I. Working Groups
   a. Services Group. Lynne Rudasill reported that although the group had not met since
      the last Implementation Team meeting a draft of a survey on services for graduate
      students had been compiled and reviewed by the group members. The survey should
      go out very soon.
   b. Collections. Marek Sroka said that this group will also produce a brief survey. Tom
      Teper explained that the survey would be concerned with “nuts and bolts” issues such
      as the need for expansion of the reference collections, serials, microform sets and
      other desiderata. Other questions that would be included would have to do with
      current periodical collections, space issues. There would also be an opportunity to
      address the expenditure of some one time monies that are available.
   c. Staffing. Nancy O’Brien reported that the staffing group had looked over the space in
      the current English and Asian Libraries. There was also a discussion about the needs
      of the Asian library and how those might be addressed in the new service model.
   d. Staff interviews. Nancy O’Brien and Tom Teper continue to interview the staff of all
      the library units involved in the move. When the interviews are complete in
      approximately 2 -3 weeks they will prepare an overview of the information they
      gathered.

II. Status of Progress Report.
   a. No comments had been received from the group up to this point. The discussion was
      opened for any last revisions.
      i. Include mention of John Randolph’s comments noting that we have not yet
         identified the new services we will offer
      ii. Add under first bullet point. Emphasize that we want to make this an inviting
         space, one where people want to come to work. New space will have
         collaborative work space.
      iii. Under 6th bullet point on p. 2. change to read: “Public access to the Main Stacks
         through the former Asian Library entrance is under review”. This increases costs
         of operation, raises questions about security. Also defeats purpose of decreasing
         service points. We also have no evidence that general user population really
         requires this.
      iv. Organizational structure for the new unit was briefly discussed. There would be
         one unit head who would oversee operations. Collection budgets would remain as
         they are. The unit head does not assign the priorities for purchase. The language
in the document that called for an area specialist for each area library was questioned. It was suggested that an historical baseline for the number of specialists for the various areas should be included. This point raised some discussion. One point was that general language might present a stronger argument for the new unit as a whole.

b. The following points should be included in the progress report.
   i. John Randolph’s comments regarding new services still to be addressed
   ii. Diane Koenker’s point about collaborative space. Nancy will discuss exact wording with her. Make it a space people want to go to.
   iii. Remove the word “possibly” from last bullet point on page one describing the creation of a seminar room.
   iv. Specialists. Provide more of a rationale for the need. Emphasize that various positions are not interchangeable, particularly with regard to acquisitions.
   v. Move second bullet point in second section of report (“Each area library collection should have at least one full time area specialist librarian”) up to the issues already decided, temporarily. It was felt that this issue had already been resolved.

There were a number of questions raised about the language used here. Many felt it was too vague. Others that being very specific could be harmful. Tom Teper presented the following scenario – if there were a Middle Eastern librarian who is an historian, why can that person not do collection development in both areas. Ken Cuno and Ron Toby both felt this was not acceptable.

At this point, Nancy will rewrite the language and resubmit draft to committee for review.

c. New initiatives and collaborations
   i. Title VI – emphasis on outreach for K-12. Combine efforts to create a collaborative site with information for all the areas. Broaden our appeal to undergraduates to encourage them to pursue area studies interests
   ii. Space for visiting scholars. Internationalize the space intellectually. Possibly the creation of “serendipitous space”.
   iii. Space for study carrels. Possibly use the offices or the hall leading to the offices. Will need consultation with head of Library Facilities. Another option might be the periodical room. Discussion also turned to the use of what is presently the circulating/reference area in English as a possible study space for the new unit. Must keep in mind that some reference materials can go to stacks reference while others might be digitized.
   iv. Raised the possibility of using the template of the Slavic Reference Service to expand reference services in other regions. Turkish has been developed and Persian is being expanded. Support has come from Title VI and, more recently, Title VIII. This further suggested the possibility of expanding the Summer Research Lab to other areas.
   v. What would make this proposed new library a more service oriented unit.
vi. Must consider staffing levels needed for new services.

vii. What could be added for language instruction? What tools might be useful? Would need to talk with Linguistics Department. Want to be able to appeal to FLAS fellows graduate and undergraduate. Need to look at all audiences. Might consider building a portal for teaching of less commonly taught languages. Maybe a classroom even for distance teaching. Could be seen as an annex of International Studies. Want to be a point that facilitates collaborative research.

viii. How do we expand the services but not minimize our role as research collection.