Present: Marek Sroka (chair), Bob Cagle, Paula Carns, Harriett Green (minutes), Tony Hynes, JoAnn Jacoby, Jo Kibbee, Bruce Swann, Sarah Shreeves

Absent: Dara Goldman, Renée Trilling

Agenda
1. Assignment of a minute taker.
Marek Sroka called the meeting to order and designated Harriett Green as the minute taker for the meeting.

2. Digital initiatives and Services
Marek then introduced guest Sarah Shreeves, the IDEALS Coordinator and Scholarly Commons Coordinator, to speak about how the new unit could work with the Scholarly Commons and participate in digital initiatives.

Sarah first explained the services that will be offered in the Scholarly Commons: The Commons will be a place for faculty and grad students to experiment with technology for research and teaching, and learn how to move their work into the digital sphere. The scholars will learn how to take advantage of digital tools, which will involve working with the Digital Content Creation unit and Betsy Kruger; text editing tools for mark up with TEI; and providing consultation on text analysis tools such as MONK, about which Sarah had spoken with Harriett. The unit will also provide data services such as GIS, which is a useful tool for patrons in Literatures and Languages Library. There will also be lab spaces for faculty, students, and librarians to create videos in Camtasia, audio, podcasts, and transcribe interviews. The Commons will also work with Undergrad to expand the collection of loanable equipment, including digital cameras, recorders, and transcribers.

Sarah explains that they have the technology but now need content experts to push these digital tools into research and library spaces—spaces where collaboration can happen. An example is a need for consultation on copyright issues and author’s rights. Particularly in light of the Google Books settlement, there could be workshops for faculty who are publishing monographs.

JoAnn explained that the scanners in the Commons will be higher end ones that the Literatures and Languages patrons could use, including sheet-by-sheet scanners, book-edge scanners, and large format scanners for folios and other large items.

Jo Kibbee then asked how much of a priority would it be for the new unit to identify items for digitization. She mentioned the back files of journals such as German Philology and Ninth Letter, to which Sarah replied that in the case of Ninth Letter, there would be major copyright issues. Others noted that the vast majority of the titles in the Modern Languages and English libraries’ collection were relatively recent monographs and reference books that were still in copyright, so this might not be an issue. Sarah explained that journal runs owned outright by the U of I, however, could be digitized. Tony asked about publications produced by individual departments, and Sarah said many of those materials are already in IDEALS, and any other similar occasional series and papers would be good candidates to add into IDEALS. Tony noted that Modern Languages had a couple complete runs of such journals.

Sarah noted that Betsy Kruger has been working with faculty to identify gaps and pockets of materials that can be digitized through the Open Content Alliance (OCA). With the upcoming Google Books scanning project, digitization projects through the Open Content Alliance should be optimized for those
collections that may not be digitized through the Google Books project. This has included the Vernon Burton project (city directories), materials for translation studies, and other materials identified for the MONK Project. Jo Ann said that the focus is on faculty projects and building partnerships that are research focused, and that there is potential to do more with materials once they’ve been digitized.

Paula then asked about MONK and to explain what it is. Harriett talked about MONK (https://monk.library.illinois.edu) and how people can create work sets from a corpus of digitized texts in collections such as Documenting the American South, Eighteenth-Century Collection Online, and 19th Century Fiction. After searching through the texts for a specific word, phrase, variant spelling, etc., scholars can analyze the resulting set of texts for patterns in the text and use visualization tools. Paula suggested that there could be link to MONK in the catalog records of books that are in MONK (i.e., Eighteenth Century Collection Online texts). JoAnn added that the responses to the planning team survey included a desire to search across texts.

Sarah said that the Hathi Trust will put OCA material into its Digital Library, where users could build collections and do full-text searching, which wasn’t as robust as MONK but along similar lines. She noted that the contributing institutions included CIC schools, the University of California campuses, California Digital Library, Columbia, and UVA. She also noted that duplication was happening, but primarily at the Google digitization level.

Jo then asked what would be the connection between Harriett and Scholarly Commons, especially given her title. It was noted that liaising with the Commons is part of Harriett’s job description and she would work with the Commons for the new unit. JoAnn then asked Sarah how subject specialists could bring their faculty into the Scholarly Commons. Sarah explained that the Commons will need people with expertise (either subject or otherwise) who could have office hours and take referrals. There is also a seminar room in the Commons where faculty and librarians could meet with research groups. A key part is pushing out the software that the Commons has to the units. She explained that they were putting together a proposal for the IT Prioritization Working Group for a research profile for public computers: there would be the standard profile and a new second one that included most of the Scholarly Commons software tools such as GIS, statistical analysis tools, Oxygen XML editor, and so on. Given the limited number of staff in the Scholarly Commons—Sarah as a .25 Coordinator and 1.00 FTE of GAs—the Commons won’t be able to be open all the time and patrons will need to be able to use the tools when the Commons is closed.

Bob and Marek then asked who will conduct the training on the software, and Bob also asked who will maintain the equipment. Sarah explained that Library IT will maintain the computers, and they would be using the Undergraduate Library’s model for managing the other equipment, including getting extended warranties. She then said that there would be summer training sessions and certain trained people will be designated as contacts for further assistance. They will continue having data services hours with people from ATLAS and they are also looking into partnering with other people like CITES for assistance on things such as developing databases. Sarah noted that as they continued to do it, there would be lots of experimentation as they continued to offer services.

Jo Ann also noted that today’s technology is cheaper and more robust, such as flip cameras that are cheaper but more powerful than a video camera from five years ago, so that more equipment is cheap enough for redundancy. Tony then asked about accountability of users with the equipment—JoAnn said that they would be checking out the equipment with their iCard and could be held accountable through that, but they would need to talk to Lori in Undergrad about their policy.

Sarah asked if there were other needs that the team knew of which could be addressed by the Scholarly Commons. Jo mentioned a set of specialized analytical linguistics databases from Europe, but then asked
if this fit the scope of the Scholarly Commons and overall, what is the policy on the scope of the Scholarly Commons and where would the library's responsibilities end? Sarah said that as an example in the humanities, they would help a faculty member start a project with tools and then guide them to grants for that project. As such, librarians could even become partners in grants. As another example, the UVA Scholars' Lab also offers technical tools for scholars to apply but they also have 10 programmers. Sarah noted that it is hard to define the line, but we'll know it when we see it. She has talked to I-CHASS and NCSA about partnerships of a sort as well—the library can't do high-performance computing, but we could refer a patron to NCSA, which can do that.

Jo then asked if the new unit wouldn't have to worry about technology, but Sarah reiterated that the Scholarly Commons would be important: it should be seen as a place to promote collaborations and where librarians could also use the tools. She explained that the ideal collaboration would be a triangular relationship between a person who has expertise with the software tools, a subject specialist/content expert, and a faculty/researcher. Marek expressed the hope that librarians would become involved with the Scholarly Commons. Paula mentioned that she had already been asked about QSR and suggested that they take a survey of what departments are using. Sarah noted that a survey had already been taken by the Data Services group, in which programs such as nVivo were suggested. She noted that they were trying to tackle questions as they moved forward, and would do a regular assessment of the machines on what software was and wasn't being used. JoAnn added that there also was a survey of software taken when they were putting together the Scholarly Commons computer profile, and QSR was one that didn't make the threshold of enough responses. But software can be rolled on and off as their use is assessed.

Paula noted that the Scholarly Commons staff would probably be soon overwhelmed with requests for help and training, and asked if there would be general training for most people. She also suggested that visual databases would be useful for patrons in the fine arts and her work in Visual studies. JoAnn noted that qualitative software, such as atlas.ti and QSR, now support analysis of images, sound and video files.

It was asked about the issue of storage, and Sarah said that they planned to ultimately pass projects back to faculty members for their storing and use. Bob then stated that the Scholarly Commons' scope and limitations must be clearly articulated, or there will be too high expectations and irritated patrons. He also noted that they must set clear expectations and not promise too much because of the limited staff, with which Sarah agreed. She also noted that Savvy Researcher is another service that will be offered through the Scholarly Commons, and said that Merinda was looking for ideas for additional workshops. Marek then thanked Sarah for speaking with the team.

3. Services Philosophy

Marek announced that at the next meeting, the team would be thinking about space and he would send out questions for discussion. Someone asked if Jeff Schrader would be attending, but Marek said that it might be too early for Jeff to come.

JoAnn suggested that it would be better if they could articulate the collection before thinking about the space—if the team could define an intellectual shape for the collection, they could figure out how to fit that collection into the space and that would be better than just weeding based on shelf room. Marek then said that the team would also look at the sets of criteria from the English Library and Modern Languages at the next meeting. JoAnn said that she could do background work on circulation numbers, and Jo then asked what was the criteria for ESSL and HPNL. JoAnn said that ESSL uses 2002-present circulation stats for sending monographs to Oak Street or Stacks; but journals vary, in that some bound volumes are sent directly to Oak Street and other bound journals up to 5-10 years back are kept in the library (Tony noted that it was now more often 5 years back). She said that they also kept track of
JSTOR's moving wall and would send journals to Oak Street once they became available in JSTOR. For HPNL, they would have to ask Mary Stuart about her criteria.

Bob and/or Bruce noted that the criteria would depend on the purpose of the collection, whether the library was just a holding barn or would have a useable core collection. Bob also said that people often browse materials and leave them on the library tables without checking out the materials. The Development Office was also raised as the best option for professional staff’s offices. Bob noted that otherwise, more space in 225 would be taken up for offices, and cubicles would not be preferable because staff need offices with doors that lock.

The meeting was then adjourned by Marek at 4:00 p.m.