Present: Barnes, Cuno, Escobar, Koenker, O’Brien (Chair), Rudaill, Sroka, Sullivan, Teper, Wei
Absent: Jiang, Orta, Song, Randolph, Toby

1. Assignment of minute taker – Lynne Rudaill

2. Reports from Working Groups

**Services Working Group** – Rudaill reported that the notes from the last two meetings had been shared. The recommendations for the services proposed for the unit are also going to be affected by work that is going on in the Library by the Reference Services New Service Model Team. At this point, triage or tiered services are under discussion as a way to provide reference. This model would also apply to the new unit. It was reiterated that the new unit will need a print scanner, a planetary scanner, and copy machines to provide support for the services mentioned in both the faculty and graduate student survey. In addition, the development of more summer research labs in other areas, perhaps even in continuing professional development for librarians might be possible. The one item that can be started at any time would be the development of a web portal bringing access to all of the units into one virtual space. In the long term, on demand ordering of resources even if they have to be supplied in a digital format is desirable. Once the Library receives the requested information in electronic format, the material can be moved into a secure reliable environment (such as IDEALS). The graduate student survey has not seen the same level of response as the faculty survey, but a difference has been seen in the expressed desire for longer hours in the unit, even if the staffing is not at the same level of expertise.

**Collections Working Group** – This information will be discussed under the Report on Collection Data from survey.

**Staffing Working Group** – O’Brien indicated that discussion of position descriptions occurred, and it was suggested that Stanford University had a good description for the position of head of an IAS-type library that the committee should look at. In answer to a question regarding titles for librarians, some of the following were suggested – African Studies Librarian, Latin American and Caribbean Studies Librarian, and so forth were suggested but the Library Executive Committee is also addressing the question of titles throughout the Library. There was brief discussion about the use of coordinators within the staffing model. O’Brien indicated that if this model was used, there could be coordinators for functional areas. For example, should there be a “Reference Coordinator,” an “IT Coordinator,” etc. and if so, should there be term appointments for these? Barnes indicated that there was no consensus in the Staffing Working Group regarding the idea of inserting coordinator positions or responsibilities into the IAS model at this point, although the group had discussed the issue extensively at its last meeting.
3. Report on Collection Data from Survey

Tom Teper indicated some responses to the space survey had been received. The remaining question is how much is left in the new area in the way of linear footage. The target for shelf density is around 70% to allow for flexibility and changes in research directions or the acquisition of new items. The addition of many current journals from the Main Stacks for the Latin American and Caribbean collection is possible. Tom also explained the importance of the stewardship of unbound journal titles that have always resided in the Main Stacks. If no one has ever had a single place to go to find these journals, there may be more browsing of the collection when they are brought together. The example of the Education and Social Science Library holding 1290 current display journals in two alcoves was used to illustrate the way in which journal collections can be compacted. There has been some discussion of using microformat cabinets such as the ones being freed of the HRAF collection so that shelving space would not have to be used for these materials. It was speculated that the shelving currently in the English library is adequate and would leave a 7% margin for growth space if the microformat materials are not placed on the shelves.

Teper also reported that he had received some requests for one-time expenditures, but he was surprised by the lack of candidates for digitization. This can easily be done for any materials published prior to 1923 and orphan works published from 1923-172 for which we might get permission. He suggested that after the report is sent out, the experts can look more closely at works that might be digitized. He would consider earmarking a pool of money for a year as a pilot project and these requests might be part of the IAS service offerings.

Teper passed out template for planning of a unit that came from the Library’s facilities coordinator. He suggested that the outline for collections and services be turned over to a planner and we can get suggestions from them. It should be very helpful in discussing issues of “adjacencies.”

4. Distribution of Progress Report – O’Brien indicated that the report had been widely distributed, to Center directors and associate directors, with requests that they then share the report on their distribution lists. She had received some comments in response to it. She will anonymize the results and distribute them to the list.

5. Process for developing Final Report – O’Brien and Teper will draft and distribute a proposed report. It would include information on what we aspire to be in the Library, how we can get there, what the sequencing might be, and also include a little history and background on the process. They do not want to make it an extremely long report.

We will continue to work on project planning and we will need concrete figures for a variety of steps to move forward. Once we have a sequence of events, it has to also be tied to other projects in the Library. We can ask for what we think we need, but may have to compromise on a few things. For example, what is the standard for remodeling offices? What would it cost? Can we, for example, re-lamp the unit.

6. The meeting was adjourned.

Next meeting: March 9
Report due: March 19