CHAPTER 19

Howard Amos, University Librarian, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand

Introduction

The University of Otago is a public collegiate university located in Dunedin, Otago, New Zealand. Established in 1869, the University of Otago is New Zealand’s oldest University. The University of Otago was one of the very few that admitted women in the 1870s, and was the first university in Australasia to permit women to take a law degree. Its first woman graduate was Caroline Freeman in 1885. Howard Amos is the current University Librarian at the University of Otago. Unlike many other academic library directors, Amos is qualified as an Information Management specialist and Librarian, and has over 15 years’ professional experience working for library software companies after qualifying as a librarian. Amos began his role as University Librarian there in October 2010. He currently represents New Zealand University Libraries on the Australasian consortium for electronic resources and is the Chair of the OCLC Asia Pacific Regional Council. Amos contributes to the development of e-research support infrastructure in New Zealand through the development of research data management metadata standards.

In the following interview, Amos shares with the readers his unparalleled expertise in managing organizational change, that is including the transition to the fully digital library, the implementation of international benchmarking activities, and the development of quality frameworks for libraries.

Could we begin this interview by first introducing yourself, for example, your professional training and education background? For example, what did you study at university?

My name is Howard Amos, and I am the University Librarian at the University of Otago, located in Dunedin, New Zealand. I have been

1 University of Otago—Homepage. Available at: http://www.otago.ac.nz/.
University Librarian for 8 years, joining Otago in 2010. After studying history at university, I spent some time in the United Kingdom in London, working for a firm of management consultants. One part of the business was a recruitment service and I was employed to manage applicants’ records, with a focus on organizing and describing these for identification by consultants who were engaged in later recruitment exercises. This was very early in the days of computerized records management and fueled an interest in information retrieval.

When I returned to New Zealand, I decided to be qualified as a librarian. In those days, it was a requirement of the New Zealand Library School (which is part of Victoria University of Wellington\(^2\)) that candidates had practical experience, so I worked temporarily as an Indexer at the Canterbury Public Library,\(^3\) where I met Peter Sidorko (now the University Librarian at the University of Hong Kong\(^4\)). As I was interested in the use of computers for bibliographic management, Peter suggested I look at enrolling with the Library School at the University of New South Wales (UNSW) in Sydney.\(^5\) In 1986, I applied to both Library Schools, was accepted by both, and went to Sydney, where I remained for 25 years.

_Could you tell us more about your path to becoming the University Librarian of the University of Otago?_

I did not follow a traditional route to becoming a University Librarian. I have worked in both the private sector and the public sector; working for commercial organizations as well as universities. After graduating from UNSW, I joined a library software vendor and worked supporting an integrated library management system for five and a half years, eventually becoming the Manager of Customer Services for Library Systems. Supporting systems provided me with good experience and analytical skills in identifying problems and issues, resolving how they came about, and providing support and direction to customers so that they could learn from mistakes. I also learned the benefit of good documentation (and how to write it), clear thinking, and the ability to “think like the end-users.”

---

\(^2\) Victoria University of Wellington—Homepage. Available at: [http://www.victoria.ac.nz/](http://www.victoria.ac.nz/).

\(^3\) Canterbury Public Library—Homepage. Available at: [http://canterburylibrary.org/](http://canterburylibrary.org/).

\(^4\) The University of Hong Kong—Homepage. Available at: [http://www.hku.hk/](http://www.hku.hk/).

\(^5\) UNSW in Australia—Homepage. Available at: [https://www.futurestudents.unsw.edu.au](https://www.futurestudents.unsw.edu.au).
In 1992, I joined the State Library of New South Wales (NSW)\textsuperscript{6} to run a wide area network called ILANET. This was one of the first library networks in existence: it used a British Telecom email software and X.25 networks so that public libraries across the state could request interlibrary loan material. With the arrival of the Australian arm of the Internet, I connected the public libraries to the rest of the world and provided Internet access (then restricted in Australia to the higher education sector) to other libraries. In 1999, I joined the Australian arm of what was then one of the largest telecommunications companies in the world, MCI WorldCom, eventually becoming Asia Pacific Regional Manager for the Outsourcing Division, before joining the Library at the University of NSW in 2004; first as Director of Library IT and then Deputy University Librarian.

You have over 25 years’ experience working for library software companies prior to becoming an academic librarian. At what stage in your career did you decide to become an academic librarian? Since you do not hold any professional Library Information Science (LIS) qualifications and received no formal training in librarianship, do you see this as an advantage for carrying out your current job as the Director of the University of Otago Library?

My postgraduate qualification is a professional library qualification called a “Diploma in Information Management” rather than a Masters of Librarianship/Information Science, I think this reflected the growing realization that information science and information management were growing closer together and traditional librarianship needed to marry with IS skills. In some ways, we still have this dilemma today: those who study information science are often not connected to the information management expertise and body of knowledge that librarians possess. I do like to remind IS staff and computer scientists that librarians have been creating metadata—arranging and describing things for their discovery, use, and re-use—for a couple of thousand years!

I do believe that my mix of commercial experience, and working in the higher education sector, has given me a wider perspective on how to provide library services, particularly in a world of constant, accelerating change. It was the Internet, technology at its most disruptive, that led me back to librarianship. The changes in how people create, arrange, and access information has changed profoundly in the last 20 years. I was part

of that when I ran the ILANET network and these changes flowed into how scholarly communication accelerated.

Could you please provide a brief introduction to the University of Otago?

The University of Otago is New Zealand's oldest University. New Zealand is a very young country, and its founding treaty dates from 1842. The University of Otago was founded in 1869 with an endowment of 100,000 ac of pastoral land, and authority to grant degrees in Arts, Medicine, Law, and Music. The University opened in July 1871 with a staff of just three Professors. Originally housed in a building in downtown Dunedin, the University moved to its present site with the completion of the Clock Tower and Geology building in 1878 and 1879, respectively.

A federal University of New Zealand was established by statute in 1870, and was the examining and degree-granting body for all New Zealand university institutions until 1961. The School of Dentistry was founded in 1907, the School of Home Science (now Applied Science) in 1911, and the University continued to expand. From 1961, when it had a roll of about 3000, the University has expanded considerably and now has just under 20,000 students. Although the University’s main campus is in Dunedin, it also has Health Sciences campuses in Christchurch and Wellington, and an information and teaching center in Auckland. The Dunedin College of Education merged with the University at the beginning of 2007, and this added a further campus in Invercargill—right at the bottom of the South Island.

What is the current collection size of the University of Otago Library? Could you also describe what you deem are the highlights of the library collections and services?

Our collections total some 2.5 million volumes with access to over 90,000 serial titles. Our special collections include, amongst others, the de Beer Collection that comprises over 7000 pre- and post-1800 books and manuscripts. It has international standing in areas of 18th-century English, history, politics, and philosophy. Major strengths include works by and about John Evelyn and works by and about John Locke. Another area of growing strength is the popular culture collections of material ranging from pulp fiction of the 1940s through to the 1970s and science fiction collections.

Special Collections mount regular exhibitions, which are also posted online (see http://www.otago.ac.nz/library/specialcollections/exhibitions.html). The University Library is fortunate to have three working printing presses: an 1845 Albion, an 1863 Columbian “Eagle” Press, and a 1950s
Vandercook proofing press. Special Collections Librarian runs the University’s Printer in Residence program, which was initiated in 2003 to encourage printing and book making. One or two limited edition publications are created and printed each year.

The “jewel in the crown” of our collections is the Hocken Collections, which owes its existence to the vigorous collecting and subsequent generosity of a Dunedin doctor: Thomas Moreland Hocken. Hocken acquired books, newspapers, maps, pamphlets, photographs, pictures, and artifacts relating to New Zealand, the Pacific, and early Australia.

The Hocken Collections is a research library similar to the Lewis Walpole Library (Yale) and the Department of Rare Books and Special Collection, Princeton. These research libraries hold and curate published items, archival material, and pictorial collections. In Australasia, no other university has a research library comparable to the depth of the Hocken Collections. The Hocken archives collection is the largest held by a New Zealand University and is now the largest documentary heritage collection outside of government ownership. It is equivalent in size to the National Library’s Alexander Turnbull Library\(^7\) or the State Library of NSW,\(^8\) and the Pictorial Collections are one of the largest art collections in the country. Exhibitions provide curated and mediated access to collections, and the Hocken exhibition program regularly includes a show that has a more social history theme and involves material drawn from across the collections. The current exhibition program has three or four exhibitions per year. Exhibitions during the academic year tend to support teaching and research at the University of Otago.

*Please describe the staffing structure at the University of Otago Library?*

Over the last few years, we have developed a staffing structure that reflects the changing needs of our users: the staff and students of the University. Very few researchers and academics come to the physical library: the material they require is now available online 24/7. Students also learn and study differently. While there is still important physical resources that they need housed in the libraries, it is just as important that we provide study space catering for individual contemplative study, as well as group study rooms where students can collaborate on shared projects.


This has meant the reorganization of our staffing structures to place more emphasis on Subject Librarians providing library services out in the faculty, taking the library to the academic. We have restructured our organization to remove a traditional “reference service” where we had a reference desk staffed by Subject Librarians “just in case” an academic came into the Library with a question or in need of some help. The Subject Librarians are now in teams, based on our Academic Divisions (Arts and Humanities, Commerce, Health Science, and Science). These teams provide direct support to faculty and continue to provide information literacy (we call them “research skills”) to undergraduates and postgraduates. Most of the material that supports undergraduates is online, either in the LibGuides\(^9\) software we use or in the University’s learning management system Blackboard.\(^{10}\) We now have face-to-face “library teaching” only with postgraduates.

Our front-of-house staffing structure has also undergone significant changes. The Client Services Unit remains the largest staff force, as we need to provide services in seven different locations. However, we now have a much flatter structure with a centralized management team and team leaders, rather than a number of separate teams that worked only within a specific branch. The Client Services Unit now provides services across all branch libraries and these services are designed to be consistent and standardized, so that any student can use any branch library and get the same service.

How students interact with our services and the study space we manage has also changed. Students much prefer “self-service” and self-discovery, so we have reduced the number of staff and removed the circulation desks. For example, students now use self-check machines to borrow books. This self-service mode of delivery has been emphasized with the creation of a “self-service hub” model, which will be rolled out across the system. It is an easily recognizable part of the library and is designed to provide information. Directions, self-check, and printing services as well as charging stations for mobile devices are provided. Many parts of the world, particularly in Asia, have been early adopters of this type of service. In New Zealand, we have only recently appreciated the need to provide more facilities that support self-help.

---

9 LibGuides—Homepage. Available at: https://www.springshare.com/libguides.
Could you describe your typical day at work? Is there ever a typical day at work?

There isn’t really a typical day. There are some consistent challenges every day. For example, I expect to have a high level of interruption rates: I always have an “open door” philosophy and expect my senior management team and staff with questions to pop in if I’m not in meetings. I counter this with being an early starter. I like to get to the office no later than 7:45–8:00 a.m. The first hour or so is when I do my “thinking and planning” work.

Any day always includes far too many meetings, but in a diverse organization like a university, one needs to expect that. What that means is a need to plan, prepare, and be punctual in order not to waste time. Staff have learned that meetings start on time and that I expect them to be on time and well prepared. There are always a wide variety of meetings, from the University’s senior management team, the wider community, student groups, marketing, etc. I also get a number of visitors or correspondence from the wider library community, either fellow members of the associations I’m in, fellow Regional Executive Committee members of OCLC, or visiting academic librarians.

Could you describe your management and leadership style? Mentorship is such an important theme in leadership, both mentoring and being mentored. Could you please tell us about your experiences about both?

When I’ve been asked that question in past job interviews, I describe my management style as “inclusive” and “supportive.” I work hard, ensuring we have an environment of trust and support, and I like to think we have achieved that. Given the way technology is changing how we librarians do business, we need to operate in an environment where we can experiment with new ways of doing things and feel encouraged to try new things, with the understanding that some things will work and others won’t but it is okay to fail at some things.

What is important about my management style is that it is open, honest, and consistent, so that it can serve as a model for my staff. It is also important that my personal style “fits” within the environment of my organization: the University of Otago is a much more conservative university than my previous employer UNSW. I have had to adjust my style and expectations accordingly. It simply won’t work if you carry out without taking any account of the greater organizational culture.

Mentoring is important, as it is personally contributing to the future of our profession by supporting staff and others who have decided to make a
I provide mentoring support to a number of staff who are in the early part of their careers or are undertaking their MIS (Masters in Information Science) postgraduate studies. I find it very rewarding to work with people as they consider their career options and helping them understand the breadth of skills and expertise that can be gained from a career in librarianship.

I was grateful for the support and advice I received when I returned to working in an academic library. Colleagues from other university libraries and the University Librarian at UNSW provided me with an understanding of the changes in librarianship.

In general, what are your views of the impacts of contemporary technologies on the management and services of your library?

Established technologies and communication services, such as the Internet, as well as emerging technologies and their application to library services play an extremely important role in the development of library services. How the scholarly communication chain has changed, the new ways humanities scholars are using, and different types of data to create new knowledge influence how we develop services to support our staff and student. Librarians need to be prepared for constant change. New technologies and new ways of doing things will keep developing and we must adapt or become irrelevant.

As we move from the hybrid library where print is in the ascendency to one where online electronic resources dominate, I have been directly involved in the ongoing review of processes and procedures to build efficient work units and realign workflows and staff.

This has led to changing workflows and services and the incorporation of these in our traditional support of learning, teaching, and research, in order to ensure work practices and process are scalable and sustainable as online e-resources continue to grow in importance.

As well as changes to staff structures, library services are being developed to locate, link, and share a variety of resources including research reports and papers, comment on studies, other academic/gray literature and discussion papers, etc.

We understand your interests lie in managing organizational change, and the transition to the fully digital library. What are the core external and internal factors that are driving library organizations to change? Are such changes or coping with such changes absolutely vital for ensuring the future survival of academic libraries and the professionals practicing in the field of LIS? What kinds of major changes have you faced with when managing and implementing organizational changes in
the library context? Did you witness any library organizations that failed to survive because they were incapable of responding to changes?

As I mentioned earlier, technology and changes in the academic landscape will mean fundamental changes in the way libraries and librarians deliver services. We need to ensure we have a culture of change and the ability to take a flexible approach to how we organize the library resources to meet the needs of our users. For example, the days when we needed large cataloging departments are gone. Vendors provide “shelf-ready” books (the few we now buy) and they provide the cataloging records too. Of more importance to our users is access to online resources, so we need staff who work in the online environment, ensuring resources can be linked to, and providing support for, material that might have restrictive digital rights (DRM) attributes. These staff are comfortable and skilled in the online world and work alongside the technical support staff.

While I don’t know of any libraries that have “failed,” I know of a number who are struggling to remain relevant to their users. A failure, not just to change but to create an environment where change is the norm results in reduced budgets and the lack of recognition that the library can contribute to new and emerging fields of research, such as digital humanities, and provided librarian skills in the management of research data.

You are also well-known for your extensive experiences in international benchmarking activities and the development of quality frameworks including balanced scorecard processes for libraries. For readers who are not practicing in the LIS field, please describe (preferably with detailed examples) what are the definitions of benchmarking and quality framework for academic libraries? How can such benchmark results be used as indicators for continuous improvements for academic libraries?

I became interested in quality assurance and quality management as applied to academic libraries while at UNSW. I was part of the senior management team that implemented a program of process review and improvement that created a framework for continuous process improvement. In essence we embarked on this process with two simple requirements:

1. What’s the work that needs doing?
2. How do we measure rather than just count?

With the University Librarian, aided by outside Quality Consultants, the senior management team developed and deployed a balanced scorecard approach to library-wide performance and quality process. The process of developing the scorecard included the following steps:
1. Defining a purpose statement,
2. Identifying strategic objectives,
3. Creating a strategy map,
4. Identifying and selecting appropriate measures, and
5. Setting targets.

The balanced scorecard approach served as a focus point on determining and planning for assessing what we were achieving against the library’s strategic objectives and ensuring they continue to align with the University’s strategic intent. This approach also allows high-level reporting of outcomes to University management as well as reporting on day-to-day operational imperatives, such as getting the books processed and on the shelves, getting items returned back on the shelves quickly.

It is well understood that university libraries need to be working towards methodologies and strategies to show that they are making an impact on the teaching, learning, and research endeavors of their university. At Otago, I have been leading our response to this imperative. We are all under increasing pressure to show how we perform relative to similar institutions in the global community. However, while there is growing interest in cross-national benchmarks, there is little transnational benchmarking that allows reliable international comparisons of performance and provides insights into how improvements might be made.

Benchmarking is the process of identifying best practices and learning from others. It has been found that actual improvements following benchmarking arise from considering and looking at processes, tools, and techniques, rather than simply comparing and reviewing measurements of activity. Benchmarking activities extend networking, build collaborative relationships and mutual understanding between participants, and enable better understanding of practice, process, and performance. Activity-based benchmarking is a methodology in which a selected number of activities, which are either typical or representative of the range of services an institution provides, are analyzed and compared with similar activities in other selected institutions.

The Matariki Network of Universities (http://www.matarikinetwork.com/) is an international collaborative venture that has been established to enable member universities to enhance diversity, to share ideas, experiences, and expertise. Each member of the Network is a leading university demonstrating international best practice in research and education, based on established academic traditions. The Network includes: Dartmouth
College, Durham University, Queen’s University, the University of Otago, Tübingen University, the University of Western Australia, and Uppsala University. The Network takes its name, Matariki, from the Māori name for the group of stars called the Pleiades, which are also known as the seven sisters. Matariki is also the word for the Māori new year, symbolizing a new beginning.

Each member of the Network is amongst the leading places of learning in its respective country, while reflecting a modern and international outlook. Each has distinguished traditions in research and each focuses on a rounded education that is research-led. Matariki members encourage an interdisciplinary approach and support a full subject base across the sciences, social sciences, and humanities; all have Medical schools. Each has a mix of postgraduate and undergraduate students with a high residential component, and a significant “town and gown” relationship.

Comparison of performance and process amongst institutions possessing similar characteristics will lead to a better understanding of relative performance in an environment where there is an increasing need to demonstrate value and provide evidence of accountability. Benchmarking amongst the Matariki Network of Libraries enables us to set individual institutional performance in an international context and help each identify areas of strength and weakness. Identification of best practices amongst the group will augment quality assurance processes and highlight areas for potential improvement. These data will inform the development of a library assessment capacity maturity model that allows each library to identify an improvement path. In a climate of competition for local and national resources, sharing on an international level offers great potential for harnessing collaborative activity.

This Network provides an ideal platform for these university libraries to collaborate on the development of a series of common international performance measures, which will provide each of the universities with a benchmark for reviewing and comparing library performance in areas of

11 Dartmouth College—Homepage. Available at: http://dartmouth.edu/.
12 Durham University—Homepage. Available at: https://www.dur.ac.uk/.
13 Queen’s University—Homepage. Available at: http://www.queensu.ca/.
14 University of Tübingen—Homepage. Available at: https://www.uni-tuebingen.de/en/university.html.
15 The University of Western Australia—Homepage. Available at: http://www.uwa.edu.au/.
16 Uppsala University—Homepage. Available at: http://www.uu.se/en.
17 Matariki Network of Libraries—Homepage. Available at: http://matarikinetwork.org/.
specific interest. As the first round of the benchmarking project progressed through 2012/13, responses provided a valuable set of data for all the libraries to review and learn from. A range of informative resources have been shared, covering policy and strategic goals through to session outlines and student information booklets. Overall, amongst the diversity of programs and activities represented, a strong commitment to the needs of clients is demonstrated by all libraries. It became apparent that sharing experiences of how each library was assessing the effectiveness of these activities would enable an understanding for each of how effective local assessment processes were.

We felt there would be value in sharing more details of the assessments used; there may well be aspects that are common to some that could provide useful data for comparing and contrasting. From this genesis, the libraries agreed to share in the development of a Libraries Assessment Capability Maturity Model (LACMM). Through responding to survey questions and comparing activities between libraries, details of assessment capability and a pathway for improving assessment are being identified. This process is contributing to developing a shared response to determine how we measure our effectiveness.

As a simplified representation of the world, CMMs contain the essential elements of effective processes. Work began on process improvement with Shewhart’s principles of statistical quality control in the 1930s (Shewhart, 1931). These principles have since been refined and extended by others (Crosby, 1979; Juran, 1988). Humphery and Radice began applying them to software in their work at IBM and the Software Engineering Institute of the Carnegie-Mellon University;¹⁸ a description of the basic principles and concepts on which many of the CMMs are now based is provided in Humphrey’s book, *Managing the Software Process* (Humphrey, 1989).

A CMM has five levels, as illustrated below. Each level represents a measure of the effectiveness of any specific process or program, from ad hoc processes through to mature and continuously improving processes. It provides criteria and characteristics that need to be fulfilled in order to reach a particular maturity level (Becker, Knackstedt, & Pöppelbuß, 2009).

Why a library assessment capability maturity model? The journey towards library assessment thus far is well documented. Leading scholars and practitioners have charted this development as they review recent contributions. Heath (2011) emphasized some of the activities that the Association of Research Libraries\(^{19}\) has supported and places these developments in the larger context of assessment activities. Hufford (2013) provided a comprehensive review of the literature around assessment in academic and research libraries covering the period from 2005 to 2011.

To guide the process of developing the LACMM, works in the field of designing maturity model were consulted, including Wilson’s (2013) account of the development of a library quality maturity model (QMM). Progress in this area has recently been reviewed, limitations identified, and best practice approaches suggested (Maier, Moultrie, & Clarkson, 2012; Wendler, 2012). Having assessed the design process of maturity models, Becker et al. (2009) provide a procedures model for developing maturity models that further refines the guidelines. This procedures model provides a useful framework for considering the construction of an LACMM. It provides a clear flow of activities and decision-making junctures, emphasizing an iterative and reflective approach; the first requirement is comparison with existing maturity models.

During the meeting at the third Matariki Library Colloquium, a review of the QMM identified that the facets of the model do not provide a direct alignment to an LACMM. However, it was suggested that there are elements of the QMM that may have relevance to an LACMM. These elements include processes such as: progress monitoring,

\(^{19}\) Association of Research Libraries—Homepage. Available at: [http://www.arl.org/](http://www.arl.org/).
performance measurement, gathering feedback, collation of feedback, respond to feedback, and act on feedback. To provide further guidance in determining the characteristics of an LACMM, Bakkalbasi, Sundre, and Fulcher's (2012) work on assessing assessment was also considered at this meeting. Their application identifies four phases of the assessment process:

1. Establishing assessment objectives,
2. Selecting and designing methodologies and collecting data,
3. Analyzing and interpreting data, and
4. Using results.

It was decided that focusing only on these elements should reduce the complexity of the design and simplify the development of the LACMM, without compromising its value and relevance to the academic library community. A template of the LACMM has been developed, as illustrated below.

![Library Assessment Capability Maturity Model](image)

As part of the third survey cycle, the partners have been asked to populate this model with examples from practice. Further meetings at the Matariki Colloquia will provide an opportunity for the partners to review and discuss these examples. As the benchmarking project continues and as the partners examine how they measure their effectiveness, more examples of practice will be added to the model. The immediate activity is to develop a framework for determining levels of capability so that the Matariki Partners apply these consistently. At Otago, we have discussed the development of the LACMM, but have not yet published any findings.

You are currently representing New Zealand University Libraries on the Australasian consortium for electronic resources, and also you are the current Chair of the Council of New Zealand University Librarians. What are the challenges faced by academic libraries in Australia and also in New Zealand in terms of the acquisitions, management, resources sharing, and service delivery of e-resources?
We face the same challenges other academic libraries are facing: we have declining or static income, while resources, particularly online resources continue to rise. As we purchase the majority of such material in foreign currency, the ability of Australia and New Zealand universities to continue to fund large price increases is under threat. Increasing costs with a declining value in our currencies will mean we will have to look at substantial reductions in our subscriptions.

Besides the cost of subscribing, there are “hidden” costs in the duplication of effort we each expend in the management and administration of our knowledge-bases and maintaining the integrity of the catalog and our information resource gateways. Some work has been done in the United Kingdom (the JISC Kb + project), with the Kuali OLE GoKB project looking at shared services for the maintenance of these knowledge-bases. I believe this warrants further investigation, although with the demise of the Kuali OLE project, I am unsure of the future of GoKB.

We notice your library has this Otago University Research Archive. How do you anticipate that contributes to research and learning at your University? (see: https://ourarchive.otago.ac.nz/)

Following Council approval of the Institutional Research Repository Policy (Jan, 2010) the Library established the “Electronic Thesis Deposit” form for Postgraduate students to submit the final version of their thesis in e-format. While most items in the OUR Archive are higher degree theses, academics and their departments have also deposited a wide range of other research outputs. The OUR Archive plays a significant role in supporting researchers, both in exposing OA copies of their findings and providing services where they can link their unpublished outputs (commissioned reports for example) to their scholarly record.

Testing a subset of OUR Archive contents demonstrates how OUR Archive research outputs appear higher on a search engine results list. This is because the Google search and relevancy ranking algorithm lists a research output higher in a results list when it is sourced from an institutional repository (OUR Archive) as opposed to a webpage or a commercial source, such as Amazon.

The Centre for Sustainability (CSAFE) undertook a 10-week project (from Nov 2014) to retrospectively add research outputs produced over the past 5 years to the OUR Archive. A comparison was made between CSAFE’s collection download and view statistics prior to and after the project, beginning with the first OUR Archive deposit made by the academic Dr. Janet Stephenson (Aug, 2009). CSAFE have more than tripled
their file downloads and quadrupled their page views. While this increase may, in part, be due to the increase in items in the CSAFE collection, the overall trend appears to indicate that the uploading of work to the OUR Archive has definitely increased visibility and this is driving an increase in views and download statistics.

Your Library has been constantly voted as one of the most beautiful academic libraries in the world in mass media. As the Library Director, how do you want to respond to that? Do you think the attractiveness of the physical library building plays an important role in drawing in both students and faculties to use the library’s facilities and resources?

It is always pleasing to receive accolades such as this. The Central Library was designed at the beginning of the 21st century and has a great structure and a welcoming aspect. The physical building plays an important role in bringing students and staff into its learning spaces. It also sits on the southern edge of campus and has strong links to the center of the University to the north and out to the town to the south.

It accommodates various student support services as well as the Central Library. Natural light and a northern aspect (we are in the southern hemisphere) provides for light-filled spaces. An atrium allows light and warmth in, which is reflected into the building by large panels on the upper level. This makes for an attractive space for students to study in, and the foyer area provides a link between the Library and the Student Union building. This is the social center on campus. The Link includes a variety of social and informal study seating, cafeterias, and retail shops.

The design plan ties the building with the adjacent Student Union and lecture theaters together into an indoor/outdoor student precinct. It was designed to be a space that collects, connects, and disperses people as they move through the campus. The building helps inform the development of other spaces across the wider campus with similar furniture, fittings, the use of materials, such as local sandstone, glass exteriors, and high ceilings. All these combine into a design signature that connects the formal and informal learning spaces of the University.

While being an undoubted success, there are obligations that come with managing a landmark building. In many ways it is a “heritage building of the future” and its architectural integrity must be protected. At the same time, almost two decades after it first opened, we need to recognize that there are changes and developments in the way people learn and teach that we need to pay heed to and consider as part of the ongoing development of this iconic building.
Which parts of your job as the Librarian do you find most rewarding? What is the most frustrating?

Perhaps the most rewarding remains the pleasure in connecting users to the contents they need. While I am not at the “coal face” as often as I used to be, I enjoy understanding what works for our users and what doesn’t, assessing how effective we are, and constantly seeking improvement.

What I find the most frustrating is the slow nature of change that can occur. Universities are conservative organizations, and they all plan to be around for centuries. Change can often be seen as unnecessary or too challenging to undertake. The Library is fortunate to have dedicated skilled staff who take great pride in their work. In a time of uncertainty and constant change, they deliver high-quality outcomes that the University can be proud of.
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