

Library Services for the 21st Century at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign:

Final Report and Recommendations of the Budget Group Plus

April 21, 2008

Introduction

Over the past several weeks, the Budget Group Plus has reviewed the proposals for “New Service Models” put forward in its Interim Report (November 2007), and evaluated each proposal for possible implementation. Substantive feedback has been received on the Interim Report from Library staff and Library users through electronic mail, the Library Web site, departmental meetings, and discussions that took place during the Town Hall Meetings held earlier this semester. Members of the Budget Group Plus were inspired by stories of how individual librarians and Library units contribute to the work of our faculty, staff, and students, and appreciative of the comments concerning both the strengths and weaknesses of our current service models. We found that our users – whether residents on the Urbana campus, participants in distance learning programs, or visitors to our Library from across the country (and around the globe) – share both our commitment to building on the strengths of the University Library, as well as our concern that Library service programs must be regularly reviewed in order to ensure that they continue to meet the needs of a broad spectrum of Library users, both for today and for tomorrow. This feedback has been essential to the review process and to the recommendations provided in this report.

Among the commitments kept foremost in mind during our review of New Service Model proposals were those identified in the Interim Report as underpinning the distinctive strengths of our traditional, “departmental library” service model. In brief, New Service Models must *retain and build upon* our commitments to:

- assigning subject specialists documented responsibilities for providing library services, collections, information resources, and information products appropriate for the faculty, staff, and students in defined fields of teaching, learning, research, and service;
- acquiring and providing access to rich collections of published scholarship, primary-source research materials, and related resources for use by faculty and students in their teaching, learning, research, and service activities;
- fostering regular communication and collaboration between faculty, students, and library professionals through the design of service programs, physical spaces, and technology-enhanced academic environments; and
- making use of the full array of library facilities in order to provide appropriate physical environments, both for our users and for the long-term preservation of the cultural and scholarly records for which we serve as stewards.

In addition, the Budget Group Plus was guided by a set of overarching principles for decision-making that focused on enhancing communication and collaboration between the Library and its user communities, providing stewardship for all resources and collections, and developing service models that may evolve as broader changes continue to shape the higher education and information environments.

Those wishing to review the full description of the challenges and opportunities addressed through the New Service Models process may consult the full text of the Interim Report, as well as the “Principles for Decision Making” on the New Service Models Web site <http://www.library.uiuc.edu/committee/budgetplus/service_models.html>.

The Budget Group Plus appreciates the input and feedback its members received during the New Service Models process. Our process of review and evaluation has been enhanced by the contributions of our staff and users. Early feedback from both groups allowed us to begin implementing several proposals that enjoyed support among the Library and campus communities, e.g., the proposal to combine the services of the City Planning & Landscape Architecture (CPLA) Library with those of the Funk Family College of ACES Library. The Library is grateful for the time and effort already being contributed by faculty and staff across campus to help us to move forward on these initial New Service Models projects. We recommend the establishment of similar implementation teams for the projects recommended for implementation in this report, and recommend, further, that future teams likewise include representatives both of the Library faculty and staff, and of campus colleagues (as appropriate). Finally, we recommend that the Library dedicate appropriate human resources to designing the project management and process improvement programs critical to the success of the multiple projects recommended for implementation in this report.

In the pages that follow, you will find our recommendations regarding the proposals described in the Interim Report. These recommendations relate to projects already approved for implementation, to projects we recommend be pursued over the next few years, as well as to operational and strategic priorities that we believe will provide the foundation for the future of Library collections and service programs at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Several proposals first considered in the Fall – e.g., establishing an information service point on the first floor of the Main Library, re-locating the Map & Geography Library, and building a new facility designed to house our invaluable rare book, manuscript, and primary-source research materials – do not appear in the final set of recommendations because they are better suited to the longer-term view of the future of core Library facilities and service programs to be addressed in Main Library/Undergraduate Library Feasibility Study (in progress). Proposals for long-term projects and priorities will be discussed directly with the architects and engineers leading the Feasibility Study. Finally, it should be noted that, while the full slate of proposals recommended in this report is ambitious in its scope, there is always the possibility that other proposals for change will be implemented as well. There are proposals for change and for strategic allocations of resources articulated in documents such as the University Library Strategic Plan that are not repeated here, but are not forgotten. Likewise, there are issues and opportunities that will arise over the next few years that we cannot imagine (or plan for) today. This report provides a roadmap for future changes, but

the Library must reserve the right to veer from that road in pursuit of goals and opportunities not yet identified. The research library, like the institutions of higher education and scholarly communications of which it is a part, is in a state of transition. This roadmap should help us to weather that transition and to reach our goal of establishing a more flexible organization for the future, but we reserve the right to go “off-road,” when needed.

This report concludes with two appendices: 1) a listing of the Library spaces referenced in this report; and, 2) a brief summary of the discussion by the Budget Group Plus of each proposal originally described in the Interim Report.

This document was prepared by the members of the University Library’s “Budget Group Plus”:

Paula Kaufman, University Librarian and Dean of Libraries (Chair)

Rod Allen, Assistant Dean of Libraries for Budget Operations & Management Information

Peggy Glatthaar, Senior Library Specialist, Central Access Services

JoAnn Jacoby, Anthropology & Sociology Librarian

Cindy Kelly, Director, Library Human Resources

Chris Prom, Assistant University Archivist

Beth Sandore, Associate University Librarian for Information Technology Planning & Policy, and Associate Dean of Libraries

Mary Stuart, Head, History, Philosophy, & Newspaper Library

Tom Teper, Associate University Librarian for Collections, and Associate Dean of Libraries

Scott Walter, Associate University Librarian for Services, and Associate Dean of Libraries

New Service Models – Recommendations for Implementation

The recommendations made below represent the next stage in planning for proposals originally outlined in the Interim Report. Several represent changes in the scope and direction of the original proposals. These changes are based both on our evaluation of the proposals and on feedback received over the past six months from Library staff and Library users.

I Proposals Approved for Implementation

The following proposals have already been approved for implementation by the University Library's Executive Committee and presented for discussion to the members of the Senate Committee on the Library and the University Librarian's Long-Range Advisory Committee. The charge and membership of the teams established to implement these proposals may be found on the New Service Models Web site <http://www.library.uiuc.edu/committee/budgetplus/service_models.html>.

1. Establish a Retrospective Reference Collection in the Main Library

Reference materials remain a critical resource for research, teaching, and learning, but the departmental library model fosters the fragmentation of these resources across multiple service points within the Main Library. Pursuing this proposal will allow us to establish a rich reference collection relevant to research, teaching, and learning in all fields of inquiry, to improve access to these materials by bringing them together in a space in which longer service hours can be provided, and to allow for greater flexibility in selecting materials for the on-site collections remaining in departmental libraries.

Implementation Team Chair: Jo Kibbee, Central Reference Services

2. Establish and Implement Appropriate Strategies for Digital Content Creation, Reformatting, Preservation, and Access

The Library is deeply engaged in digital content creation, and needs to determine the most effective way to organize, manage, deliver and sustain access to this content. Pursuing this proposal will include: articulating the principles and methods critical to effective digital content life cycle management, including selection, digitization, metadata creation, quality review, management and access, and long-term archiving and curation; defining creation, management, access, and preservation needs and priorities for all types of content; and recommending the establishment of an effective organization and management structure to support the life cycle of digital content creation, access and management.

Implementation Team Chair: Michael Norman, Content Access Management

3. *Combine the Collections and Services of the City Planning & Landscape Architecture (CPLA) Library with those of the Funk Family College of ACES Library*

Discussions about the CPLA Library have been ongoing with faculty in the College of Fine & Applied Arts and the College of ACES. Pursuing this proposal will allow us to improve access to Library collections and services for CPLA patrons through their transfer to a better facility, as well as to continue discussions with our users about the collections and services appropriate to a 21st-century “design library.”

Implementation Team Chair: Sue Searing, Library & Information Science Library

4. *Establish a “Scholarly Commons” Service Model and Service Point in 200 Library*

The Scholarly Commons is envisioned both as a physical facility and as an evolving service environment aimed at the changing needs of graduate students and faculty. Pursuing this proposal will allow us to more effectively bring together Library subject specialists and other professionals in support of scholarly activity, and provide an opportunity to develop critical collaborative relationships with campus units including CITES, ATLAS, the Graduate College, and I³. The Scholarly Commons will develop in phases in order to support a wide range of traditional and emergent service needs (e.g., research consultation, integration of Library-provided content into teaching and research design, IT applications development and support, digital content creation, data services), and to allow for new service programs to emerge as part of the expansion of digital scholarship in the humanities and social sciences. The Scholarly Commons will serve as a key support mechanism for the development of cyberinfrastructure in the humanities and social sciences, as well as a campus hub for the support of e-learning and e-science.

Implementation Team Chair: Scott Walter, Library Administration

5. *Open and Improve User Services in the Main Library Book Stacks*

The University and the Library have dedicated significant resources toward improving the service environment within the Main Library Book Stacks. Improved collection management has been facilitated by the construction of the Oak Street Library Facility, for example, and environmental conditions have been improved by the installation of sprinkler systems and other life safety enhancements. Finally, ongoing efforts to shift the collection, uncover and process previously-hidden collections are resulting in greater consistency in shelving and the ability to make better use of access tools. Pursuing this proposal will allow us to make the Stacks more open to browsing and to use by our patrons, and to focus needed attention and resources on the management of physical collections and enhancement of user space. Dedication to these goals will ensure ongoing and improved access to a “browsing collection” of over 4.5 million volumes, while also allowing the Library to take advantage of opportunities provided by the Oak Street Library Facility to maintain lowered long-term storage costs and to provide the optimal physical environment for long-term preservation of our physical collections.

Implementation Team Chair: Tom Teper, Library Administration

II Recommendations for Strategic Initiatives to Pursue as Part of Library Planning and Budgeting Activities

The following proposals represent strategic initiatives identified as critical for the University Library to pursue, or as initiatives already recognized in the University Library Strategic Plan (2006), but requiring renewed commitment of resources. Competition for scarce resources available for support of strategic initiatives requires the Library to take a balanced approach to making progress in each area over the next three years, but also one that is guided by concrete benchmarks and operational goals.

6. Support E-Science and E-Scholarship as a Strategic Priority for the University Library

Over the past several years, the term “E-Science” has been used to describe new research methods in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities that take advantage of increases in computing power, storage capacity, and measurement techniques to ask new questions, as well as new information and communication technologies that link data, people, and computational services together in virtual organizations. E-Science encompasses computationally-intensive inquiry carried out in distributed environments, science that uses large data sets requiring grid computing, as well as inquiry in the social sciences and humanities that requires the management and use of quantitative data or the systematic mining of textual data. Pursuing this proposal will ensure that the University Library will be in a position to provide ongoing support to established and emergent e-science and e-scholarship programs across campus and with external partners.

7. Establish a Scholarly Communications Unit and Service Program

Establishing a robust scholarly communications program has already been identified as a strategic priority for the Library, and this proposal provides support for the coordination of existing scholarly communications programs in place, as well as for the enhancement of those programs through more effective integration into Library-wide service programs. The Budget Group Plus recommends that the Library invest in the human resources, information technology infrastructure, and staff training and development programs needed to support campus-wide attention to critical scholarly communications issues while building on the many successful initiatives already pursued by the Library in this area.

8. Establish New Approaches to Library Services to Multi-Disciplinary Fields and Research Centers

Building on the success of the Biotechnology service model established several years ago, and recognizing the significance of campus trends, including the establishment of the Illinois Informatics Initiative (I³), the success of interdisciplinary research and teaching programs like the Game Research Program, and the establishment of Professional Science Master’s (PSM) programs, the Budget Group Plus recommends that the Library look anew at the ways in which Library services are developed and promoted in emergent areas of research and teaching not defined by traditional disciplinary boundaries (or easily served through departmental libraries). In some cases, this will require the creation of new faculty positions (e.g., Biotechnology, Multicultural Outreach); in others, it will provide an opportunity for re-envisioning the scope of an existing position. The opportunity to explore new models for subject

specialist services in libraries is significant, as is the opportunity to look at how the Library can be more agile in developing service programs relevant to the needs of emergent fields of inquiry on campus. Relevant areas already identified in the University Library Strategic Plan include Gaming Studies and Health and Wellness Studies.

9. *Establish a Library-Wide Program of Assessment of Library Collections and Services*

Establishing a “culture of assessment” has already been identified as a strategic priority for the Library. The Budget Group Plus recommends that the Library invest in the human resources, information technology infrastructure, and staff training and development programs needed to foster the development of an environment in which decisions can be made based on user feedback and other defined data points, and progress toward strategic goals consistently noted and disseminated.

III Recommendations for Service Program Changes to be Pursued as Part of Ongoing Planning for the Future of the Main Library

The following proposals represent service program changes that will continue throughout the three-year planning window represented by this report, and will likely continue as part of ongoing planning for the future of the Library. We recommend that each of the projects recommended in Section IV (below) include attention to these overarching, operational recommendations as part of the implementation process.

10. *Consolidate Responsibility for Acquisition and Cataloging of Library Materials within Central Technical Services Units*

Currently, a number of technical services operations are housed in departmental libraries, including, but not limited to, the Undergraduate Library, Government Documents Library, Music Library, Slavic & East European Library, and Asian Library. The Budget Group Plus recommends undertaking a comprehensive review of technical services functions (acquisitions, serials check-in, electronic resource management, cataloging, and metadata creation) across the Library with the goals of improving collaboration and coordination of efforts, and of facilitating the virtual and physical consolidation of staff and services. The Budget Group Plus recommends pursuing this proposal in a staged fashion that will allow us to: identify opportunities for consolidation and/or coordination of technical services operations across the Library; continue to develop and implement standards for materials processing and use of enterprise systems (e.g., Voyager); and foster the development of a robust community of staff and faculty specialists with similar (or complementary) responsibilities.

11. *Centralize Responsibility for Main Library Access Services*

Currently, a variety of access services operations are performed in multiple departmental libraries housed within the Main Library facility. The Budget Group Plus recommends undertaking a review of access services functions (e.g., circulation, retrieval of materials for call slip/ILL/DD, and provision of print reserve materials) provided in the Main Library with the goal of facilitating coordination and

consolidation of staff and services. The Budget Group Plus recommends pursuing this proposal in a staged fashion that will allow us to provide improved access services to Library users by allowing for more effective use of staff and student employees, as well as by bringing a consistent approach to one of our busiest service programs, and allowing for greater flexibility in the articulation of responsibilities within departmental libraries.

12. Establish Central Curatorial Control of Rare Book and Special Collections Material

Recognizing the immense financial and scholarly value represented by our collection of rare book, special collection, manuscript, and archival materials, we must commit to developing a Library-wide program statement on special collection operations and the place of special collections in the service programs of the University Library. Pursuing this proposal will require an assessment of materials currently housed in departmental libraries as the foundation for future discussions related to facilities needs, human resources needed to provide improved physical and intellectual control over these materials, the identification of “hidden” collections, and the integration of special collection materials into broader plans for the enhancement of Library services.

IV Recommendations for Service Program Changes to be Implemented in the Next One to Three Years

The following proposals represent service program changes that may be completed within the three-year planning window represented by this report, if provided with appropriate financial and human resources, and subject to additional considerations. Owing to the need to stage projects for most effective use of resources and facilities, the recommendations in this section are presented, roughly, in the order suggested for implementation.

13. Integrate Government Documents Service Programs into Broader Service Programs

As a land-grant library and a participant in the Federal Depository Library Program and other bodies’ depository plans, the University Library has a commitment to collect and preserve government information, as well as to design service programs that allow faculty, staff, students, and members of the community to access and make effective use of government information. In order to ensure continued excellence in the care of government information collections and the provision of government information services, the Budget Group Plus recommends pursuing a staged approach to integrating government information service programs into broader service programs and initiatives of the University Library. Pursuant to Proposal No. 10, the Budget Group Plus recommends that technical service operations in the Government Documents Library consolidate with complementary Central Technical Services operations. Further, the Budget Group Plus recommends that faculty and staff in the Government Documents Library and Central Reference Service collaborate to establish a shared service point that will facilitate robust staffing of one of our key information service areas while providing the flexibility necessary to support a full range of service programs, including ready reference service, digital reference service, instructional services, research consultation, and public engagement.

14. *Create a “Media & Information Studies Library” to be located in 122 Gregory Hall*

Inquiry in the fields of Communications Studies and Library & Information Science (LIS) routinely requires use of materials housed in a variety of locations. This reflects both the broadly interdisciplinary nature of research and teaching in these fields, as well as the limitations of current Library spaces. Recognizing these limitations, as well as the projected expansion in the undergraduate programs both of the College of Media and the Graduate School of Library and Information Science, the Budget Group Plus recommends combining the collections and service programs of the Communications Library and the LIS Library to create a “Media & Information Studies Library” that will bring together complementary resources in a space that may continue to provide robust support for students and scholars in the constituent disciplines.

15. *Re-locate the Classics Library to 306 Library*

The limitations of the current Classics Library space have long been known, and its current space is not suitable either for the long-term maintenance of collections or for the provision of public services. In support of the long-term goal of re-locating public service units from the 4th floor to more heavily trafficked locations closer to the building entrances, and taking the opportunity provided by the creation of the “Media & Information Studies Library,” the Budget Group Plus recommends re-locating the Classics Library to 306 Library. This new location will also be more amenable to students and scholars who routinely make use both of materials housed in Classics and materials housed in the Rare Book and Manuscript Library (346 Library) in support of inquiry in the fields of Classics and Medieval Studies.

16. *Create a “Languages and Linguistics Library” to be located in 225 Library*

The English Library and the Modern Languages and Linguistics Library provide complementary collections and expertise in areas related to the study of world languages, literatures, and linguistics. Likewise complementary are certain collections and services of the Latin American & Caribbean Library, which, like Modern Languages & Linguistics, collects materials published in languages such as Spanish and Portuguese. The Budget Group Plus recommends combining the complementary collection and service programs of the English Library, the Modern Languages & Linguistics Library, and the Latin American & Caribbean Library to create a “Languages and Linguistics Library” that will provide a robust service point focused on resources related to the study of Western languages, literatures, and cultures, and that will build on pre-existing collaborations between the faculty currently housed in the English, Modern Languages & Linguistics, and Latin American & Caribbean libraries.

17. *Create an “Area and International Studies Library” to be located in 321/325 Library*

The Area Studies represent a historic area of strength, both in collections and public service, for the University Library, and the Library’s area studies faculty and staff provide complementary services to campus units and across campus units. Access to many of those collections and services, however, is limited by the demands involved in operating multiple area studies units within the Main Library facility. Recognizing both the strengths and the limitations of the current model, the Budget Group Plus recommends establishing an “Area and International Studies Library” that will provide a robust service point focused on resources related to the study of defined regions of the world and allow for more effective integration of resources collected in vernacular languages into broader service programs. The Budget Group Plus recommends establishing this unit in the co-located space of 321 Library (to house the collections and services currently housed in the Slavic & East European Library and Africana Library Unit, as well as complementary collections and programs of the current Latin American & Caribbean Library) and 325 Library (to remain the Asian Library). Finally, pursuant to Proposal No. 10, the Budget Group Plus recommends that technical service operations in the area studies units consolidate with complementary Central Technical Services operations.

18. *Re-locate the Illinois History and Lincoln Collections to 324 Library*

The limitations of the current Illinois History and Lincoln Collections space have been noted more than once. In support of the long-term goal of re-locating public service units from the 4th floor to more heavily trafficked locations closer to the building entrances, and taking the opportunity provided by the creation of the “Languages & Linguistics Library,” the Budget Group Plus recommends re-locating the Illinois History and Lincoln Collections to 324 Library. This new location will also be more amenable to students and scholars who routinely make use of rare books and primary-source materials housed in IHLC and in the Rare Book and Manuscript Library (346 Library) to pursue inquiry into Illinois History and Lincoln Studies. The Budget Group Plus recommends, further, that print materials currently housed in IHLC that are neither rare books, nor manuscript materials, be transferred to circulating collections in order to improve access and provide for more effective coordination of complementary acquisitions programs. Finally, the Budget Group Plus recommends that, concurrent with this re-location, faculty and staff in the Illinois History and Lincoln Collections dedicate substantial effort to improving access to print, microformat, and manuscript materials through established discovery tools, and develop a Web portal to Illinois History and Lincoln Studies. Together with the re-location of the Classics Library, pursuing this proposal will establish a robust set of complementary service points supporting the interdisciplinary study of the Humanities within the Main Library.

19. *Create an “Earth and Life Sciences Library” in 101 Burrill Hall*

Demands for space in the Natural History Building following the establishment of the School of Earth, Society, and the Environment and a planned NHB renovation project have led to discussions of re-integrating the Geology and Biology libraries as a means of providing effective support to interdisciplinary teaching and research activities across these disciplines. The Budget Group Plus

recommends combining the collection and service programs of the Geology Library and the Biology Library to create an “Earth and Life Sciences Library” that will provide a robust service point focused on resources related to the study of constituent fields, as well as their scientific intersections, e.g., the connection between organisms and their environment. The Budget Group Plus recommends continuing to pursue these discussions in consultation with the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences while also pursuing opportunities to provide consultation and teaching space for the Geology Librarian in the Natural History Building in collaboration with ATLAS.

V Recommendations for Changes to the Organization and the University Library

The following proposals reflect ongoing discussions about the organizational structure and culture of the University Library, as facilitated, beginning in early 2007, by external consultants from the Renewal and Transformation Group (RTG). The Budget Group recognizes that one or more of these proposals would require review and/or revision of the University Library By-Laws, and would require appropriate oversight by organs of faculty governance.

20. Include Library Staff Representatives on Appropriate Library Committees

Most Library services are supported jointly by Library faculty, Academic Professionals, and Civil Service Staff. Several current committees include representatives of faculty and staff, and others have in the past. Committing to broad representation on all appropriate committees, task forces, etc., will improve communication among Library personnel and will result in improved services to our users. The Budget Group Plus recommends that the Library Executive Committee pay special attention to including appropriate staff representation on New Service Models implementation teams. The Budget Group Plus further recommends that inclusion of staff representation on all appropriate committees continue as a guiding principle for all committees, task forces, etc., routinely created by Executive Committee, Administrative Council, and other standing committees of the University Library.

21. Review and Re-Align the Divisional Structure

Library Divisions play a central role in faculty governance and faculty affairs, dissemination of information across the Library, and fostering collaboration and community among Library faculty and staff. The Budget Group Plus has received feedback from faculty and staff across the Library suggesting the need for a comprehensive review of the current divisional structure owing to increasing overlap among areas such as Physical and Life Sciences, Central Public Services and Technical Services, etc. The Budget Group Plus recommends that the Library Executive Committee initiate this review as soon as possible with the goal of ensuring continued support for Library faculty and staff, and for shared governance, within an organizational structure less likely to perpetuate existing divisions, both among disciplinary groupings, and between disciplinary groupings and central service groupings. The Budget Group Plus recognizes that a re-alignment of the divisional structure will have significant implications for a number of standing committees and governance activities, and recommends that the review process identify instances where representative committee memberships, etc., will need to likewise be reviewed and revised.

22. *Review and Re-Align Decision-Making Structures*

The University's focus on strategic investments and measurable outcomes requires prompt and coherent responses to requests for new ideas, information, and proposals for new programs. The Library's dual role as an academic unit and a service unit requires there to be a close working relationship between its policy-setting and administrative leadership groups. The Budget Group Plus recommends that the Library Executive Committee initiate a thorough review of current decision-making structures, and identify a group responsible for preparing information routinely required to support decisions about strategic investments.

Appendix 1

List of Library Facilities and Spaces Referenced in this Report

Note: A complete list of Library facilities is available at <<http://www.library.uiuc.edu/services/find.php>>.

101 Burrill Hall – currently houses the Biology Library, and is the proposed location for the “Earth and Life Sciences Library” [Proposal No. 19]

122 Gregory Hall – currently houses the Communications Library, and is the proposed location for the “Media and Information Studies Library” [Proposal No. 14]

200 Library – currently houses the Central Reference collection, as well as the Government Documents Library, and is the proposed location for the Scholarly Commons [Proposal No. 4]

225 Library – currently houses the Slavic & East European Library, and is the proposed location for the “Languages and Linguistics Library” [Proposal No. 16]

306 Library – currently houses the Library and Information Science Library, and is the proposed location for the Classics Library [Proposal No. 15]

321 Library – currently houses the English Library, and is the proposed location for one of the “Area and International Studies Library” units [Proposal No. 17]

324 Library – currently houses the Latin American & Caribbean Library, and is the proposed location for the Illinois History and Lincoln Collections [Proposal No. 18]

325 Library – currently houses the Asian Library, and is proposed to remain the Asian Library unit of the “Area and International Studies Library” [Proposal No. 17]

346 Library – houses the Rare Book & Manuscript Library

Appendix 2

Interim Report Proposals: Summary of Discussion and Decision-Making Process

In making the recommendations contained in the body of this report, the Budget Group Plus relied not only on the “Principles for Decision-Making” noted in the Introduction, but also on considerable feedback from faculty, staff, students, and other users of the University Library. Members of the Budget Group Plus have met over a dozen times since the beginning of the academic year, and members of the group have also participated in each of the Town Hall meetings held to solicit input from across campus, as well as in discussions of the New Service Models process at meetings with each Library Division, the University Library Executive Committee, and faculty groups from multiple academic departments.

While it would be impossible to report the contents of each e-mail, letter, phone call, or face-to-face discussion held with Library users as part of this process, the Budget Group Plus presents the following synthesis of the discussions of each proposal contained in the Interim Report to provide a sense of the serious and deliberate manner in which the challenges and opportunities presented by each proposal were reviewed.

The proposals are ordered below in the same manner in which they were presented in the Interim Report.

* * *

1. Centralize Responsibility for Main Library Access Services

Discussions of this proposal focused on the degree to which some access services have already been centralized and the significance of the acceptance last year of the “Access Services Report,” which resulted in the decision to merge Central Circulation & Book Stacks with Interlibrary Loan/Document Delivery into Central Access Services. Early feedback on that merger has been largely positive, and progress is being made toward resolving several long-term issues in stacks management and customer service support. We have also seen very effective collaboration between Central Access Services and Content Access Management staff in pursuit of shared priorities over the past several months.

Discussions also focused on the opportunity that centralization of responsibilities for activities such as management of print reserve collections and call slip retrieval and processing might have for increasing flexibility in human resource allocation and enhancing the efficiency of daily Library operations. It was recognized that several of the New Service Models proposals depend precisely on that sort of flexibility and on the opportunity to reduce duplication of effort across multiple service points within the Main Library.

Given the recent change to Central Access Services operations and the potential impact on Access Services work flow not only of New Service Models projects, but also of enterprise-level projects such as our planned participation in the CIC – Google digitization program, the Budget Group Plus chose not to identify this as a specific proposal for implementation in the near term, but will ask all appropriate implementation teams to consider opportunities to move in this direction as part of their planning for new service programs.

The final recommendation on this proposal can be found in Section III of this report as Proposal No. 11: “Centralize Responsibility for Main Library Access Services.”

2. Establish a Retrospective Reference Collection in the Main Library

The development of a retrospective reference collection in the Main Library has been under discussion for years. The “Final Report of the Bookstacks Reorganization Task Force” (2005) proposed that we establish this collection, and several steps had already been taken to identify relevant selection criteria and to provide appropriate space within Stacks. Discussions of this proposal recognized the strong foundation already in place for implementing this proposal, as well as the fact that the opportunity to provide improved access to selected reference materials as part of this collection would facilitate other collection management decisions that will be required as part of other New Service Model proposals. The Budget Group Plus selected this proposal for immediate implementation based on widespread support for the proposal within the Library, lack of significant concern raised about this proposal among our user community, and the role that successful completion of this project will play in facilitating the success of future New Service Model projects.

The final recommendation on this proposal can be found in Section I of this report as Proposal No. 1: “Establish a Retrospective Reference Collection in the Main Library.”

3. Consolidate Responsibility for Cataloging and Acquisitions of Library Materials within Central Technical Services Units

Discussions of the proposal focused on the efforts that have been ongoing in this area for some time, as represented by the re-configuring of the Cataloging Department into Content Access Management in 2005, the establishment of cross-training and overlapping responsibilities for materials processing between CAM and Acquisitions in 2006, and the establishment of the Electronic Resources Management unit in 2007. Discussions of this proposal and how it might be implemented dovetailed with a separate proposal to merge the Undergraduate Library Information Processing and Management unit with CAM in order to provide enhanced support for electronic reserves programs, as well as to provide enhanced support for Library-wide materials processing and resource description programs – a proposal approved for implementation by the Library Executive Committee in early 2008. In addition to following a direction that has already proven successful on a number of fronts, our decision to endorse this proposal was rooted in a recognition that the Library could achieve greater economies of scale and flexibility in the use of skilled human resources through this service model change, as well as through a commitment to fostering the development of a community of staff and faculty specialists with similar (or complementary) responsibilities.

Public feedback on this proposal focused on the concerns raised by specific materials (e.g., materials published in languages using non-Roman scripts) and by the tradition still found in several units of integrating public and technical service responsibilities. With these concerns in mind, the Budget Group Plus sought input from colleagues at peer institutions in order to determine the impact that like changes have had on collection and service programs of similar breadth and depth. Given the unique concerns related to materials currently acquired and cataloged in departmental units, the Budget Group Plus

chose to recommend that this proposal be identified as a long-term change that will need to be accomplished in phases.

The final recommendation on this proposal can be found in Section III of this report as Proposal No. 10: “Consolidate Responsibility for Acquisition and Cataloging of Library Materials within Central Technical Services Units.”

4. Establish Central Curatorial Control of Rare Book and Special Collections Materials

The decentralized nature of the University Library has left us with rare book and special collection materials scattered across campus. Some of these collections are relatively small and easily accessed through existing discovery tools, while others are large and essentially “hidden” from user view. Discussions of this proposal focused on the value these materials hold to students and scholars and the role they will play in the future of the 21st-century research library. The importance of making this commitment was reinforced over the past few months by the attention paid to unprocessed special collection materials brought to the attention of the group as part of planning for New Service Models in the Labor & Industrial Relations Library and the City Planning & Landscape Architecture Library. In short, many of these materials represent rich cultural and scholarly resources, and most would benefit from increased attention to their security, access tools, and provisions for long-term preservation. In other cases, the items are easily accessible but lack a proper storage environment. In nearly all cases, the units housing these items lack staffing and facilities sufficient to serve these items.

Public feedback on this proposal has been largely limited to those directly involved in our rare book and special collections programs, and those whose “hidden” collections have been uncovered by ongoing programs. Given the fact that our existing rare book and special collection units cannot process or house all relevant materials within existing allocations of resources and space, the Budget Group Plus chose not to identify this as a specific proposal for implementation in the near term, but will ask all appropriate implementation teams to consider opportunities to move in this direction as part of their planning for new service programs. Given, further, the unique needs of these materials, dependent on format, as well as the degree to which some of these materials have been integrated into local teaching programs, the Budget Group Plus recognized that our approach to this long-term goal must be fashioned on a case-by-case basis, and must learn from the experience of collaborative approaches to enhancing control and access of special collections materials, as in the current collaboration between the Music Library and the Sousa Archive and Center for American Music.

The final recommendation on this proposal can be found in Section III of this report as Proposal No. 12: “Establish Central Curatorial Control of Rare Book and Special Collections Material.”

5. Optimize Reformatting, Metadata Creation, Digital Preservation, and Access Work

The need to better coordinate our efforts related to digital content lifecycle management (digital content creation, resource description, digital curation, etc.) has become increasingly apparent in recent years, and is related to our strategic commitments to invest both in a Library-wide preservation program (1999 –), and in a Library-wide digital content creation program (2006 –). Given the ongoing commitment of resources to these projects, and the recent approval of the CIC – Google Digitization Program, the Budget Group Plus selected this proposal for immediate implementation in order to provide the necessary infrastructure support and long-term vision needed to develop and support these essential Library service programs for the 21st century.

The final recommendation on this proposal can be found in Section I of this report as Proposal No. 2: “Establish and Implement Appropriate Strategies for Digital Content Creation, Reformatting, Preservation, and Access.”

6. Identify Support for E-Science as a Strategic Priority for the University Library

Discussions of this issue focused on the broadly-defined roles that the Library will be called upon to play in support for e-science and e-scholarship on campus, both as part of campus strategic initiatives (e.g., I³), and in recognition of new approaches to scholarly inquiry that will be made possible by the tools provided through our Large-Scale Digitization and Scholarly Communications programs. Budget Group Plus discussions of this proposal were also influenced by the identification of e-science as the subject of the 2008 CIC Library Conference, and the national discussions of scholarly cyberinfrastructure and library support for e-science and e-scholarship facilitated by the Association of Research Libraries. While support for e-science was not identified as a strategic direction for the Library to pursue during its 2006 planning process, changes in the rapidly changing environment for science and scholarship since then make it clear that planning and budgeting for such support is critical to our ongoing excellence as a research library. Recognizing this, the Budget Group Plus identified this not as a specific project to pursue, but as a lens through which broader discussions of Library facilities, service programs, collections programs, hiring plans, and opportunities for collaboration with other campus units should be viewed.

The final recommendation on this proposal can be found in Section II of this report as Proposal No. 6: “Support E-Science and E-Scholarship as a Strategic Priority for the University Library.”

7. Establish a Scholarly Communications Service and Support Unit and Service Program

As in the case of consolidating technical services programs, discussions of this proposal focused on the ongoing efforts in this area, as well as on the fact that scholarly communications programs have already been identified as part of the Library strategic plans.

While the Library has successfully established key infrastructure support pieces such as an institutional repository (IDEALS) and has recently established a Library-wide Scholarly Communications Committee, our efforts in this area remain decentralized and largely separate from the core service programs provided to faculty, staff, and students by liaison librarians. By reiterating our strategic commitment to Scholarly Communications Services, the Budget Group Plus aims to support broader discussions of budgeting, hiring plans, and opportunities for broader collaboration with campus units on scholarly communications issues.

The final recommendation on this proposal can be found in Section II of this report as Proposal No. 7: “Establish a Scholarly Communications Unit and Service Program.”

8. Establish New Approaches to Library Services to Multi-disciplinary Fields and Research Centers

Discussions of this proposal focused primarily on its amorphous nature. Budget Group Plus members recognize that our current model for identifying liaison assignments, recruitment of Library professionals, and articulation of professional responsibilities for the development, delivery, and assessment of service programs may not be flexible enough to address changes in the way academic research and teaching programs are evolving. The group was likewise attentive to the strong sentiment among Library and campus communities regarding the critical role that traditional subject specialists continue to play in core Library services. Mindful both of traditional responsibilities, as well as emergent ones, the Budget Group Plus identified this proposal as one with great significance for our future, but one that requires further discussion across campus, as well as further study of emergent models in peer libraries.

The final recommendation on this proposal can be found in Section II of this report as Proposal No. 8: “Establish New Approaches to Library Services to Multi-Disciplinary Fields and Research Centers.”

9. Expand the Scope of the University Archives to include responsibility for Historical Collections

There was limited discussion of this proposal, both within the Budget Group Plus, and as part of our programs for gathering input and user feedback. In general, the sense of the group was that the University Archives’ current mandate already encompasses the types of materials discussed in the proposal, and that the challenge faced by the Archives is not the scope of its mandate, but the range of its resources. As records management and enhancement of access to special collection materials becomes an increasingly important feature of the Library’s service program, attention must be paid not only to the physical facilities in which these materials are housed, but also to the identification of human resources appropriate to the full range of services expected from the University Archives.

As the result of the above discussions, this proposal does not appear in the Final Report.

10. Integrate Illinois History and Lincoln Collections into Broader Service Programs

Discussions of this proposal were substantial, driven not only by considerable feedback on the original proposal by members of the Library community and the public, but also by long-standing concerns regarding access to the rich collections of the Illinois History and Lincoln collections. Recognizing that the current IHLC service program is deeply valued by its core constituents, and that the Library must make a commitment to increase access to its collections in connection with the upcoming Lincoln Bicentennial, Budget Group Plus decided that the long-term goals of the Library would be best served by focusing on sustaining and enhancing access to these materials, and on developing a robust Web presence that will provide access to the full range of services and collections relevant to the study of Illinois History and Abraham Lincoln, including (but not limited to) those contained within the ILHC. The decision to pursue the creation of newly-defined public service units on the 3rd floor of the Main Library provided an opportunity to re-locate the IHLC to a more convenient public service space, and to bring complementary rare book and manuscript materials expertise into closer physical proximity of one another.

The final recommendation on this proposal can be found in Section IV of this report as Proposal No. 18: “Re-locate the Illinois History and Lincoln Collections to 324 Library.”

11. Consolidate Central Reference and Government Documents into Central Information Services

There was substantial discussion on the merits of the original proposal within the Budget Group Plus following feedback received largely from within the Library community. The most significant of the concerns raised during these discussions had to do with the ability of Government Documents librarians to successfully maintain the full scope of their service programs if integrated into a public service unit with a broader mandate. The Library is committed to its ongoing role as a government information provider and took these concerns seriously. A number of options were discussed, including the potential merits of integrating Government Documents collections and services with a unit other than Central Reference Services. Recognizing the merit of these concerns, and lacking consensus on the best approach to a short-term plan involving complete integration of Documents with another unit, the Budget Group Plus came to the conclusion that a more moderate approach to the meeting the goal of bringing government documents service programs into the mainstream of Library services was most appropriate during the three-year planning window represented by this report. The group articulated a plan that will allow for Documents operations to follow long-term operational strategies identified by the Budget Group Plus (e.g., consolidation of technical services operations), while allowing Documents faculty and staff and Reference faculty and staff to provide leadership for a coordinated approach to services that will retain the unique strengths of each while facilitating greater coordination and collaboration across units.

The final recommendation on this proposal can be found in Section IV of this report as Proposal No. 13: “Integrate Government Documents Service Programs into Broader Service Programs.”

12. Establish a Scholarly Commons in 200 Library

Discussions of this proposal focused on the place that the “Scholarly Commons” holds in our strategic plan, as well as on the strengths and weaknesses of two earlier attempts to make progress on this strategic initiative in 2006 and 2007. Taking the report of the “Integrative Research Services Task Force” (2007) as a starting point, noting the development since 2006 of “faculty commons” and “scholar services” programs at other ARL libraries, and noting the broad sentiment within the Library that progress on this initiative is essential to the future of Library services, the Budget Group selected this proposal for immediate implementation.

The final recommendation on this proposal can be found in Section I of this report as Proposal No. 4: “Establish a ‘Scholarly Commons’ Service Model and Service Point in 200 Library.”

13. Consolidate the English Library and the Modern Languages & Linguistics Library into a Single Library Unit

There was limited discussion of this proposal, as members of the Budget Group Plus found the underlying rationale persuasive, and received little feedback expressing concern about proceeding from either our staff or our users. The consensus of the group is that there is strong support for the initial proposal. As part of broader discussions of collections and services in support of materials collected in languages other than English, and noting the close collaboration between faculty in the Modern Languages & Linguistics Library and the Latin American & Caribbean Library, the Budget Group revised the original proposal to bring appropriate materials published in Spanish, Portuguese, and other vernacular languages, and currently collected through the LACL, into its discussions of a “Languages and Linguistics Library.” The Budget Group Plus discussed this proposal, as well as the proposal to consolidate Area Studies service programs within a long-range view of integrating collections and service programs designed for students and scholars of the non-English-speaking world, as well as those designed for all who have an interest in the study of world languages, literatures, cultures, and societies, or in focused study of a particular region, its language, and people.

The final recommendation on this proposal can be found in Section IV of this report as Proposal No. 16: “Create a ‘Languages and Linguistics Library’ to be located in 225 Library.”

14. Consolidate the Library & Information Science (LIS) Library and the Education & Social Sciences (ESSL) Library

Discussions of this proposal were substantial, but focused primarily on the most effective way to integrate the collections and services currently housed in the LIS Library with another unit. As one of the primary user groups for LIS collections and services, the Library faculty and staff are well aware of both the strengths and the limitations of the current arrangement. Budget Group Plus members were also mindful of the comments made by students and faculty in the Graduate School of Library & Information Science regarding the symbolic value of the LIS Library space, as well as the value of its on-site collections, as currently constituted, for direct support of GSLIS teaching, especially teaching related to pre-professional librarian education. Even those whose feedback focused on the need to retain the LIS Library as an independent unit, however, recognized the core arguments against that approach, e.g., the interdisciplinary nature of inquiry in LIS, the limitations of the current space to support the full range of inquiry in the field, and the documented evidence of limited use of the physical space. Budget Group Plus did recognize the concerns regarding integrating another social science discipline into the ESSL space, however, and parallel discussions regarding the future of the Communications Library provided an opportunity not found in the original proposal: to integrate the LIS Library and the Communications Library into a “Media and Information Studies Library.” The revised proposal addresses the concerns identified in the original, but also provides an opportunity to bring complementary collections and services together in support of two disciplines soon to see an influx of new undergraduate students, and to provide more robust staffing to a Library unit outside of the Main Library.

The final recommendation on this proposal can be found in Section IV of this report as Proposal No. 14: “Create a ‘Media and Information Studies Library’ to be located in 122 Gregory Hall.”

15. Consolidate Area Studies Public Service Programs into a Single Library Unit

There have been several discussions of the Area Studies units in recent years, culminating in the “Area Studies Proposal” circulated in 2005-06. There were substantial discussions of this proposal within the Budget Group Plus, and it is safe to say that issues related to this proposal were among the most often discussed in the Town Hall meetings held in Spring 2008. The Budget Group Plus recognized the many concerns expressed regarding the need for specialized language expertise to support teaching and research in Area Studies programs, as well as the fundamental concern that this change might somehow result in diminished support for Library collections and services in these areas (and concomitant weakening our Title VI grant proposals that depend, in part, on evidence of strong Library services and collections). While the Budget Group Plus was unanimous in its commitment to maintaining support for Area Studies collections and service programs, it was clear that any change to the current Area Studies configuration in the Library would require ongoing communication and collaboration with faculty and students in various programs. At the same time, the underlying rationale behind the desire to consolidate these units remained unchanged: the model of narrowly-defined Library units was economically unsustainable, and the result was a fragmented program of Library service and support. There were also ongoing concerns about the need for coordinated and long-term approaches to issues related to the acquisition and timely processing of materials meant to support academic programs in the area studies. The Budget Group Plus came to the conclusion that a more moderate approach to meeting the goal of consolidating Area Studies service programs was most appropriate during the three-year planning window represented by this report. The group articulated a plan that will allow for Area Studies units to follow long-term operational strategies identified by the Budget Group Plus (e.g., consolidation of technical services operations) in a phased manner – allowing the appropriate time to review all relevant issues and to coordinate operations prior to a merger desired for the future. The decision to pursue the creation of the “Languages and Linguistics Library” and to house it in the 225 Library space currently occupied by the Slavic and East European Library provided an opportunity to bring a number of area studies units together in a physical space in close proximity to the Asian Library, thereby creating an Area Studies “hub,” rather than a single Area Studies Library. This approach also addressed the significant concerns regarding our ability to move the Asian Library collections, which are currently housed in a space adjacent to the Asian Library in the Main Library Book Stacks, and cataloged using a classification system incompatible with other Main Library collections.

The final recommendation on this proposal can be found in Section IV of this report as Proposal No. 17: “Create an ‘Area and International Studies Library’ to be located in 321/325 Library.”

16. Consolidate the CPLA Library into the ACES Library

Discussion of the future of the CPLA Library began in 2006, and active discussions with members of the Department of Landscape Architecture and the Department of Urban & Regional Planning were already under way prior to the commencement of the New Service Models process. Owing to the preexisting program of discussion outside the Budget Group Plus, there was limited discussion of this proposal by the group. There was also strong consensus that the current service model for this library was untenable in the long term. The Budget Group Plus selected this proposal for immediate implementation based on widespread support for the proposal within the Library and interest in pursuing this proposal among our user community.

The final recommendation on this proposal can be found in Section I of this report as Proposal No. 3: “Combine the Collections and Services of the City Planning & Landscape Architecture (CPLA) Library with those of the Funk Family College of ACES Library.”

17. Consolidate the Geology Library and the Biology Library into a Single Library Unit

Discussions of the future of the Geology Library began in 2006 as part of campus planning for the future of the Natural History Building, and in light of the establishment of the School of Earth, Society, and the Environment. Owing to the preexisting program of discussion outside the Budget Group Plus, there was limited discussion of this proposal by the group. There was a strong sense that the proposal enjoyed support within the Library, and that it also enjoyed support from the academic leadership of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. There was little public discussion of this proposal, and limited input received from our user community. Given the wide array of facilities renovations and academic program reviews that are part of the broader programs initiated by LAS and SESE, the Budget Group Plus chose to recommend pursuit of this proposal, but to tie its support to the broader planning efforts by our LAS colleagues. Further discussion of the proposal among LAS faculty has highlighted the logic of re-integrating these collections and service programs (once housed together as part of the “Natural History Library”).

The final recommendation on this proposal can be found in Section IV of this report as Proposal No. 19: “Create an ‘Earth and Life Sciences Library’ in 101 Burrill Hall.”

18. Create an Information Service Point on the First Floor of the Main Library

There was significant discussion of this proposal within the Budget Group Plus, but, following a series of facilities reviews and discussions of the impact on existing first-floor service points, the final conclusion of the group was that it was not a project suitable for pursuit during the three-year planning window represented by this report.

As the result of the above discussions, this proposal does not appear in the Final Report, but is noted as a discussion point to be pursued as part of the Main Library/Undergraduate Library Feasibility Study (along with the broader issue of wayfinding in the Main Library).

19. Open and Improve User Services in the Main Library Book Stacks

There have been numerous studies of the Main Library suggesting that increasing access and improving the user service conditions in the Book Stacks should be a long-term goal for the Library. Discussions of this proposal focused both on the potential benefits of addressing this proposal, both in the short term, and as part of the long-term future of the facility to be outlined in the Main Library/Undergraduate Library Feasibility Study, and on concerns raised regarding the current organization of the Stacks and the need to take appropriate steps to ensure the security of an “open” Stacks collection. Following review of these concerns and recognizing that this will be a long-term project that will be implemented in phases, the Budget Group Plus selected this proposal for immediate implementation based on the role that even limited success in the short term will play in facilitating the success of other New Service Model projects.

The final recommendation on this proposal can be found in Section I of this report as Proposal No. 5: “Open and Improve User Services in the Main Library Book Stacks.” It is also noted as a discussion point to be pursued as part of the Main Library/Undergraduate Library Feasibility Study.

20. Re-locate the Classics Library to the 3rd Floor of the Main Library

There was limited discussion of this proposal within the Budget Group Plus, owing to the consensus among the group that the current Classics Library is unsuitable either as collections or public service space. The Budget Group Plus discussed feedback received from some users expressing concern about the size of any new collection space for Classics. The decision to pursue creation of the “Media and Information Studies Library” in Gregory Hall provided an opportunity to re-locate the Classics Library to a space both more convenient to its users, and more appropriate for the long-term preservation of its collections, to bring Classics into closer physical proximity to complementary collections held in the Rare Book & Manuscript Library, and to provide easier access for its users to appropriate instructional spaces.

The final recommendation on this proposal can be found in Section IV of this report as Proposal No. 15: “Re-locate the Classics Library to 306 Library.”

21. Re-locate the Map & Geography Library to the Basement Level of the Main Library

Discussion of this proposal focused on: 1) the scope of the current unit; and 2) the significant organizational and physical hurdles that pursuing this project in the near future would require us to clear. While some components of the original proposal may be pursued as part of other projects, e.g., a study of how best to provide support for GIS services in the Library, and while the Budget Group Plus remains convinced that the Map Collection must be re-located to a more suitable location, the final conclusion of the group was that it was not a project appropriate for pursuit during the three-year planning window represented by this report.

As the result of the above discussions, this proposal does not appear in the Final Report, but is noted as a discussion point to be pursued as part of the Main Library/Undergraduate Library Feasibility Study.

22. Review and Re-align Divisional Structure

The Budget Group Plus received several proposals suggesting the need to review our Divisional structure, as well as various suggestions for specific changes that might be made. As an organizational issue internal to the University Library, the Budget Group Plus decided that this issue should be referred as soon as possible by the Library Executive Committee for action.

The final recommendation on this proposal can be found in Section V of this report as Proposal No. 21: “Review and Re-Align the Divisional Structure.”

23. Review and Re-align Decision-Making Structure

The Budget Group Plus received several proposals, and broad feedback from within the Library community, regarding the need to review our decision-making structure and to clarify the role and scope of standing bodies such as Budget Group, Administrative Council, and Executive Committee. These comments complement extensive discussion of this issue as part of organizational development activities facilitated among the members of those standing bodies by members of the Renewal and

Transformation Group (RTG) in 2007. As an organizational issue internal to the University Library, the Budget Group Plus decided that this issue should be taken up as soon as possible by an appropriate committee or task force and refers the matter to the University Librarian and Dean of Libraries for action.

The final recommendation on this proposal can be found in Section V of this report as Proposal No. 22: "Review and Re-Align Decision-Making Structures."

24. Dedicate Resources to Effective Assessment of Library Collections and Services

The Budget Group Plus recognizes Library Assessment as a strategic priority of the University Library and, moreover, is aware of the significantly increased attention to the planning, implementation, and reporting of assessment activities now found across campus. The Budget Group Plus noted the substantive discussions that have taken place over the past several years regarding the importance of Library Assessment, as well as the 2007 establishment of the Library Assessment Working Group. As an organizational issue internal to the University Library, the Budget Group Plus recommends that future plans for the allocation of human resources by Executive Committee and other groups include focused attention to the need to support and enhance assessment activities at the unit and Library levels.

The final recommendation on this proposal can be found in Section II of this report as Proposal No. 9: "Establish a Library-Wide Program of Assessment of Library Collections and Services."

25. Add Library Staff Representatives to Appropriate Library Committees

Discussions of this proposal were brief and to the point: it is undoubtedly beneficial to the operations of the University Library to encourage and support broad participation by members of its staff on the committees, working groups, and task forces that conduct much of the operational and strategic planning of the organization. As an organizational issue internal to the University Library, the Budget Group Plus refers this proposal for action to Library Divisions, Budget Group, Administrative Council, Executive Committee, and other Library committees, working groups, and task forces for consideration as they plan and renew their memberships.

The final recommendation on this proposal can be found in Section V of this report as Proposal No. 20: "Include Library Staff Representatives on Appropriate Library Committees."