图书馆学情报学教育的创新与发展

The Innovation and Development
of Library and Information Science Education

首届中美数字时代图书馆与情报学
教育发展国际研讨会

暨2000数字时代图书馆与情报学
教育发展高级研讨班

Proceedings of

2000 Sino-U.S. Symposium and Workshop on Library and Information

Science Education in the Digital Age

论文集

马费成　周欣平　陈传夫　主编

Edited by　Feicheng Ma　Peter Zhou　Chuanfu Chen

National Excellent Press
全 国 优 秀 出 版 社
Wuhan University Press

武 汉 大 学 出 版 社

首届中美数字时代图书馆与情报学教育发展国际研讨会 **论文集**
暨2000数字时代图书馆与情报学教育发展高级研讨班

图书馆学情报学教育的创新与发展

主　编 马费成　周欣平　陈传夫

编委成员 王新才　黄如花　王子舟　李　纲

The Innovation and Development of Library and Information Science Education

CHIEF EDITORS   Feicheng Ma   Peter Zhou   Chuanfu Chen

EDITORIAL STAFF   Xincai Wang   Ruhua Huang   Zizhou Wang   Gang Li

Wuhan University Press

首届中美联合主办
数字时代图书馆与情报学教育发展国际研讨会
暨数字时代图书馆与情报学教育发展高级研讨班

Sino-U.S. Symposium and Workshop on
Library & Information Science Education
in the Digital Age
at
Wuhan University, People's Republic of China

一、主办和资助机构

主办单位

　　武汉大学

　　匹兹堡大学

资助单位

　　亚洲基督教高等教育联合基金会

　　美国图书馆与信息资源委员会

　　中国国家教育部

　　国家自然科学基金会管理科学部

承办单位

　　武汉大学信息管理学院

　　武汉大学信息资源研究中心

二、组织机构

顾问委员会

　　侯杰昌　教授　武汉大学校长

　　Mark Nortenberg　教授　匹兹堡大学校长

　　吴俊培　教授　武汉大学副校长

　　胡德坤　教授　武汉大学副校长

　　阚元河　中国教育部社政司副司长

　　刘凤泰　中国教育部高教司副司长

　　陈晓田　国家自然科学基金会管理科学部副主任

学术委员会

主　席：

Brooke E. Sheldon　美国得克萨斯大学奥斯汀分校图书情报学院前院长, 荣誉教授

彭斐章　武汉大学信息管理学院教授, 博士研究生导师, 国务院学位委员会图书馆、情报与档案管理学科评议组成员、召集人

成　员：

Peter Zhou(周欣平)　美国伯克里加州大学图书馆馆长助理, 东亚图书馆馆长, 武汉大学兼职教授

Leigh Estabrook　美国依利诺依大学图书馆学情报学研究生院院长, 教授

Brooke E. Sheldon　美国得克萨斯大学奥斯汀分校图书情报学院前院长, 荣誉教授

Blanche Woolls　美国圣何塞大学图书情报学院院长, 教授

Rush Miller　美国匹兹堡大学图书馆馆长, 信息科学学院教授

吴慰慈　北京大学信息管理系教授, 博士研究生导师, 国务院学位委员会图书馆、情报与档案管理学科评议组成员

孟广均　中国科学院文献信息中心研究员, 教授, 博士研究生导师, 国务院学位委员会图书馆、情报与档案管理学科评议组成员

梁战平　中国科技信息研究所所长, 国家工程图书馆馆长, 教授, 博士研究生导师, 国务院学位委员会图书馆、情报与档案管理学科评议组成员

彭斐章　武汉大学信息管理学院教授, 博士研究生导师, 国务院学位委员会图书馆、情报与档案管理学科评议组成员、召集人

马费成　武汉大学信息管理学院教授, 博士研究生导师, 院长, 武汉大学信息资源研究中心主任, 国家社科基金图书馆、情报与文献学评议组成员

胡昌平　武汉大学信息管理学院教授, 博士研究生导师, 副院长, 武汉大学信息资源研究中心副主任, 国家社科基金图书馆、情报与文献学评议组成员

陈传夫　武汉大学信息管理学院教授, 副院长, 博士研究生导师, 国务院学位委员会图书馆、情报与档案管理学科评议组秘书

组织委员会

主　席

马费成　　　教授

Peter Zhou　　教授

成　员

马费成　武汉大学信息管理学院教授, 院长, 武汉大学信息资源研究中心主任

Peter Zhou(周欣平)　美国伯克里加州大学图书馆馆长, 武汉大学兼职教授

David Vikner　亚洲基督教高等教育联合会主席

Anne Ofstedal　亚洲基督教高等教育联合会中国项目部主任

Diane Perushek　美国西北大学图书馆副馆长

Deanna Marcum　美国图书馆与信息资源委员会主席

Hua-wei Lee(李华伟)　俄亥俄州立大学图书馆名誉馆长,武汉大学兼职教授

刘俊昌　武汉大学信息管理学院副教授,常务副院长

胡昌平　武汉大学信息管理学院教授,副院长,武汉大学信息资源研究中心副主任

张　昆　武汉大学信息管理学院教授,副院长

陈传夫　武汉大学信息管理学院教授,副院长

陈广胜　武汉大学社会科学部教授,部长

柳传忠　教育部武汉大学师资交流培训中心副主任

彭元杰　武汉大学国际交流合作部部长

胡焰初　武汉大学国际交流合作部副部长

赵锡斌　武汉大学管理学教授,博士研究生导师,武汉大学研究生院常务副院长

任珍良　武汉大学校长办公室主任

燕今伟　武汉大学图书馆馆长

大会秘书长

陈传夫　武汉大学信息管理学院教授,副院长,博士研究生导师,国务院学位委员
会图书馆、情报与档案管理学科评议组秘书

三、会议特邀主讲专家

美方主讲人

Leigh Estabrook　　依利诺依大学图书馆学情报学研究生院院长,教授

Brooke E. Sheldon　得克萨斯大学奥斯汀分校图书情报学院前院长,荣誉教授

Blanche Woolls　　圣何塞大学图书情报学院院长,教授

Rush Miller　　　匹兹堡大学图书馆馆长,信息科学学院教授

Peter Zhou(周欣平)　美国伯克里加州大学图书馆馆长,武汉大学兼职教授

中方主讲人

吴慰慈　北京大学信息管理系教授,博士研究生导师,国务院学位委员会图书馆、
情报与档案管理学科评议组成员

孟广均　中国科学院文献信息中心研究员,教授,博士研究生导师,国务院学位委
员会图书馆、情报与档案管理学科评议组成员

梁战平　中国科技信息研究所所长,国家工程图书馆馆长,教授,博士研究生导师,
国务院学位委员会图书馆、情报与档案管理学科评议组成员

彭斐章　武汉大学信息管理学院教授,博士研究生导师,国务院学位委员会图书
馆、情报与档案管理学科评议组成员、召集人

马费成　武汉大学信息管理学院教授,博士研究生导师,院长,国家社科基金图书

馆、情报与文献学评议组成员

胡昌平　武汉大学信息管理学院教授,博士研究生导师,副院长,国家社科基金图书馆、情报与文献学评议组成员

陈传夫　武汉大学信息管理学院教授,副院长,博士研究生导师,国务院学位委员会图书馆、情报与档案管理学科评议组秘书

前　言

随着数字化技术的飞速发展,图书馆学、情报学教育面临着前所未有的挑战与发展机遇。图书馆学、情报学教育的改革与创新,已成为世界各国积极探索的重要课题。为了加强国际交流,促进合作,进一步探索数字环境下图书馆与情报学教育的发展趋势,经国家教育部批准,武汉大学主办 2000 年"数字时代图书馆与情报学教育发展高级研讨班"。同时受亚洲高等教育联合董事会(United Board for Christian Higher Education in Asia)资助,武汉大学与匹兹堡大学联合主办 2000 年"首届中美数字时代图书馆与情报学教育发展国际研讨会"。这两项学术活动同时举行,为有关教育专家、学者和实际工作者提供了切磋学术,交流成果,进一步探讨数字环境下图书馆与情报学教育的发展趋势的极好机会,必将对中美两国图书馆与情报学教育的合作与发展产生积极和深远的影响。

本次国际学术研讨会暨高级研讨班定于 2000 年 11 月 6 日至 10 日在中国武汉大学召开。会议讨论的主题非常广泛,包括数字化时代图书馆与信息科学课程设计,21 世纪图书馆学与信息学教育的发展趋势,信息人才的知识结构与图书馆与信息科学核心课程,师资素质与教学方法,因特网资源与数字化图书馆教育研讨,国家信息基础设施建设与图书馆学信息科学教育问题研讨,图书馆数字化技术的应用与专业教育,数字化时代美国图书馆学信息学教育的变革,美国图书馆与信息学研究生课程发展,信息管理与信息系统专业教育研讨,中美图书馆与信息学学位制度的比较,数字化时代图书馆学信息教育哲学的变化,国家图书馆学与信息科学教育政策问题研讨等。本次国际学术研讨会的通知发出后,国内多家专业杂志刊登了征文通知,国际互联网报道了会议消息,得到了国内外图书情报界以及许多领导、专家、学者的广泛响应和热情支持。会议特邀了得克萨斯大学奥斯汀分校图书情报学院前院长 Brooke E. Sheldon 教授,依利诺依大学图书馆学情报学研究生院院长 Leigh Estabrook 教授,武汉大学信息管理学院教授、博士研究生导师彭斐章教授等多位中美两国的知名学者担任主讲专家。会议还收到 30 余篇与会学者带来的论文。本书即是本次研讨会的专题论文集,书中对主讲专家的讲稿以及与会专家的论文一般不作内容上的改动,并采取中英文稿混排形式。

本次国际学术研讨会暨高级研讨班得到了中国国家教育部、亚洲高等教育联合董事会、武汉大学、匹兹堡大学以及中国国家自然科学基金会的资助。教育部武汉大学师资培训交流中心,武汉大学外事与国际合作部、社会科学研究部和后勤保障部的领导给予了大力支持。武汉大学信息管理学院和武汉大学信息资源研究中心承担了绝大部分的筹备任务和会务工作。武汉大学信息管理学院办公室的同志和部分研究生承担了大量的会务工作,陈传夫、王新才、李纲、王子舟、黄如花同志和部分研究生承担了秘书工作,为本书的编辑印刷付出了辛勤的劳动。陈传夫、李纲同志设计了"会徽"。徐丽芳、李小鹏、孔希、曹海峰、郑睿、丁波、余传明、夏卡莉、谢莹、陈幼华、李洪武等青年教师和研究生承担了大量的翻译工作,黄如

花同志担任译文的总校对工作。还有许多老师、干部和研究生为会议的筹办、召开及论文集的修改、编辑等工作提供了多方面的支持和帮助。在本次国际学术研讨会举行和论文集付梓之际,我们怀着十分感激的心情,谨向所有关心、资助、支持和帮助本次国际学术研讨会的单位和个人表示最诚挚的谢意!

由于我们水平有限,加之时间紧迫,论文集中难免存在缺点或疏漏,恳请大家谅解和指正。

马费成

2000 年 11 月 3 日

于武汉大学

目　录

Embedding an LIS School
within the University and Society

Leigh Estabrook
(University of Illinois at Urbana—Champaign)

Abstract   This paper explores strategic internal changes of the U.S. LIS schools during the past 15 years with examples drawn from the Graduate School of Library and Information Science at the University of Illinois. In 1985 almost all United States universities seemed to view their LIS schools as marginal to the University mission—a pattern consistent with the findings of Marion Paris. External developments in communication and computing technologies, with increased focus on managing the information content supported by these technologies have changed public perceptions about the value of library and information science knowledge. Cross-disciplinary research and teaching, community outreach and other initiatives improve LIS schools' visibility and embeddedness in their universities. At the same time attention to quality and promoting university recognition of quality have increased their status.

Keywords   Library and information science   Education   Quality

Introduction

By the mid-1980s library and information science (LIS) education in the United States felt itself under siege, as many of the most prestigious schools had been closed or were under review and threatened with being closed included Case Western, the University of Chicago and Columbia University. No school felt safe and indeed, probably none at that time was. Our understanding of why schools of library and information science were not being supported by their universities was most clearly elucidated by Marion Paris in her dissertation, turned book entitled *Library school closings: four case studies* [1]. Paris's case studies of 4 schools that were closed revealed: (1) their relative isolation from the universities of which they were a part, (2) an inability of the LIS administrators to articulate the value of their programs to the universities and society, (3) a sense that the schools were encroaching on the "pedagogical territory" of other units, and (4) poor evaluations of the LIS programs by external bodies. She concluded that "library education programs that survive will share two attributes: imaginative, diplomatic leadership and a strong mission, or 'sense of self.'" [1]

This paper examines the ways in which schools of LIS education in the United States

have, since the mid-1980s, sought to embed themselves into the fabric of their universities and become more fully members of the academic community. With apologies for certain parochialism, I will draw heavily from examples of changes at the University of Illinois. I do this in part because it is a situation with which I am most familiar, having been dean since January of 1986. I also do so because the strategy at Illinois has been somewhat different from other schools and also because the University is one of the major research universities in the country. The University continually evaluates its schools and departments with the result that I think often about how to make my LIS school indispensable to the institution. A number of times campus leaders' comment on our school being ranked first by the U.S. News and World Report is almost frightening, particularly when we know how fragile perceptual rankings can be.

The University of Illinois in 1985 was similar to many of its peer institutions: relatively isolated from the rest of the University and questioned by its university colleagues. Early in my deanship a former chancellor was quoted as saying about our school, "You may be one road apple (i.e., horse dung), but you are still a road apple." To him the peer rankings that placed our school among the top LIS schools meant little since he perceived no value in library and information science as a field. The challenge then was to change university perceptions about both the field of library and information science and about the school.

Changing perceptions of library and information science, both on our campuses and in the larger environment, has been the easiest task for LIS faculty and administrators, although it has cost significant effort. Particularly the Internet and the World Wide Web, have become major forces in the economy, individuals who work with those technologies and make them more useful have gained in prestige. People like Robert Taylor, Fred Kilgour and Forrest W. (Woody) Horton recognized by the 1970s the convergence between librarians' skills and management of new technologies. From then until the early 1990s, librarians and information scientists presciently spoke of the importance of their knowledge to the application of a computer. It wasn't however, until computing technologies expanded significantly into information technologies, and particularly the development of the Internet and World Wide Web that the role of librarians became widely recognized outside the field. The first National Science Foundation Digital Library Initiative provided a significant boost to our field by linking the concept of libraries to digital content. Subsequently, the growth of the Web, with its need for information architecture, information design and content building has hastened the demand for individuals educated with the classic skills of librarians in organizing and retrieving information. One colleague recently commented, who would have ever thought that "cataloging" would become a growth industry?

The responses to social and technological changes of LIS schools in the United States have varied. Syracuse University was the earliest adopter of a broader mission, becoming the School of Information Studies over 30 years ago. A few schools, like Pittsburgh and Drexel, also took early leadership in expanding their programs to embrace a focus on technology, expanding their offerings and degrees in areas such as telecommunications, information science and information

technology. As other schools have transformed themselves, some have focussed more on users, others on aspects of communications studies or educational technology, yet others on information management in some form. In recent years, LIS schools have become increasingly different one from another as they have built on the strengths of their own faculty and those of the wider university of which they are a part. These differences reflect the unique circumstances of each institution: the relative strengths and passions of the LIS faculty and administration, the strengths and weaknesses of each university, and the financial and political position of the schools and universities. At Illinois, for example, a new budgeting system returns all graduate tuition dollars to the School, allowing significant control over our resources. This is a benefit, but also entails risks should the number of students decline. For now, our Computer Science Department and Business School have too many students, so there has been little battle for turf as we increased the number of courses in information science and technology. At the same time, the College of Communication has eagerly sought a partnership with us so they could claim some involvement in "information technology." Our undergraduates who minored in "information studies" are based on our School, but it is "in collaboration with the College of Communication"—an important symbolic and political decision.

Let us turn then at what schools have done to embed themselves in their universities. Colleges and universities in the United States assess academic programs on three essential criteria: their quality, their centrality to the mission and work of the university, and the level demand for their program—both in recruiting students, and in placing them in jobs after graduation. (Some institutions, particularly those in which cost or revenue of LIS represents a significant portion of the college or university budget-look at a fourth criteria, cost.)

Quality

There are some differences among colleges and universities in how they measure quality. Some large research universities have frequently questioned hosting LIS schools within their ivy walls. At this time, the primary indicator is the quality of faculty research. At schools based on liberal arts colleges and "second tier" universities, teaching quality may be most important (although all the U.S. colleges and universities seem to be increasing their emphasis on faculty research).

Disciplines vary in how they do research—an historian, for example, will depend on archival records and libraries and will tend to publish in books or journals; a physicist will do experiments in a lab and depend on pre-prints for communication with his or her colleagues. As a multidisciplinary field, scholars in library and information science may differ in the way they conduct research and how they transmit their findings. This is often a challenge as we evaluate our colleagues within our schools or make cases for promotion and tenure in the wider universities. In the end, faculty in LIS schools must expect to be evaluated exactly as their disciplinary colleagues who are in other departments: on the quality of teaching, research and service of each faculty member.

Evaluation of faculty research will include some combination of the following:

(1) Level of outside funding to support research;

(2) Citations by others to the scholar's work;

(3) Rankings of the school or department in average numbers of publications or numbers of citations;

(4) Awards for research received by faculty from outside bodies;

(5) Productivity as measured by the number of publications;

(6) Membership in national academies or other honorary societies.

For many years, LIS researchers tended to conduct their research as isolated endeavors and were driven primarily by opportunistic interests. By that I mean that LIS research often focussed on problems for which there was funding or which interested the faculty member at that time. Few faculty in LIS in the 1980s and before were building a body of cumulative research, the findings of which were significant to other scholars and helpful to a deep understanding of a problem. This has changed in important ways. One of the most important ways in which LIS schools have embedded themselves more fully in their academic institutions is by their faculty—as individuals and collectively—meeting the university expectations, as listed above. We can now find LIS scholars with a series of connected research projects and significant publication of findings that distinguish them as experts. We find small groups of LIS scholars who are working together to solve large problems. They identify themselves as a community and build on one another's work in deliberate ways. And they are tackling problems that are recognized by outsiders as important and worthy of significant funding. LIS schools have been recipients of large national grants. These have made a difference in the problems we can solve. It has also had an impact on how we are viewed within our universities.

At Illinois, it was important at the university level that our school received grants from the Institute of Museum and Library Services, Department of Commerce, Fund for the Improvement of Post-secondary Education and National Science Foundation programs including the DLI(Digital Library Initiative), KDI (Knowledge and Distributed Information) and ITR (Information Technology Research). The grants signify to the University that outside peer reviewers think well of the quality of the research our faculty conducts. Most of these grants involved collaboration with other departments on campus or even segments of the local community and they also funded graduate students—two other important aspects of how we are perceived by our university.

The university administrators also pay attention to studies that rank impact of the school as measured by citations to our faculty members' works and level of productivity. It has been important for me to nominate our faculty for various university and national awards—so that having a GSLIS faculty member at the annual Celebration of Academic Excellence or receiving one of the ALISE awards is an important goal. Obviously, we won't succeed every time— many other LIS schools are striving for the same level of excellence and recognition, but we attend to this systematically in ways few of us did 20 years ago. It has also been important to