conversations around copyright, licensing and alternative publishing models. Nearly from the beginning, both graduate and undergraduate student works played a prominent role in the creation of IRs.

**Methodology**

The authors gathered data for this project by reviewing the online holdings in IRs of U.S. college and university libraries that use bepress’ Digital Commons product to publish the work of scholars at their institution. Bepress lists their clients according to type of institution (e.g., colleges and universities, liberal arts schools, research universities, law schools, community colleges, medical schools, etc.). The Colleges and Universities category was selected as the focus of this study. Foreign colleges and universities were eliminated from the list. The remaining institutions ranged in size from small to large, were both public and private, and represented all geographic regions in the United States. There were 329 institutions on bepress’ list of colleges and universities. Sixteen of those were foreign institutions and were eliminated from the study. One hundred six institutions contained no works that would qualify as USW and were also eliminated from the study. The remaining 207 institutions were evaluated according to the criteria outlined in the Methodology section of this paper.

In order to determine the extent to which USW are represented in each IR, the authors looked at four criteria: types of collections, size of collections, coverage, and discoverability. First, the types of USW collections available in each repository (e.g., honors theses, capstone projects, posters, etc.) were analyzed. Second, the number of USW contained within the repository were noted and assigned a range (i.e., <50, 50-200, >200) in order to avoid counting each individual work, which would have been impossible given the size and number of collections and the fact that the authors extracted the data manually instead of exporting it with a computer program. Next, the coverage of those collections was considered and the starting and ending dates were noted along with any outliers. For example, if undergraduate collections coverage in the IR ranged from 2011-2016 but there were a handful of items from 1975 and 1983, those items would be noted as outliers. Finally, both the prominence of the USW within the IR and the availability of OCLC records were observed. The authors wanted to know how easily discoverable these items were. In terms of prominence, if the USW collections were linked on the main page of the IR, they were considered prominent. If they were embedded 2-3+ layers deep, they were not considered prominent. Also, a random sample of the records of each institution’s USW collections were searched in OCLC to determine if the items had been cataloged. If cataloging was available, the authors noted the earliest and latest dates of the works that were present in OCLC.

The data associated with each criteria was extracted manually through a visual analysis of each institution’s IR. The author’s reviewed the IR website at each individual institution using a list of URLs found on the bepress website. Each URL linked directly to the IR’s main page. The author’s selected the Browse Collections link from the navigation side bar to access a list of the content in the IR. Some of the content was organized by academic department while others were organized by contributor category (e.g., undergraduate, graduate, faculty, etc.). For the content organized by academic department, undergraduate collections with that department were identified based on the title of the collection (e.g.,
undergraduate student papers, honors theses, capstone projects, etc.). If it was unclear by the title that the collection consisted solely of undergraduate work, the authors reviewed individual records within the collections in question to determine if they were undergraduate in nature. Data was collected manually and input into an Excel spreadsheet.

**Findings**

Five criteria were examined to determine the extent that USW were represented in the IRs of U.S. colleges and universities that use bepress’ Digital Commons product: types and sizes of collections, span of coverage, prominence, and discoverability.

**Types of Collections**

The first criteria considered was types of collections. Many different names were used to refer to collections by the 207 institutions, but thirteen categories emerged when grouping the various types together. Table 1 defines the categories and provides examples of types of collections within each.

The most widely represented type of collection among the 207 institutions was theses, with 114 institutions (55%) having digitized and made available some variation of undergraduate theses in their IR. The second most widely represented type of collection was papers, which 91 institutions (44%) made available in their IR. The distribution of the other types of collections defined above is illustrated in table 2.

**Size of Collections**

The measurement of the second criteria, size of collections, was simplified by using a range of sizes (e.g., <50, 50-200-, >200) to portray the extent of each collection. The difference in range of sizes among institutions was much smaller than the wide gaps seen in types of collections. The sizes were much more evenly spaced at 35% (72) of institutions with less than 50 USW in their collections, 33% (69) of institutions with 50-200 USW in their collections, and 32% (66) of institutions with >200 USW in their collections.

**Coverage and Outliers**

The authors were able to determine coverage for 204 of the 207 institutions under study (table 3). The number of years of coverage among the institutions ranged from 1 year to 102 years. The majority of institutions (77) had five years or less of coverage. Ninety-one institutions had 6-15 years of coverage, and the remaining 35 institutions had between 16 and 102 years of coverage. The oldest date of beginning coverage was 1878, and the most recent beginning date of coverage was 2017. The majority of institutions (143) had beginning coverage dating from 2006-2016. Thirty-one institutions had coverage beginning during the time period 1996-2005, and only 24 institutions had coverage beginning prior to 1996. The majority of the institutions (169) included USW in their IR that were dated as recently as 2016-2018. Twenty-one institutions had end dates between 2012 and 2015, and one institution had an end date of 1941. The thirteen single date institutions were not considered in these calculations.

Only 19% (39) of the institutions had outliers. Outlying works were defined as those works that were produced outside the years that clearly defined the start of the IR. Twenty-two of those 39 institutions had only one outlying year. The other seventeen institutions ranged from 2 to 10 outlying years. All but three of the institution’s outlying years were dated earlier than their main span of coverage.

**Prominence**

The authors categorized 119 institutions as having prominent undergraduate collections. These collections were all linked on the main IR page. The other 88 were not considered prominent within the institution’s IR, as they were not easily discoverable. In order to find the USW at these institutions, the authors had to navigate 2-3 layers into the IR to find them. While somewhat subjective, the authors expected that USW would be easily discernable without trying to examine every work individually. For example, theses collections that combined masters, doctoral, and undergraduate in the same collection were not considered as displaying USW in a prominent way.

**Discoverability**

A random sample of titles from each institution was searched in OCLC for the availability of cataloging records. Seventy-two percent (150) of the institutions had not cataloged their USW. The remaining 28% (57) were institutions who cataloged their USW to varying degrees. Of the 28% of institutions who cataloged their USW, 35 (61%) cataloged the entire range of their student works from earliest date of coverage to latest date of coverage. Sixteen institutions (28%) cataloged the earlier years in their span of coverage but had not cataloged their most recent student works. Three institutions (5%) cataloged the most recent years, but had not yet cataloged their older works. And the remaining 3 institutions (5%) cataloged content falling somewhere in the middle of their span of coverage, bypassing the earliest and latest years.

**Discussion**

Digital Commons provides institutions the means to showcase a vast array of scholarship, and, while there is a basic framework, there can be a great deal of variety in how the institution chooses to organize its IR, as well as a great deal of variety in the kinds of collections that the institution chooses to add. The authors focused on discovering USW.

In examining the 207 institutions that had undergraduate works, table 1 shows that there is a wide variety of types of works that institutions have chosen to add to their digital collections. Institutions promote everything from art work, posters, and podcasts to the more “traditional” undergraduate papers. Not surprisingly, theses and papers dominate undergraduate scholarship in bepress.
Institutions that have yet to consider undergraduate work outside of theses and papers will find a wide variety of items that might be considered for inclusion to their digital collections.

As noted, the authors chose to simplify counting the number of items in any individual repository by using ranges to determine size. Of course, the size of the collection can be based on many factors, including size of institution, length of time the institution has had an IR, restrictions on the type of items that can be added, and the number of staff dedicated to adding materials to the repository. While some larger institutions had over 200 items in the undergraduate collections, there were several institutions with enrollments under 2000 students that also were in this category. Institutions that feature a wider variety of collection types typically have more items, if only because there are more USW that can be added to various collections. Additionally, those institutions that have had an institutional repository for a number of years may have more works than an institution that only recently began adding items to its IR.

While coverage varied widely, the majority of items in the IRs examined are dated after 2016. Projects to digitize older print USW require time, funding, and staffing. At the authors’ institution, written permission to digitize must be given by the author, adding a criterion that is difficult, if not impossible, to accomplish. As noted, only a small percentage (19%) of the institutions had outliers. While it is impossible to determine the exact reason that these undergraduate works were added to all collections, at the authors’ institution these outliers are due to a former student discovering the IR and formally requesting that his/her work be added.

In seeking USW, the authors found that the majority of IRs linked those collections on the main page, but 88 institutions made it more of a challenge to identify them. Repositories that specifically listed undergraduate scholarship as a collection made discovery of USW very easy. Student works, student scholarship, and other collection names that didn’t specify undergraduate, could include both undergraduate and graduate works, and the user would have to go further into the collection to see if USW were present. USW were also found in collections under the broader bepress heading research unit, center or department. Again, some collections listed under this broad heading specified undergraduate works, while others required the user to examine a student work collection to find undergraduate works. Repositories that were organized so that USW were listed under individual academic departments or schools were not considered to display USW prominently. Particularly in these cases, it would have been time consuming for the authors to identify and count USW because they could only be found by looking through every school or department. Those repositories that combined both undergraduate and graduate theses in the same collection were not considered to display undergraduate research in a prominent way. A user would have to examine each thesis individually to determine whether it was for an undergraduate or graduate degree. There were a handful of institutions that required a password to access all works in their IR, so that while USW might appear to be prominently displayed, further examination was impossible.

The authors also searched OCLC for records in order to determine whether the majority of repositories were adding records to OCLC to increase discoverability. Print honors theses at the authors’ institution were sent directly to Archives and Special Collections, and were not cataloged. Digital honors theses are now discoverable through the Libraries’ IR. Since the graduate ETDs had always been cataloged, a decision had to be made about cataloging undergraduate theses. Given the time needed to catalog the undergraduate theses, and a shrinking cataloging staff, the authors were curious whether other bepress institutions were adding these records to OCLC. For 72% of the institutions, it appeared that cataloging records for USW in the repositories examined were not being added to OCLC. Generally, if an institution cataloged undergraduate works in OCLC, cataloging started with the earliest work in the collection and continued to the most recent work in the collection. In a few cases, it appeared that cataloging in OCLC had been done for earlier works, but appeared to have ceased. While cataloging these materials might happen at some future date, there was no way for the authors to determine why newer works were no longer being added to OCLC even though older works had OCLC records.

Conclusion

The authors found that the original hypothesis was not correct. USW are well represented in the IRs that were examined in bepress. The authors found a wide variety of undergraduate works. Finding USW is easiest in those IRs that maintain collections that contain only these works. Student work collections that contain both undergraduate and graduate works require more effort to distinguish between the two, but it can be done. Those institutions that require that patrons examine each collection under individual schools and departments to find USW might consider creating a student work collection. Finally, while OCLC cataloging records are not available for the vast majority of USW, these works are still being discovered by users worldwide.
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Table 1. Types of Collections Defined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Collections Defined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART: painting, photography, exhibitions, mixed media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTISTIC PERFORMANCES: student concerts and recitals, songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWARDS: award winning papers and essays, images of award plaques, grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREATIVE WRITING: essays, poetry, short stories, fiction, creative non-fiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS: flyers, charts, maps, abstracts, learning objects, data sets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPERS: symposium papers, creative papers, senior scholar papers, seminar papers, conference papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTERS: poster session images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENTATIONS: class presentation, conference presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECTS: senior projects, undergraduate projects, honors projects, senior capstone projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLICATIONS: undergraduate journals, student newspapers, yearbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPORTS: internship reports, class project reports, case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL MEDIA: podcasts, live tweets, videos, blog posts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESSES: honors theses, undergraduate theses, senior capstone theses, oral defenses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Distribution by Type of Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Collection</th>
<th># of Holding Institutions</th>
<th>% of Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theses</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papers</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Performances</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Span of Coverage
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SEL/A/GENERAL NEWS:

The Public Libraries Section of SELA is hosting a library management webinar in July. Please join us to learn more about the challenges and joys of public library management.

SEL/A’s Public Libraries Section presents:

**Library Management Scenarios**
Webinar - Tuesday July 16, 11:00 - 12:00 pm EST

A constant of library management is that there will always be something to surprise you. As a manager, the ability to think on your feet and address new issues is key. This webinar is a panel discussion featuring four library managers with a wide range of experience currently working in very different public libraries. Panelists will share information about their library, their path to management and surprising lessons learned. Then they will discuss various management scenarios submitted by webinar attendees. There will be time for questions at the end.

**Panelists:**
- **Alexandra Eberle**, Library Director, Brooke County Public Libraries, West Virginia
- **Mark Engelbrecht**, Branch Leader, Mountain Island Library, Charlotte Mecklenburg Library, North Carolina
- **Stephanie Fennell**, North Regional Manager, Durham County Library, North Carolina
- **Christie Reale**, Kannapolis Branch Manager, Cabarrus County Public Library, North Carolina

Register here: [https://tinyurl.com/y6mp5se5](https://tinyurl.com/y6mp5se5). If you’d like to watch the recorded webinar, please register and select that option.

Upcoming webinars from SEL/A’s Public Libraries Section:
August – Career Paths in Public Libraries
More info coming soon on the SELA listserv

If questions, please contact Kate Engelbrecht, Chair, Public Libraries Section SELA kengelbrecht@cmlibrary.org

LIBRARY NEWS:

**South Carolina**

**Greenville County Library System** and Greenville County Soil and Water Conservation District have combined their resources to establish the Upstate’s only Seed Library. This free, accessible, year-round source of flower, herbs and food seeds has been received with excitement by the Greenville County community.

The Library System proudly introduced the Seed Library at the Sarah Dobey Jones Branch in Berea on Saturday, February 23. With over 400 people in attendance, the Seed Library Kickoff event offered a chance to showcase the repurposed card catalog featuring drawers filled with over 50 varieties of food and flower seeds ready for planting, and provided a platform to share related resources, classes and programs focused on sustainability and gardening.

Additional programming surrounding the Seed Library provides education on growing food, flowers, and native plants while inspiring an increase in local food production, promoting a healthy diet, and preserving plant diversity with heirloom seeds. Library card holders may select up to ten seed packets per visit and receive a supplementary growing guide provided by Greenville County Soil and Water Conservation District. The seeds have been sorted, separated by type, packaged, and clearly labeled with information and instructions by Greater Greenville Master Gardeners, the Greenville County Soil and Water Conservation District, and Greenville County Library System volunteers.

Since opening the Seed Library has attracted over 2,200 visitors that have taken home just over 11,000 seed packets. System-wide, 24 programs with a sustainability and gardening focus have attracted over 250 attendees of all ages.

**PERSONNEL NEWS:**

**North Carolina**

**University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill**

The University Libraries at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is pleased to announce several appointments.

**Sonoe Nakasone** was appointed as community archivist for the Southern Historical Collection at the Wilson Special Collections Library.

In this position, Sonoe will serve as project manager and coordinator for the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation grant “Building a Model for All Users: Transforming Archive Collections through Community-Driven Archives.” Sonoe will service the Southern Historical Collection’s existing community archives projects, including the Appalachian Student Health Coalition, the Eastern Kentucky African American Migration Project, the Historic Black Towns and Settlements Alliance, and the San Antonio African American Community Archive and Museum.

Prior to this appointment, Sonoe worked as lead librarian for metadata technologies at North Carolina State University Libraries and as an adjunct professor at North Carolina Central University. Before that, she was special formats and metadata cataloger at UNC-Chapel Hill.
Sonoe holds an M.S. in Library and Information Science from Pratt Institute in New York, New York, with an advanced certificate in archives and a certificate for museum librarianship. Her B.A. in English and political science is from Howard University in Washington, DC.

Rebecca Carlson is health sciences librarian and liaison to the School of Pharmacy for the Health Sciences Library. In this position, Rebecca will provide library support for the faculty, students and staff of the Eshelman School of Pharmacy and will offer both virtual and on-site instruction for the Doctor of Pharmacy program. At the Health Sciences Library, she will be part of the Clinical, Academic, and Research Engagement team.

Prior to this appointment, Rebecca worked as clinical librarian for the Health Sciences Library, in the University Libraries at UNC-Chapel Hill. Previously, she was library director of the Mercy College of Nursing and Health Sciences, at Southwest Baptist University, in Springfield, Missouri.

Rebecca holds an M.S. in library science from UNC-Chapel Hill.

Matt Jansen has been appointed as data analysis librarian. As part of the University Libraries’ Digital Research Services unit, Matt will work with scholars to collect, create, process and analyze data. He brings expertise in statistical analysis, text analysis, data visualization and reproducible research. He will also identify, evaluate and recommend research tools and methods for the University Libraries and the campus research community.

Before this appointment, Matt worked as data analyst, and previously as serials projects specialist, in the University Libraries at UNC-Chapel Hill.

Matt holds a B.A. in political science and an M.S. in statistics and operations research from UNC-Chapel Hill.

L. Blue Dean will join the University Libraries at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill as Executive Director of Library Development, effective July 1, 2019. Dean brings to this newly expanded role nearly twenty years of fundraising leadership in the higher education and non-profit sectors.

At Carolina, she will provide strategic vision, leadership and direction for a comprehensive development program as the Library pursues an ambitious agenda emphasizing preservation, student success and engagement with the research enterprise. She will serve as a member of the Library Leadership Team and will guide the organization in achieving its goal toward the University’s capital campaign, For All Kind: The Campaign for Carolina.

Aaron Smithers has been appointed special collections research and instruction librarian in the Wilson Special Collections Library, effective June 17.

In this position, Aaron will support teaching and research at the University and in broader communities by promoting access to and use of unique and primary source materials. In collaboration with colleagues across the University
Libraries and with faculty and instructors, he will help to develop effective teaching strategies that make use of special collections material. He will also provide reference and research services for special collections and will contribute to the development of exhibitions and public programs.

Before this appointment, Aaron was collection assistant in the Southern Folklife Collection (SFC) at the Wilson Special Collections Library and has worked as audio engineer in the SFC at UNC-Chapel Hill.

Aaron holds an M.A. in folklore from UNC-Chapel Hill and a B.S. in radio-television-film and a B.A. in the Plan II interdisciplinary program, with an anthropology concentration, from the University of Texas at Austin.

Memorial Tribute

Dr. Joe A. Hewitt, University Librarian Emeritus at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, died at home in Durham on December 19, 2018. Hewitt—known widely to colleagues and acquaintances as Dr. Hewitt—was born on October 13, 1938, to the late Joe Anderson Hewitt, Sr. and Betty Plyler Hewitt in Newton, North Carolina. The family moved to Shelby, North Carolina, when he was 7 years old and he always considered Shelby his hometown.

Dr. Hewitt graduated from Shelby High School in 1956 and enrolled in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill as a Morehead Scholar. After his sophomore year, he interrupted his studies to enlist in the U.S. Army Security Agency. He graduated from the Russian program at the Army Language School in Monterey, California (now the Defense Language Institute), before being posted to Lubeck, West Germany, where he worked as a Russian voice intercept operator.

In Lubeck, he joined a spirited and talented group of young linguists, most intercept operators and direction finders, on the front lines of the Cold War at a time of high international tension. They worked on the border of East and West Germany, where they developed close bonds as they pursued their passion for German entertainment, drink and culture. In later years, they established the Lubeck Association to hold reunions and maintain cherished connections.

He took his discharge from active service in Germany and traveled in Europe before returning to UNC to resume his studies. Back in Chapel Hill, he took a student job in Wilson Library, assisting in Slavic acquisitions. Encouraged and mentored by the professional staff, he gained an appreciation for the mission of a major academic research library. After receiving his B.A. in history, he enrolled in the School of Information and Library Science (SILS) and commenced a long and distinguished career.

Dr. Hewitt spent nine years at the University of Colorado, earning his doctorate in education before returning to Carolina as Associate University Librarian for Technical Services in 1975. In 1993, he was named Associate Provost for University Libraries, or University Librarian.

Dr. Hewitt believed deeply that the Library belonged to the people of North Carolina and that its collections and staff should serve the state. This sense of commitment and responsibility guided his tenure. Under his leadership, the Library achieved a series of notable firsts that extended the reach of its outstanding collections and expertise well beyond Chapel Hill.

A year into Dr. Hewitt’s directorship, the Library staked out its first homepage on the rapidly coalescing World Wide Web. Shortly thereafter, it launched “Documenting the American South,” a project to digitize frequently requested slave narratives. DocSouth rapidly grew into a pioneering online home for hundreds of full-text books, documents, images and audio files. It continues to attract readers and accolades from North Carolina and from around the world.

Dr. Hewitt sought to use the Library as a springboard for outreach and for great cultural programming that would benefit North Carolinians. He helped to establish a North Carolina Literary Festival that continues today under private guidance, and he initiated a partnership with the UNC Press to publish and distribute books that drew on the Library’s unparalleled collections.

He founded the Carolina Academic Library Associates program in partnership with UNC’s School of Information and Library Science to attract and train the next generation of college and university librarians. Today, the program’s nearly 200 alumni work at libraries across the state and the country.

Under Dr. Hewitt’s leadership, the Library attracted notable gifts and collections, including the papers of journalist and alumnus Charles Kuralt; the André Savine collection, which documents the Russian Diaspora; and materials related to luminaries such as Thomas Wolfe, William
Butler Yeats and Gail Godwin. An acquisition of 60,000 recordings put Carolina on the map with one of the largest collections of Southern folk and roots music outside the Library of Congress.

Dr. Hewitt’s tenure saw a full-scale renovation of the R.B. House Undergraduate Library, which reopened in 2002 as a center for student life. When the aftermath of Hurricane Floyd diverted promised state funding, he and the Friends of the Library raised $2 million in private funds to complete the project.

With a deep passion for the mission and potential of libraries, Dr. Hewitt loaned his energy and intellect to organizations that advance their work, including the Triangle Research Libraries Network, the Association of Research Libraries and the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions.

Dr. Hewitt was an elegant and prolific writer about library issues, with dozens of articles and books to his credit, beginning with research into what was then the emerging field of online cataloging and acquisitions. He later turned his attention to special collections, helping the Association of Research Libraries develop a programmatic agenda to advance the visibility and promote the use of rare and unique materials. In retirement, he wrote a detailed history of the Wilson Library at Carolina for the building’s 75th anniversary.

Dr. Joe Hewitt was a wise, kind and trusted mentor to a generation of librarians. They took inspiration from his gentle guidance and scholarly outlook and from his abiding belief in the promise of libraries and the academy.

For his achievements, Dr. Hewitt in 1999 received the University’s Distinguished Alumni Award. Upon his retirement in 2004, Governor Mike Easley bestowed upon him The Order of the Long Leaf Pine for extraordinary service to the state.

University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Gerald Holmes, associate professor and diversity coordinator at UNC Greensboro’s University Libraries has received the 2019 Distinguished Alumni Award from the UNC Chapel Hill School of Information and Library Science (SILS). The award recognizes Holmes’s work at UNC Greensboro, UNC Chapel Hill and professional library organizations. Through his work, Holmes has made the library profession more welcoming and opened it up to individuals from underrepresented backgrounds.

At UNC Greensboro, Holmes has spearheaded multiple diversity efforts, including the Faculty Senate Committee on Equity, Diversity and Inclusion, the Chancellor’s Equity, Diversity and Inclusive Excellence Committee, the University Libraries’ Diversity Committee and the University Libraries’ Diversity Residency Program. Holmes’ has also worked to mentor other employees and community members by working with stakeholders to build networks of diversity education. Additionally, Holmes assisted in creating the Association of College & Research Librarians (ACRL) Residency Interest Group and has served on the Executive Board of the Black Caucus of the American Library Association (ALA) and the North Carolina Library Association (NCLA) and chaired NCLA’s Round Table for Ethnic Minority Concerns.

Holmes received his master of science in library science from UNC Chapel Hill and a bachelor of science degree in criminal justice from UNC Charlotte. He is also a life member of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc.

Florida

University of Central Florida

The University of Central Florida (UCF) Libraries announces the retirement of Margaret “Meg” Scharf, Associate Director, Communications, Assessment, and Public Relations, as of May 31, 2019.

A University Librarian, Scharf holds master’s degrees in Library Science (Indiana University) and Business Administration (UCF). She joined the UCF Libraries in 1984, helping to develop the Library Information Network and Exchange (LINE) program. She then moved to the Reference Department, later becoming Head, while also teaching popular library instruction classes and developing collections for business and hospitality. Scharf was promoted to Associate Director for Public Services in 1999; she assumed her current role in 2012, reporting to Director Barry Baker.

During her nearly 35 years at UCF, Scharf has been an active member of many professional organizations, including the American Library Association, the Florida Library Association and the State University Libraries, serving on a myriad of committees and subcommittees. She has presented at such diverse venues as EDUCAUSE
Conferences and the Lilly Conference on Higher Education in England. She held the position of regional reporter for the Association of College & Research Libraries Newsletter, Florida chapter, and served as editor of Internet Reference Services Quarterly and as a peer reviewer for the Journal of Academic Librarianship.

Scharf is also involved in the Central Florida community. She has been a judge for the Orlando Sentinel’s annual Spelling Bee since 2001. She also served as a member of the Central Florida Memory project, an online repository of images and stories about the area’s history.

Within UCF, Scharf served on or chaired numerous committees, including the Advisory Board for the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning and the Quality Enhancement Advisory Plan Committee. She also worked closely with Student Accessibility Services to improve library services for students with disabilities. She was instrumental in redesigning the main floor of the Orlando campus library to include more space for group and independent learning, and in planning InSTALLments, the quick-read newsletter posted inside the library bathrooms. She created a Student Advisory Board to more closely listen to students’ concerns and expectations.

Scharf will long be known for her empathetic approach to students, visitors, and staff; and for her deep and genuine commitment to the library profession, UCF, and the community.

The University of Central Florida Libraries is also pleased to announce that Katy Miller is the new Student Success / Textbook Affordability Librarian.

Miller assumed a full-time faculty position on the main UCF campus as of March 11. She has her master’s degree in Library and Information Science from the University of North Texas, and a BA in Art History from the University of Memphis.

Miller has worked at Valencia College as the Project Director for an East Campus Title V grant, “Strengthening Academic Advising and Transfer”, as well as teaching the New Student Experience course (SLS 1122). Prior to this role, she served as the Library Director for Valencia’s Winter Park campus, overseeing the library and testing/assessment centers. Before shifting to higher education, Miller worked as a corporate librarian, heading the editorial research department for the Orlando Sentinel newspaper. In her role with UCF, she will create programs to support student academic success, in addition to leading the Libraries’ initiative to increase textbook affordability.

Georgia
Clayton State University

Dr. Gordon N. Baker. Dean of Libraries at Clayton State University retired on May 31, 2019 with 40 years of service to the University. Dr. Baker started as a part-time/weekend reference librarian, became Head of Public Services, Director, and the first Dean of the Library. In addition to his career at Clayton State, Dr. Baker served as a classroom and library/media specialist in the Griffin-Spalding County (GA) and Clayton County (GA) school systems. He worked as library/media specialist and coordinator of instructional technology and media specialist in the Henry County (GA) School System, retiring in 2004. Dr. Baker served as a member of the Henry County Library System Board of Trustees for 18 years. He served as treasurer for four years and chair of the Board for 14 years.

Dr. Baker has served as the elected president of the Georgia Library Media Association (GLMA), the Georgia Association for Instructional Technology (GAIT), and the Georgia Library Association (GLA). He served as president of the Southeastern Library Association (SELA) during 2014-2015. Dr. Baker has been recognized by his peers receiving the following awards: 1988 Georgia Elementary School Library/Media Specialist of the Year (GLMA), William E. Patterson Service Award (GLMA), Distinguished Service Award (GAIT), Walter S. Bell Service Award (GAIT), Juanita Skelton Service Award (GAIT), Nix-Jones Award (GLA), The Bob Richardson Memorial Award (GLA), GLA Team Award, Mary Utopia Rothrock Award (SELA), and the Hal Mendelsohn Award (SELA).

Dr. Baker now resides in Savannah. He is an adjunct instructor for the Department of Library and Information Studies at Valdosta State University. He continues to serve as SELA Administrative Services Coordinator.
BOOK REVIEWS


This stunning success on gardens and beautiful buildings and mansions of Georgia consists of Contents, Acknowledgments, Introduction, Andrew Low House and Garden, Savannah, Ashland Farm, Flintstone, Barnsley Gardens, Adairsville, Barrington Hall and Bulloch Hall, Roswell, Battersby-Hartridge Garden, Savannah, Beech Haven, Athens, Berry College: Oak Hill and House o’ Dreams, Mount Berry, Bradley Olmsted Garden, Columbus, Cator Woolford Gardens, Atlanta, Coffin-Reynolds Mansion, Sapelo Island, Dunaway Gardens, Newnan vicinity, Governor’s Mansion, Atlanta, Hills and Dales Estate, LaGrange, Lullwater Conservation Garden, Atlanta, Millpond Plantation, Thomasville vicinity, Oakton, Marietta, Rock City Gardens, Lookout Mountain, Salubrity Hall, Augusta, Savannah Squares, Savannah, Stephenson-Adams-Land Garden, Atlanta, Swan House, Atlanta, University of Georgia: North Campus, the President’s House and Garden, and the Founders Memorial Garden, Athens, Valley View, Cartersville vicinity, Wormsloe and Wormsloe State Historic Site, Savannah vicinity, Zahner-Slick Garden, Atlanta, Appendix, Notes, Bibliography, and Index.  The work’s content discusses lovely gardens, mansions, and buildings of Georgia.  Staci Catron is Cherokee Garden Library Director at Atlanta History Center Kenan Research Center.  Mary Ann Eaddy was Technical Services head and aide to the Director of Georgia Department of Natural Resources of Historic Preservation Division.  The gorgeous photographs are from James R. Lockhart who was a photographer for the Georgia Historic Preservation Division.  The writing style is articulate, clear, eloquent, and easy to read.

The forty-three page Appendix List and Status of Gardens Documented through the Georgia Historic Landscape Initiative from Garden History of Georgia, 1733-1933 reveals approximately one hundred fifty-five gardens and accompanying mansions and structures by county and city, the times gardens, constructions, and houses commenced, and a few important details about the gardens, mansions, and constructions.  Delightfully and marvelously useful for sightseers the Appendix discloses which gardens, places, and homes allow visitors.  The wonderful picturesque book notes the locales that are in the National Register of Historic Places.  The bibliography consists of two hundred six references.  Four intriguing lists include “Plants Grown by Alice Hand Callaway That are Still Cultivated at the Hills and Dales Estate,” “Plants Grown by Sarah Coleman Ferrell That are Still Cultivated at the Hills and Dales Estate,” “Rock City Gardens Historic Plant List,” and “H.W. Stephenson Residence, Partial Planting List, 1931.”  The introduction shows the history of Georgia and the history of gardens and garden clubs of Georgia.  Around three hundred eighty bright vividly colorful photographs astound readers with the gorgeous loveliness of the gardens, mansions, and constructions.  Each picture has a concise description.  The work has two maps and eleven drawings of the gardens.  Charming scenic decorations in the gardens include stone lanterns, benches, stone bridges, gazebos, sundials, reflecting ponds, stone paths, sunken gardens, terraces, greenhouses, catfish ponds, blue peacocks, teahouses, pergolas, Doric columns, waterfalls, wooden bridge, amphitheaters, fountains, statues, Ionic columns, Corinthian columns, fishing, tennis courts, parterre, courtyards, marble columns, bay windows, and white stucco.  Dazzling picturesque flora comprise laurel, Japanese cherry trees, dogwoods, magnolias, petunias, lilies of the valley, English ivy, Lady Banks Roses, Japanese maples, ferns, azaleas, tea olives, Camellias, roses, crape myrtles, Ginkgo, pomegranate, rhododendron, gardenias, daffodils, tulips, wisteria, hydrangea, and boxwoods.  Interestingly, Juliette Gordon “Daisy” Low of beautiful Andrew Low House and Garden in Savannah, Georgia established the United States Girl Scouts.  Atlanta’s Beautiful Swan House with a grand fountain that cascades was brought into play in the movies Hunger Games: Catching Fire and Hunger Games: Mockingjay Part 2.  Beautiful Hills and Dales Estate of LaGrange is a gorgeous Italian villa with beautiful gardens of foliage and boxwood saying “God is Love” and “God” and gorgeous fountains maintained from the 1800’s.  The recommendation for audience is researchers and people looking for information and complete histories on Georgia’s spectacular gardens, impressive structures, and gorgeous houses.

The book is highly recommended for public and academic libraries.

Melinda F. Matthews
University of Louisiana at Monroe

Georgia native Clay Scroggins explains the oddity of leadership. An individual does not have to be in a leadership role in order to lead. Employers may be inclined to depend upon those in authority to indicate change. But what if that change never happens? Those with ideas are encouraged to speak out with confidence that their voice will be heard. Scroggins is a lead pastor of one of a network of six interconnected church campuses in the Metropolitan Atlanta area. When he first took this role, he felt that his ideas were not being valued and understood. Instead of sitting back and pointing fingers and doing nothing about it, he took charge by writing this book and implementing changes in himself and the environment he describes in his book. He wrote this book about leadership.

The first part of this book focuses on how a new leader needs to accept and identify what authority their position offers. After, use the authority wisely to influence and make things better. Scroggins also focuses on the difference between leading by influence rather than authority, and how their influence on others can effect change. Scroggins goes a step further to discuss leadership as a sense of identity. “Near the core of what makes a person a leader is their sense of identity.” Your identity has three parts, your past, other people, and last is your personality. From your past, your family plays a key role in molding the person you have become. Other people is how an individual thinks others may perceive them in a particular way. With personality, our characteristics, traits, and talents all shape our lives. Scroggins talks about leading oneself through self leadership principles. First, model followership, meaning follow well. Second, monitor your heart and behavior, meaning monitor your emotions. And lastly, have a plan. What are you doing to lead yourself well first? A person can’t lead others until they learn to lead themselves.

Strongly recommended for individuals in leadership and middle management.

Mark A. Kirkley
Kennesaw State University


“The document selections in this book feature the voices of southern women who lived in the Progressive Era. That time period stretched from the 1890s to the end of World War I, when the United States was transformed by politically active pressure groups who called for various kinds of reform. The Reformers called themselves progressives, and the name has stuck.” (Introduction). So begins this amazing collection of historical research highlighted by personal writings, stories, reflections and photographs of noted women of the times.

The editors highlighted “progressive” women most engaged in reforming their circumstances and bettering the lives of those around them. The progressives were mostly middle class women who sought to “address many of the social, economic, political, and cultural problems of an industrialized and urbanized world”. (Intro.)

Roberts and Walker organize the data of their research on “progressives” into three headings: Activists in the Making, A New Southern Workforce, and Regional Commentators. Within each Part (one, two and three), rich detail on their lives and social activism are presented through personal writings in letters, diaries, and journals. These are fascinating reads. Along with the documents, there are numerous illustrations, and photographs that enliven the writings.

As an incentive to acquire and read this book, I hope you will consider your own life if it touched your mother’s life between the 1900s and the 1950s. I looked upon mine and could see and hear her and my grandmother’s stories of life during the progressive times.
I recommend this book to public, academic, and seminary libraries! There are fascinating notes beginning on page 319 and an index beginning on page 359.

Carol Walker Jordan
Librarian and Consultant


In November 1996, salvage divers found the resting place of Queen Anne’s Revenge (QAR), the flagship of Blackbeard, America’s most infamous pirate, off the coast of North Carolina. Foundering on a sandbar while trying to negotiate the Beaufort Inlet, the vessel capsized and sank in 1718. Although no riches were discovered through the subsequent ongoing excavation, the treasure trove of artifacts so far recovered provide a fascinating glimpse of life on board a pirate ship. Mark Wilde-Ramsing and Linda Carnes-Naughton, archaeologists who have been with the state sponsored QAR shipwreck project since its inception, combine entertaining vignettes on pirate history and lore with details about the excavation and artifact conservation in their book Blackbeard’s Sunken Prize: the 300-year Voyage of Queen Anne’s Revenge.

Giving context, the authors relate the tumultuous history of the notorious Edward Thache (Teach), a.k.a. Blackbeard, beginning with his capture of the French slave ship the Concorde in the Caribbean, which he renamed the Queen Anne’s Revenge. Relieving it of most of its crew and slaves, he outfitted it with forty plus cannons, eventually heading up the North Coast with several vessels under his command. After audaciously blockading Charleston, South Carolina, he sailed north and ran aground while trying to navigate the Beaufort Inlet.

Historical accounts tease the possibility that Blackbeard planned the shipwreck with the aim of taking the ship’s wealth and swindling his partner, Steve Bonnet, and other crew. After marooning fellow pirates who demanded a stake he went to Bath, NC to request the King’s pardon. However, not content with the quiet life, he once again took to piracy, coming to an ignoble end when he crossed swords with Lieutenant Robert Maynard and his men, commissioned by the Virginia Governor to engage and dispose of Blackbeard.

From the excitement of the shipwreck find to the trials of securing the site and handling the publicity, the QAR project faced unique challenges and surprising breakthroughs. Coordinating the archaeological marine investigations with the conservation and interpretation teams was integral to its success. To date, only sixty percent of the wreck has been excavated. Three chapters of the book are devoted to discussing the recovered artifacts. Some of the significant finds include two bronze ship bells, a brass mortar and pestle, a urethral syringe used to treat syphilis and various pewter plates. Weaponry, of course! Cannon, simple grenades, various blades and firearm parts have been discovered, as well as ammunition. Only four coins and a smattering of gold dust have been recovered, lending credence to the belief that Blackbeard kept the hoard for himself.

The authors marshal their expertise at marine excavation and archaeological interpretation of artifacts to provide cultural context for that era of piracy and relevance to historical records regarding Blackbeard. With detailed maps, graphs and tables, as well as a comprehensive index and list of notes, this book serves as a resource for the serious scholar and history buff alike.

Recommended for academic and public libraries.

Melanie Dunn
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

This book, as the title indicates, is a collection of essays written by Robert M. Calhoon’s graduate students to share Calhoon’s vision of Loyalism and Loyalists. What was loyalism and who were the loyalists?

Calhoon’s students were challenged to examine a variety of questions such as: were those who called themselves loyalists desirous of continuing in the service of the “crown”, were they those who did not want to take up arms and fight the “crown”, were they hopeful of finding peaceful ways of insuring freedom from unfair taxation, etc., were they those who thought the revolutionaries were moving to take away their land and their means of life, were they white, black, Indians?

To shed light on some of these questions, Calhoon’s students contributed essays inspired by his lectures and research, such as “The Politics of Loyalty in the Revolutionary Chesapeake”, “Reexamining Loyalist Identity during the American Revolution”, “Quaker Women Writers of the American Revolution”, “To be Parts and Not Dependencies of the Empire”.

Interestingly, Calhoon led his students to examine the concept of the revolutionary war as a civil war. A civil war in which loyalists and revolutionaries held differing opinions about separating from the British government. Those opinions became obvious when it was shown that Loyalists were counted in the thousands—possibly 500,000 individuals of the white population. Paul Smith (p.1) also says 19% of all citizens at the time of the war were Loyalists. What happened to Loyalists when the Revolutionary War ended, Smith says “the longer-term effect of the Revolution on the Loyalists—the exile experiences of perhaps 80,000 Loyalists and their dependents who departed or the adaptation of as many as 400,000 who remained in the US” (p.3). The jewel of this book is the raising of our consciousness toward those in early America who wished to remain loyal to the “crown”. Also the essays give us the option to begin to learn more about the Revolutionary War as a “civil war”.

This is a good book for public and academic libraries. Also recommended for archives and historical collections. The book contains 250 pages, Notes from page 251 to List of Contributors on 319 and an Index on Page 321. List of illustrations on pages 45 125,127 and 131.

Carol Walker Jordan
Librarian and Consultant


Robert Emmett Curran tells of 1600 letters written by members of the Lynch family. He transcribed and annotated 561 of those letters and placed them in chronological order for us, 1858-1865. These letters were meticulously presented as a life story of the Lynch family in South Carolina during the Confederate War years. Patrick Lynch became the third Catholic Bishop of Charleston, his brother, Francis, established tanneries that supplied shoes to the troops of the Civil War, and his sister, Ellen, established a school for young girls as a protection for them during the War.

Patrick Lynch became a highly respected and much loved Bishop and was selected by Jefferson Davis to represent the Confederacy to the Papal States in hopes of securing support of Europe for the Confederacy. While Bishop Lynch was a slave owner and a secessionist, his reputation with inclusion of black free slaves was well known.

The outstanding elements of this research are the 561 beautifully transcribed and annotated Lynch family letters written to each other during the years of 1858 to 1865. The readability and clever language in each letter along with the inclusion of local and regional happenings helped me as a
reader to see the beginning, the development and the ending of a family story that was deeply involved in the War.

An excerpt from one letter is an example of the beautiful prose and sensitivity to each family member:

“My dearest brother, I leave it to others to congratulate you on the honor and dignity you have received if any I will bless God for having extended your sphere of usefulness and placed you in a position where you may affect the good…How is your cold and cough? I am very anxious about it for none of us have stentorian lungs and I am afraid you will not resort to effectual remedies…”

As this example shows, you can be assured of reading letters both informative and filled with the love and good feelings within the Lynch family!

Recommended for public, academic and archival libraries. There are a List of illustrations beginning on page vii, Acknowledgements on page ix, a helpful introduction on page xi and the Lynch Family Genealogy on page xxiii. The text covers pages 1 to 365.

Carol Walker Jordan
Librarian and Consultant


Huw David brings to this manuscript a background, as he describes himself, driven by “historical detective work”. Today Huw holds a Ph.D. in History from Lincoln College, Oxford. He was awarded the 2015 Hines Prize by the College of Charleston for the best first manuscript relating to the Carolina lowcountry and the Atlantic world. That manuscript led to this book which is beautifully organized and complete with biographical sketches of his characters, illustrations of particular people, seascapes, unique buildings and scenes, along with data tables – all highlighting his detective work.

The story Huw David tells is of an early Atlantic seaport town where a few transatlantic white merchants devised an economic trade system that propelled them to fame and fortune. Utilizing their knowledge of trade, their political acumen, and seeing unique economic opportunities, these men entered a variety of business and political ventures within the pre-revolution colony known as George Town.

Prior to the Revolutionary War, through trade with England in the 1730s, these merchants sent ships back and forth from Charles Town to London. They secured clients and opportunities to buy and sell goods. The products such as rice, hemp, and indigo were prized by the British. The opportunity to use the British slave trade to acquire slaves for the plantation workforce to produce goods was of great benefit to the colonists in and around Charles Town. One data chart shows that between 1706 and 1776, 69,765 slaves were imported to Charles Town on British vessels (p. 33).

The author tells us that the merchants grew very wealthy, acquired land and property in both the Carolina territory and in England. Yet as the Revolutionary War erupted and the loyalties of the merchants were questioned, many of these merchants returned (fled?) to England and tragically lost or became debt ridden over their investments in the colony.

This fascinating manuscript gives a chronology that is very helpful in placing the history of the relationships between the maritime merchants and the Charleston citizens. Also there is a brief but informative sketch of many of the merchants and their investments and families. The Notes section begins on page 188. There is a Bibliography on pages 229 (Primary Sources), an Index on 249. Illustrations are set throughout the manuscript.

This is a fascinating and very readable manuscript and one which I highly recommend for academic libraries and archival collections. (Charles Town was renamed Charleston in 1783) p.xviii

Carol Walker Jordan
Librarian and Consultant

My attraction to the book, “The Perfect Scout”, edited by Anne Sarah Rubin and Stephen Murphy, was the cover photo of George W. Quimby riding his horse and leaping over a fallen tree with a stream below. Yes, I love horses and I admire the relationship between a soldier and his horse. Seeing the title of the book, “A Soldier’s Memoir of the Great March to the Sea and the Campaign of the Carolinas” deepened my desire to learn more.

Upon George Quimby’s death in 1990, Rubin and Murphy were appointed to settle the family estate. In their examination of the papers, documents, and other items in the home in Seattle, they found 3 legal sized folders of neatly typed memoirs. George W. Quimby was a Union soldier who served as a scout for Generals in the Union army. His challenge was to go ahead of a General and his troops and return with information of general reconnaissance.

Rubin and Murphy read the memoirs with great interest and decided a book that informs readers of General Sherman’s march from Atlanta to Savannah and from Savannah to Goldsboro through the eyes of a Scout was a missing piece of history.

These memoirs accomplish two objectives: informed knowledge of the life and work of a “Scout” and a deeper perspective on the last months of the Civil War under the command of Union soldiers in the March to the Sea and the Campaign of the Carolinas.

“The Perfect Scout” is beautifully written as a story that highlights pain, agony, mystery, death, tragedy, irony, and all those factors that war can highlight. To learn anew or for the first time, the struggles of Union and Confederate soldiers, Generals, and Scouts as well as families, children and citizens in the wake of the Marches toward an end of a tragic war is etched in the reflections of George W. Quimby.

Recommended for public and academic libraries. May be a great addition to an historical collection of Civil War resources. Maps are available and the text includes a Preface, Introduction, and a George W. Quimby’s Introduction. There is a Conclusion, Notes, Bibliography, and Index. Pages 165-191.

Carol Walker Jordan
Librarian and Consultant


This work is about beautiful Andrew Low House in Savannah, Georgia. Author Tania June Sammons was the administrative head of Savannah Georgie Telfair Museums landmarks and ornate arts. Tania June Sammons wrote The Story of Silver in Savannah: Creating and Collecting since the 18th Century and The Owen-Thomas House, a beautiful house also in Savannah. Virginia Connerat Logan is a Georgia National Society of the Colonial Dames of America member and was librarian at Andrew Low House. Ms. Logan wrote Andrew Low’s Legacy and was an archivist for Georgia.

Andrew Low House. Two excellent quality pictures show designs for the Andrew Low House.

The house was the residence of Andrew Low who moved from Scotland to Savannah in 1829 and became wealthy because of cotton and textiles. The Andrew Low House came into existence in 1845. William Low inherited the house and gave it to his wife Juliette “Daisy” Gordon. Daisy founded the United States Girl Scouts. The Girl Scouts convened in the Andrew Low House Carriage House. The State of Georgia National Society of the Colonial Dames of America is the owner of the Andrew Low House since 1928. The Andrew Low House allows tourists daily for a fee. Intriguingly, the front doors appear like doors to Rome’s Temple of Romulus AD 309. Two front columns are like columns from an Athens Tower of the Winds created purportedly around 50 and 100 BC. Lovely iron balconies the shade of green are at the entry. Two impressive statues of lions are on both sides of the outdoor stairs to the splendid front door.

Pre-Civil War antiques are in the house. Fascinatingly, amethyst gems of Marie Louise Duchess of Parma a wife to Napoleon are there. Delightfully, the Brussels rugs in the parlors are Devonshire and similar to some in Metropolitan Museum of Art. Gorgeous bright vivid paintings of the family adorn the mansion. Beautiful Brussels Lorenzo rugs are in the dining room and library. The beautiful dining room table exhibits lovely Dihl et Guerhard china from the dawn of the 1800s. The parlor has beautiful red and gold silk sofas of Boston from the mid nineteenth century. An 1810 John Broadwood & Sons England rosewood pianoforte is enchanting. Remarkably, a New York A & W Geib pianoforte from the commencement of the 1800s in the second parlor is playable. The lovely ceilings in the parlors display two gorgeous crystal chandeliers. Other decorations include a desk for inscribing composed of rosewood, a mahogany bed from Jamaica, Argand Lamps, Parian ware busts and greyhounds, Chinese porcelain vases, a unique stand for washing, a bathtub of copper, a mahogany wardrobe, a transom, two gilded pier mirrors, and a gold and white satin settee of Sheraton design.

The masterpiece in great detail narrates the history of the occupants of the Andrew Low House. What’s more, beautiful pictures enhance the lively description of the bright and beautiful landscape. The house has a dry moat. Two well-known visitors were Robert E. Lee and the writer William Makepeace Thackeray.

The recommendation for audience are researchers and individuals interested in beautiful residences and their histories. This work is a must for academic and public libraries. It is an excellent and entertaining story of the Andrew Low House and any interested tourists to Savannah will be much more knowledgeable of the Andrew Low House open for visiting.

Melinda F. Matthews
University of Louisiana at Monroe Library


This collection of interviews and significant research documents surrounding the life of Angela Gregory provides the reader an opportunity to see and hear a southern woman artist reveal her life as she lived it. We are able to “see a rarely opened window into southern society before, during and after the American Civil War and into the twentieth century” (Preface). Of most interest to me is the revelations of life in New Orleans and the French-dominated culture that surrounded Angela Gregory.

The reader will find it fascinating to follow Angela as she struggles with her artistic enthusiasms and her choices to follow the opportunities she finds to become a sculptor or a painter—both of which she has amazing talents and family support that can lead to accomplishments. Especially of interest is the story that is woven of Angela’s childhood, teenaged years, travels to France, internships, fellowships and study under a world famous sculptor.

The interviews that Angela provides to Nancy Penrose are vivid and entrancing. Compliments to both of them for this entrancing and delightful book. If you love art, French culture, and family stories, you will love getting to know Angela Gregory.

Recommended for public and academic libraries. Many illustrations throughout and a section of Notes, a Bibliography and an Index for research. Also a good listing of all of Angela’s sculptures. Also highly recommended for art libraries.

Carol Walker Jordan
Librarian and Consultant
Elizabeth D. Leonard lays before us two primary goals for this book, *Slaves, Slaveholders and a Kentucky Community’s Struggle Toward Freedom*.

**Goal One**
Leonard explains her hopes to offer a close-up look at a group of slaves from Breckinridge County, Kentucky, who served in Company A of the 118th United States Colored Troops. Her research follows them “from slavery through the Civil War and on into a post war world” (p.x).

**Goal Two**
Leonard depicts in “specific detail the complicated tensions that characterized the intersecting communities—state, local, and interpersonal—from which Kentuckians came and to which they returned after the war.” (p.x)

The book is divided into helpful sections: Part One: Once a Slaveholder… Part Two: Once a Slave… Part Three: War’s End and returning to Kentucky.

Leonard presents two lives that come from different but similar backgrounds. Joseph Holt was a wealthy, highly educated land and slave owner, and Sandy Holt was a slave who was born into slavery, lived his life as a laborer and never learned to read and write.

Both men lived in Holt Bottom, Kentucky, until circumstances took them away. Joseph Holt went to Washington where he became a strong force against slavery. Sandy Holt found the opportunity to escape slavery by joining the United States Colored Troops where he fought with the Union hoping to earn his freedom by his service.

In the 1860s both men left Kentucky. Joseph Holt was appointed by President Lincoln as his Judge Advocate General shortly after the Emancipation Proclamation.

Sandy Holt ran away to join the 118th United States Colored Infantry regiment.

Leonard’s research is fascinating and her determination to help the reader understand how Kentuckians and other slave state owners dealt with the Civil War, the loss of the war to the Union and the aftermath of Lincoln’s proclamation of freedom from slavery for slaves in the “slave states”. There is a Notes Section, a Bibliography, and an Index that provides great resources for searching primary documents. There are no illustrations except for one small map.

Recommended for public and academic libraries.

**Fall or Fly: The Strangely Hopeful Story of Foster Care and Adoption in Appalachia**


How do you serve the best interest of a child, when the parents can’t? What resources exist for children suffering wholesale family disintegration in the midst of a national drug epidemic that has hit Appalachia the hardest? In *Fall or Fly: The Strangely Hopeful Story of Foster Care and Adoption in Appalachia*, Wendy Welch documents the social service crisis unfolding in the region. By relating the personal stories of service providers, foster and adoptive parents and the children themselves, she reveals bleak truths about the system, while at the same time highlighting the compassion and hope inspiring care providers to make a difference.

An Appalachian native with a background in public health and author of the memoir *The Little Bookstore of Big Stone Gap*, Welch uses storytelling journalism to narrate the personal accounts of these social service workers, adopting and foster parents and older adoptee and foster youth.
Conducting interviews in a multistate region she refers to as “Coalton”, the stories she compiles are true, but the identifying details are obscured to provide anonymity for her sources.

Welch praises the social workers who tirelessly advocate for the children caught up in the child welfare system. It is an ongoing struggle finding the right foster family who will accept a child in need, many of whom come from dire circumstances. As a consequence of the substance abuse epidemic, social workers have larger workloads than ever before, with fewer acceptable foster homes available. Foster children themselves recognize they’re on trial with each placement in a home, knowing that the older they get the less chance they have of being adopted. It is telling that some of these youth, after being aged out of the system, later choose to become involved as foster parents themselves to give other children the opportunities they never had.

Adoptive parents often begin as foster parents, hoping to bring one or more children into their permanent family. Regrettably, a child’s age plays a large part in their ease of adoption, with those three and under - still developmentally impressionable - in great demand. Appalachian family relationships sometimes feature into the equation, with birth mothers often choosing kin to raise their children due to a variety of reasons, some enumerated by Welch: drug abuse, debilitating illness, educational pressures, and the refusal of a current boyfriend to rear another man’s offspring. The undeniable truth is that every child in the system wants to be adopted whether they admit or not. The other painful truth is that no matter how badly treated they were by their birth parents, there’s often a strong need to reconnect and seek out a relationship.

Foster parents experience special challenges repeated throughout the stories. The children, frequently having been bounced from family to family, are defensive and sometimes manipulative in order to protect themselves. They often haven’t had the opportunity to learn many basics of family life - such as hygiene and chores - that parents take for granted. The foster families who sign up do it for a variety of reasons; the majority for altruistic motives. Others, unfortunately, do it for the most venal of incentives: state money provided for the upkeep of the children. To critically judge any of the foster families, except the most egregious of those taking advantage of the system is to respond to the challenge: why not you?

The author concludes by referencing the inherent tensions between the social workers, foster parents and the courts - all of which try to support the children, but often end up at odds, especially when the biological parents are in the mix. Based on interviews and research, she supports coordinated efforts between child welfare entities through better communication, cooperation and information sharing to ensure the best outcome for the children. This subject is not an easy read, but for potential families hoping to foster or adopt and anyone involved in child welfare, public health, or the justice system, Welch provides a much-needed personal perspective. With chapter notes and a list of additional resources included, Fall or Fly: The Strangely Hopeful Story of Foster Care and Adoption in Appalachia is recommended for public and academic libraries.

Melanie Dunn
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga


As a graduate student at the University of South Carolina, I spent many hours walking the stacks, reading titles, sitting on the floor beneath shelving and pulling down books for browsing. Those days discovering a particular gem brought emotional highs. Actually those leads cemented my dissertation topic and led me to focus on women and women’s colleges and presidential leadership.

Candace Bailey, a well-known university professor, tells us “…I planned to spend a few days in the South Carolina Historical Society in Charleston as I began studying women and music in the antebellum South” (p.ix). Bailey says the idea arose of checking out the Charleston Museum and much to her surprise her curiosity helped her to uncover a wealth of letters and sheet music among the historical papers of Harriet Lowndes, Henrietta Aiken, and Louisa Rebecca McCord—all women dedicated to the passion of finding and collecting musical archival materials.

From research and writing, it seems those found materials focused Bailey’s research on the lives of the three women and their families who lived in Charleston during the years before and during the Civil War. All three women had great privilege and social opportunities affording them excellent educations, language and cultural sophistication, along with a passion for world travel. Harriet, Henrietta and Louisa Rebecca were focused on music (opera and classical works) and by traveling abroad to France, Germany and Italy, they searched, found and purchased...
musical works of great composers and performers. These works were brought by them to Charleston and today are preserved in various libraries and historical settings in Charleston.

Candace Bailey’s three Appendices A, B, C contain manuscript materials, and lists of composers and performers collected by the three women. Additionally there are examples of musical scores and title lists of many of the works that are in the collections. Overall Bailey’s book is a treasure which deserves a place in the history of world music, of the city of Charleston and of the antebellum South.

Highly recommended for academic, public and archival libraries—especially music libraries. Of particular significance to women’s history professors and students is the Conclusion on pages 209 to 220. Following the three Appendices are the Author’s Notes, a Bibliography and an Index.

Highly recommended is a visit to the Aiken-Rhett House museum, on youtube.com.

Carol Walker Jordan
Librarian and Consultant
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