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Introductions
Outcomes

1. Participants will be able to explain the importance of strategically aligning their liaison activities with campus goals and priorities in order to support and lead initiatives within the context of their home institutions.

2. Participants will define and describe new metrics in order to measure and evaluate liaison activities and impact within an institutional and national context.

3. Participants will use a national dataset of library liaison activities in order to benchmark and reflect on their institution’s liaison activities and practices.
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This SPEC Kit explores the changing role of the library liaison, the shifting goals and strategies of liaison programs at ARL member libraries, and the factors that influence these changes on an institutional level. This study covers liaison services objectives and policies, assignment of liaison responsibilities, level of department participation, administration and evaluation of services, how liaisons are trained, and the benefits and challenges of offering such services.

This SPEC Kit includes examples of liaison services websites; descriptions of liaison responsibilities, competencies, and goals; job descriptions of staff who provide these services, and reports on changes to liaison models.
• Evolution of who library liaisons are and what library liaisons do
• Evolution of how library liaisons work
• Major changes and future directions for library liaisons
Service Model

“An emerging theme in the development of the liaison model is to shift the focus away from the work of librarians to that of scholars and to develop engagement strategies based on their needs and success indicators.”

(Kenney, 2014, Leveraging the Liaison Model)
## Service Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A narrative response indicating variance across institutions</td>
<td>• Departmental outreach</td>
<td>• Departmental outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collections</td>
<td>• Communicating dept. needs to the library</td>
<td>• Reference assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communication</td>
<td>• Reference</td>
<td>• Communicating dept. needs to the library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reference/Instruction</td>
<td>• Collection development</td>
<td>• One-shot instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Integrating lib. instruction into the curriculum</td>
<td>• Collection development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Core Duties

“Effort should be made to continue exploring non-traditional and expanded roles for liaisons, as contributing members of research teams and instructional programs.”

(Latta, 1992, SPEC Kit 189)
## Core Duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection development</td>
<td>Departmental outreach</td>
<td>Research consultations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Reporting back to library</td>
<td>Managing collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Outreach &amp; communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New faculty orientations</td>
<td>Collection development</td>
<td>Teaching one shots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation of service problems</td>
<td>Integrating info lit</td>
<td>Scholarly communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional BI</td>
<td>Embedding in courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scholarly communication</td>
<td>Data management support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating web-based instruction modules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Core (Additional) Duties in 2015

- Consulting on scholarly impact and metrics
- Promotion of IR
- Consulting on open access issues
- Creating web-based learning objects
- E-research support
- Consultation on IP issues
- New literacies education
## Skills and Outlooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject expertise</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>Communication skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized knowledge about scholarship and research</td>
<td>Subject knowledge</td>
<td>Collaborative/teamwork skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>User-centered focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding collections</td>
<td>Instruction skills</td>
<td>Teaching skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding budgeting &amp; acquisitions processes</td>
<td>Public service ethic</td>
<td>Interest and passion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding university political and cultural dynamics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Responsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lifelong learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collection (knowledge of and building)</td>
<td>• Education, marketing, communication</td>
<td>• Communication, marketing, embedded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reference</td>
<td>• Collections</td>
<td>• Marketing, outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communication</td>
<td>• Instruction</td>
<td>• Reference, consultation, and instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Budgeting</td>
<td>• Budgeting</td>
<td>• Collections, scholarly communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Assessment and Evaluation

|-------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| •     | 12% compile stats         | • 49% have conducted formal evaluation of liaison services | • 94% compile stats
|       |                           | • 49% have conducted formal evaluation of liaison services | • 49% have conducted formal evaluation of liaison services |

- New partnerships across campus
- Increased numbers of consultations
- Increased numbers of classes
- Feedback from faculty and students
- Recognition from university
- Recognition from professional orgs
- Retention of liaisons
- Liaison personal assessment
Major changes and future directions for library liaisons
73% of responding libraries have recently incorporated changes into liaison roles. 18% are currently planning changes to liaison roles.

• Changing landscape of scholarly communication
• New needs and strategic directions within university/org
• New leadership within library
• Addition of new roles for liaisons within university/org
• New leadership within university/org
Expert

Widely recognized
knowledge or deciding right

59% of responding libraries assign liaison to administrative support departments.
Team-based work

“Instead of one person handling all assigned duties for an academic department, a team of librarians will be taking on different aspects while staying in close communication with each other.”

(2015 respondent)
Professional Development and Continuing Education

- Dedicated funding and support for conference attendance: 97%
- Internal cross-training and professional development: 94%
- Dedicated funding and support for external workshops and continuing ed programs: 92%
- Dedicated funding and support for participation in formal classes and degree programs: 70%
- Other opportunities: 22%
Reimagining Liaison Librarianship
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Number of programs on liaison librarianship at ACRL, including this one
19

Percent of ARL professional staff who are subject specialists (liaisons)

ARL Salary Survey 2014–15
Percent of current vacancies for liaison librarians on the ARL job list, or 32 jobs*

*Accessed 2/17/17
Reports and Surveys
ARL Library Liaison Institute

Cornell University
June 11–12, 2015
15–20 liaisons each from Cornell, Columbia, and the University of Toronto

Organizers

Sue Baughman, ARL
Barbara Rockenbach, Columbia University
Judy Ruttenberg, ARL
Kornelia Tancheva, Cornell University
Rita Vine, University of Toronto
Arl Library Liaison Institute

Replication institutes:
- University of Rochester
- University of British Columbia
- University of Oregon
- University of Alabama

Cornell University
June 11–12, 2015

15–20 liaisons each from Cornell, Columbia, and the University of Toronto

Organizers
- Sue Baughman, ARL
- Barbara Rockenbach, Columbia University
- Judy Ruttenberg, ARL
- Kornelia Tancheva, Cornell University
- Rita Vine, University of Toronto
What we’ve learned

Current measures of liaison work are not aligned with the current vision of liaison work, and everyone knows it.

The new vision requires new skills, new ways of working, and new tools.

Service & performance expectations are a work in progress.

The community needs new measures.
Engagement framework

defined by what users do, not by what libraries do

aligns with the needs and pressures of higher education and the parent institution

expansive in scope
We have a vision—we know it when we see it
Engagement activities, skills, expertise

- Instruction, consultation, collection building
- Copyright and scholarly communication
- Digital scholarship and tools
- Outreach to local community
- Fundraising
- Exhibit and event planning
New skills, tools, and ways of working

- Copyright & intellectual property
- Digital scholarship
- Research data management
- Project management
“... you will find quiet and stubborn resistance to providing people and funding to actually do the trendy things we’re all supposed to be doing like digital scholarship support, data management, learning analytics, developing open education resources, providing publishing support, and being the local experts at altmetrics. The things we find old-fashioned and slightly embarrassing still have enormous gravitational pull.”
Engagement exercise: Value propositions

how might libraries enhance their value or create new value based on user needs?
Value propositions

Gail Steinhart
@gailst

If you can't craft a compelling value prop statement, reconsider whether product matters?
#arl_liaison

6:25 AM - 12 Jun 2015
Running a Value Proposition Exercise in Your Library

“How-To” Lessons from the ARL Liaison Institute

Good afternoon and welcome to Running a Value Proposition Exercise in Your Library.
Locally defined scenarios

• Breaking down barriers among collections
• Expectations of librarian expertise with technology
• Integration of librarians in university curriculum
• Leadership of libraries on diversity and inclusion
• Culture of assessment shaping services
Ongoing Institute themes

• Rise of project-based work
• Mindset challenges and culture change
• Empathy to drive service design
• Subject, method, domain... what is expertise?
• (Internal) Teaming
• (External) Partnerships and collaboration
Vexing challenges for library managers—how to help staff...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Move from....</th>
<th>To....</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>service-centered</td>
<td>impact-centered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advancing library goals</td>
<td>advancing university goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providing information</td>
<td>providing advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serving</td>
<td>partnering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you!
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Subject Liaisons in Academic Libraries: An OA Dataset
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Shaping our project

• Snapshot of subject liaisons in 21st century
• How do we work?
• How do we spend our time?
• How do we support students and faculty?
• What has changed?
Building on previous work

• Smaller studies done—hard to extrapolate small population studies to other situations
• Realized others would want to use this data
• Design came from what we wanted to know, and what others could use and reuse for further study
The paper

• Includes survey design
• Literature review
• Links to the dataset
• Methodology
• Process of the survey
• Survey instrument
• Invitation to use the data
The participants

- Created a list of librarians from land-grant, Oberlin group, and ARL institutions with subject liaison responsibilities—4,396
- Wanted to capture responses from a wide variety of institutions of different sizes
- Compiling this list was the most labor intensive part of the work
- Done by a well-trained student over 4 months
The questionnaire

• 8 demographic
• 5 subject liaison responsibilities
• 7 outreach and instructions
• 3 traditional reference
• 2 scholarly communications
• 3 collection development
• 1 open-ended
Introduction to the data

Show you a few key data points from the results

Further analysis is up to YOU

Whet your appetite to get in there and investigate and answer your own questions
Demographics of respondents

Female/Male 69% / 28% (with 2 respondents replying other)

ARL 63% / 37% for comparison

Main vs. Branch 63% vs 36%
Liaison responsibilities

Only one-third of subject liaisons have this as their only responsibility—Further research needed on—do they have time to focus on faculty and students?
A majority of liaisons (80%) support multiple subjects or departments.
Subject degree or experience

- Neither: 17%
- Related degree: 26%
- Subject experience: 21%
- Both: 36%
Types of outreach
The charge

Data set and instrument are open and available

Princeton Institutional Repository
dataspace.princeton.edu

Scholarsphere at Penn State
scholarsphere.psu.edu

Search for our names and you will get to the data
Questions & Discussion
Thank you!