This meeting was one of a series of open meetings the Library held to gather input for the final Action Plan report to the Provost. The following notes report on the general themes and concerns about the draft Action Plan expressed at the meeting.

General Comments:

This integration could provide a model for whole Library.

Developing a model for referrals and effective cross-training will be essential to making this work.

The proposed Coordinator position was seen as a good idea. There was general support for the idea of managing the government documents collection holistically across libraries and reducing duplicates; benefits will include making it easier to find government documents in all formats. The Coordinator will also have a much-needed library-wide role in training staff and instructing users.

Many advantages to mainstreaming government info were noted; more specialists learning new things while still doing specialties

Focus should be on rethinking services, creating a new model and not just patching together pieces of the units as they were.

Combining two units is just the first step. Then new services emerge.

Current Government Documents staff would like to have set hours in one place.

Access to Government Information / Technical Services:

Opportunity to enhance access by through integration with Tech Services, e.g., automate the process of adding URLs to analyzed serials – pilot with Geology technical reports.

Working more closely with Technical Services and their workflows may help make online government information resources more accessible.

User Services:

We need a robust model for making referrals to the government information specialists. How to know when to refer to each other? Is there a common level of difficulty at which a question should be referred? Need for training emphasized again.
What will be the role of specialists whose departmental libraries in Main have closed?
Will the referral model be broader than just Gov Docs?

Proposal to combine Maps and Government Documents:

Synergies:
- current use materials-not special collections
- many maps issued by governments
- Need lots of hands-on help, specialized knowledge
Should current maps be brought into the new Ref/Gov Docs unit, as well?

Strong argument made that Gov Docs and Maps have different missions and that the
long-term recommendation to combine the two, in whole or in part, was not sound.
- Only 5% of new printed maps from US government, more from non-US
- Most users don't want to make own maps; they want to see an artifact
- Not sure there is a connection intellectually or collection-wise.
    Kaufman agreed that this long-term recommendation had been neither requested
    nor explored and should be taken off the table.

International and Area Studies
Action Plan Meeting
March 31, 2009

This meeting was one of a series of open meetings the Library held to gather input for
the final Action Plan report to the Provost. The following notes report on the general
themes and concerns about the draft Action Plan expressed at the meeting.

International and Area Studies:
Concern expressed that this model is organized to support undergrads at the expense
of scholars
Direct stack access in Asian is a boon; as is direct access to collections in Stacks.
    Asian as now configured meets the needs of one participant in the discussion and
    should not be changed.
Concern that the proposed Area Studies model skewed to Title VI
Foreign languages lost lots of staff with specialized skills when they became a school,
    concern that the International and Area studies team's recommendations will affect
    ability to attract grad students and faculty
International documents should be part of this unit?
How to provide better access, longer hours to these collections and deep expertise?

Humanities/Literature/Languages:
The team’s report did not adequately address the need of humanists; Literature &
Philosophy doesn't fit with area studies for research; need support for literature,
humanities, linguistics worthy of a strong research university
There was no consultation with Modern Languages and Linguistics (MLL) faculty regarding literature analysis, other than the MLL librarian on the Team. The English Librarian was invited to meet with the committee but was asked only to provide brief information about the English Library.

Propose that we take out MLL and have new committee to look at NSM #16—combining English and MLL.

There was no consultation with humanities faculty.

Kaufman agreed that support and services for humanities, particularly for those who study literature, was not addressed adequately in the team’s report. She agreed to establish another group to identify and focus on these needs and that will consult widely with humanities faculty. (Note, this team is being formed currently and will be charged the first week of May. Its recommendations will be due for submission by October 15, 2009.)

Collections:
Need open major working collections; a draw for visiting scholars
Dismay that French Literature collection in Stacks was split between two floors

Spaces:
Suggestion to move English to Slavic Library space on the 2nd floor, move Area Studies into English on the 3rd Floor
Consider spaces – make clear who gets what and why
Make 2nd floor a humanities floor
What goes where? English/Modern Languages 2nd, area and international 3rd? Should the 2nd Floor be exclusively European-focused? (No, was the general consensus)

Staffing:
Still have German or Korean vacancies; staffing needs should be included in our report to Provost

General Comments:
Need broad faculty consultation
Name/identity – how do we make sure that distinct areas of specialization are visible?
What are the guiding principles?
Bringing smaller units together would increase hours and access to expert staff

Sciences
Action Plan Meeting
April 3, 2009

*This meeting was one of a series of open meetings the Library held to gather input for the final Action Plan report to the Provost. The following notes report on the general themes and concerns about the draft Action Plan expressed at the meeting.*

Geology:
This is a coherent collection with identity, faculty and students need 60% of current collection on hand (old materials useful); keep librarian; need map collection; want details of implementation and better communication

Physics:
What’s the rationale for consolidating Physics and Astronomy into Grainger? Concern that will lose 24-hour access since Grainger is not open 24 hours over break, when faculty are working

Applied Health Sciences (AHS):
Library is a gathering place for students/student project/small group work. AHS Library provides a sense of identity for students. They have no other similar place in the College. Need place to hang out/social networks. Sense of home in large university. 20% of students are from underrepresented groups – this helps with retention. Research also shows that such dedicated study spaces improves students’ success. Social integration best predictor of retention; research-based statement

Collections:
Role of special collections in science research? Old material can be important, but it’s the intellectual content, not the artifact that really matters.

What books go where if a department library is closed?

There is a cycle of print materials. Current materials important, then not so much. Eventually old stuff more important again.

Biology:
Systemists and taxonomists use older materials

General comments:
Gathering/study space important to students
Distribute plans ahead of time – make sure departments know
Communicate to students
Timeline for these proposals?
Need phased approach; staff feeling very stressed

Library Staff – Sciences
Action Plan Meeting
April 6, 2009

This meeting was one of a series of open meetings the Library held to gather input for the final Action Plan report to the Provost. The following notes report on the general themes and concerns about the draft Action Plan expressed at the meeting.
Factors that go into decision making about consolidating a library or keeping it as a departmental library were discussed.

The process for staff reassignments should be made clearer.

**Library Staff – Area and International, Humanities**  
**Action Plan Meeting**  
**April 9, 2009**

*This meeting was one of a series of open meetings the Library held to gather input for the final Action Plan report to the Provost. The following notes report on the general themes and concerns about the draft Action Plan expressed at the meeting.*

One staff member described why the changes in her job have been possible thanks to a reorganization and closer coordination with technical services. She appreciates the new opportunities to develop her skills and do more challenging work.

- Asian catalogers need to be close to their collections
- Users need mediated access; Stacks is not Undergraduate-friendly
- Service units should be faculty/AP heavy and staff light
- Action Plan wasn’t visionary, light on the operational
- Need more team-building in the new units and in the Library

**Action Plan Meeting**  
**April 25, 2009**

**Applied Health Sciences:**
What will current space be used for after it is vacated? Kaufman responded that no plans have yet been developed for this space.

**Area and International Studies:**
Difference among area, international, humanities disciplines like history not appreciated by LAS Administration or the Library

- Intermediate moves not most efficient and disruptive
- Title VIII – Slavic Summer Lab; 100 people – won’t be able to be accommodated when Slavic is in Room 200; need discussion about timeline
- Need more vision to frame the document, rationale for the International and Area Studies Library; Area Studies Centers are on board – but the Library should discuss with them and then articulate how new space will function

- Concern about recruiting grad students, faculty, undergrads if there are no separate area studies libraries. We need to compete with Harvard and Columbia.
**Biology:**
Faculty retention issue for Entomology; need to know plan – especially expertise

**English/Literatures**
Collections will be decimated; delete paragraph and replace with statement saying English and Modern languages collections and services will be examined by faculty, students, librarians to determine new model.

**Humanities:**
Work with Humanities Council; Library is lab for humanities; Provost should offer equivalent funding of a science lab to the Library for benefit of humanities faculty

**Scholarly Commons:**
Improve faculty input in Scholarly Commons.

**Collections:**
Print collections are important and will remain so into the long-term.

**Space:**
Possibilities for internal renovations to bring units together, such as an elevator form Slavic to English with Asian as an access point into Stacks have been ignored explicitly

Study spaces – is the Library looking to recapture the lost seats?

**General Comments:**
Need to talk with faculty in groups of 1, 2, 3

In times of change, people need to hear “What’s happening and why? How will it affect me?“

Need to maintain experts.

Action plan not clear about staffing levels, need to specify current staffing levels and future.

Provost needs to commit to supporting this initiative, it will be disruptive and expensive if not properly funded.

What are the priorities for scholarship?

Online portals and guides are insufficient markers of identity for distinct areas of inquiry

Action plan needs vision to be more explicit
Sense that the proposals mean decreasing access to books, people

Only certain people know what “the plan” is; what’s the hidden agenda?

Action plan too vague. Should be a plan of leadership with a vision, and should reflect the vision of the planning groups

Extend timeline of closings – not enough time to do it right

Action plan will be posted for comment by all Library Faculty before is submitted

Transparency and trust are close to zero; work of teams was ignored

Level of uncertainty is stressful, especially to staff