SSHEL Implementation Team Meeting

February 20, 2012, 9-11am
428 Main Library

Present: Lisa Romero, Lillian Morales, Mary Beth Allen, Lynne Rudasill, Tom Teper, Beth Sheehan, Sue Searing, Nancy O’Brien (chair)

Sue Searing was designated as minute taker. The February 6 and 13 meeting summaries were approved as amended.

Review of collection transfer spreadsheet prepared by Michael Norman

The spreadsheet shows projected transfers of materials out of ESSL, AHS and Main Stacks, and into SSHEL, Main Stacks and Oak Street. The number of volumes is shown for each sub-category, along with estimates of linear feet based on three different assumptions about the average thickness of the books (1.25”, 1.5”, and 1.75”). According to the spreadsheet, the maximum amount of shelving required (excluding the S Collection and excluding the recommended 15% growth space) is 7,390 linear feet. A quick calculation of S Collection needs, assuming an average thickness of .5”, added 1,131 linear feet.

There was considerable discussion about the assumptions behind the spreadsheet and about the earlier recommendations of the Collections and Facilities sub-group. Will SSHEL’s collection be defined by date of publication (e.g., all monographs now in AHS or ESSL published since 2005), or by date of last circulation (e.g., all monographs now in AHS or ESSL that have circulated since 2005), or by a combination of these factors (e.g., all monographs now in AHS or ESSL published since 2005 plus any monographs with earlier imprints that have circulated since 2005)? Nancy said that ESSL currently holds over 100,000 items that have circulated since 2005. Mary Beth reported that the spreadsheets on the G drive show zero circulations for items that currently have a status of charged out or renewed. Tom messaged Michael during the meeting and confirmed that the spreadsheets we were looking at reflected publication dates, not dates of last circulation. He estimated that retaining pre-2005 imprints that have circulated since 2005 in SSHEL would double the size of the SSHEL collection.

The maximum shelving space in each wing is 5500 linear feet, per our meeting last week with Jeff Schrader. That figure will be reduced if user seating or group study space is integrated into the SSHEL stacks areas, as we’ve proposed. In addition, SSHEL may have to absorb some BEL reference works and journals. Nancy, Tom, Becky Smith and others will meet next week to determine how much BEL material will come to SSHEL. Given these realities, Nancy noted that there is no way the S Collection and general circulating collection can fit into the same room.

Mary Beth and Nancy noted that many classic older books still circulate in ESSL and AHS and ought to be readily available for students to find in SSHEL. Furthermore, some AHS subjects (e.g., certain sports) are slimly represented in recent literature; if older books are sent to STX or Oak Street, those subjects will be less visible. Nancy noted, however, that some subjects (e.g. university histories) are collected mostly for historical purposes and can go straight to STX or Oak Street without impacting
users. Mary Beth said the same thing about biographies of sports figures that come on the approval plan.

Further discussion ensued about the possible benefits of using publication date as the sole location criterion (e.g., easier for processing, simple explanation for users). One outcome of sending more frequently-used books to STX is that STX will become a more browsable and used collection. Lisa asserted that user needs should drive where materials are located, and that circulation is the clearest indicator of user needs. Lynne noted that circulation activity does not mean that users retrieved the books themselves at the library. Circulation figures also reflect call slip requests and interlibrary loan, and thus are a measure of remote use as well. Remote users will not be inconvenienced if a simple publication date criterion shapes the SSHEL collection. The STX collection will be more valuable for browsing as more ESSL and AHS books are transferred there, but Sue noted that many patrons perceive location in STX as a barrier to use.

The team’s report may need to include two options for SSHEL’s circulating collection. Option A would include all monographs now in AHS or ESSL published since 2005 plus any monographs with earlier imprints that have circulated since 2005. Option B would be limited to all monographs now in AHS or ESSL published since 2005. The linear feet of shelving necessary for each option will be included in the report.

Discussion of space and floor plans (including faculty/staff space)

We considered an alternative to previous proposals that would split the circulating collections between the ESSL and BEL spaces. Lynne proposed putting the S Collection into the BEL stacks space and the rest of the circulating collection in the main BEL space. By putting all the circulating collections in BEL, there will be less need for expert help and only a single circulation desk must be staffed. Services would be concentrated on the ESSL side, along with the materials that are more likely to require intervention (microforms, journals, reference books). The journals would be shelved in the ESSL stacks space. Faculty and staff offices would be placed around the perimeter of ESSL’s main room.

We agreed that librarians’ offices should still be placed in both BEL and ESSL spaces, however, for accountability and monitoring; staff office locations should follow function (e.g., staff responsible for call slips should be located near the circulating collections). There is a concern about disrupting the sightlines in the BEL reading room if it is full of shelving. Tom assured us that carpeting will be laid down before shelves are installed, so as the print collection shrinks, we can easily regain the space for users. He also suggested half-height shelving or a combination of half-height and full-height shelves.

We agreed that room 100B should be set aside for group study and meeting space, not staff offices. The microform collections are sizeable and need to be accessible, but not necessarily in the main room.

Assessment of SSHEL services and outcomes

We reviewed Sue’s draft assessment plan. Nancy suggested a specific measure be added: “D.1.b.: Has the demand for Education Oak Street materials decreased with browsable on-site collections?” In reference to options A and B (above) for scoping the circulating collection in SSHEL, assessment should address the impact of the chosen option on user satisfaction. No questions appear in the assessment plan regarding the website, since we have not discussed its goals yet.
Lynne reported that the International and Area Studies team conducted a survey of users prior to opening the library. The survey asked about how people used the website. A check-off question provided choices such as asking reference questions, setting up instruction sessions, etc. The survey doubled as a marketing tool and also elicited suggestions for improving the website.

Since we cannot design and conduct a survey before March 1, our report will recommend conducting needs assessment by means of a survey and/or focus groups later in the spring. Sue will revise the assessment plan and post it to the G drive; it will be included as an appendix to the report.

We agreed that assessment components may occur at different appropriate times, such as one semester after opening SSHEL, 12-18 months later, and/or three years later. The assessment plan should also describe the follow-up plan for applying the knowledge gained from the data.

**One-time funding potential purchases**

We reviewed the spreadsheet of suggested one-time purchases which Tom compiled. We recommended:


2nd priority: Alexander Street Rehabilitation Therapy in Video; Elsevier Ebook Collections (Health Professions, and Clinical Medicine); Elsevier Encyclopedias; Oxford Handbooks; Oxford Medical Handbooks; Oxford Neurology Library.

3rd priority: Oxford Bibliographies Online.

Not selected: PsycTESTS (because it’s a subscription database, not a one-time purchase); Defining Gender (because we will ask HPNL to support it); Elsevier Ebook Collection – Vet Med (because it’s out of scope for SSHEL).

Tom stated that $200,000 was set aside this year for NSM purchasing, and none of it has been used yet.

**Online/instruction outreach**

Nancy stated that she had approached the SSHEL librarians, Lisa Romero, and Tom Teper for ideas for the Library’s internal marketing grant. Up to $500 is available, and applications are due on February 24. We discussed the importance of using online media to attract users to the new website, as well as traditional approaches to attract visitors to the physical library. The acronym SSHEL might inspire a logo or motto for branding. (Tom: We're coming out of our SSHEL.). A WebCam or a regularly updated photo diary would enable users to follow the construction process.

**Review of team charge to make sure all points are covered**

We pinpointed aspects of the charge that we have not yet dealt with fully.

**Charge**

1. Develop a fully-integrated service profile for the new unit that:
• Draws on work of the planning team, as well as conversations with relevant campus communities, to further define existing and emerging needs of students and scholars in the social, behavioral and applied health sciences.

• Considers the role of librarians and staff serving Communications, Geography and Library and Information Sciences in the new model, specifically addressing how these related areas can contribute to the service program of the larger hub, as well as draw on the consolidated resources (including staff, GAs, and teaching spaces) in the new unit.

• Situates the proposed services for the social, behavioral and applied health sciences as a core component in a broader array of Library service programs supporting scholarly work in these areas (e.g., in the Scholarly Commons, Funk-ACES, and the UIC Library of the Health Sciences-Urbana). The proposed service profile should be in accord with the recommendations from the Reference Services Implementation Team.

2. Work with the Assistant Dean for Library Facilities to develop a space program that fully integrates collections, services, user spaces and staff work spaces in the east wing of the first floor of the Main Library (i.e., the spaces currently occupied by the Business and Economics and the Education and Social Science Library). This process should focus on the creation of student-focused collaborative user space and other programmatic needs identified in the “Operational and Space Planning” section of the SAHS Planning Team Report (pp 12-13) and the [HISP Report, pp. 27-28].

3. Develop a model for the staffing and organizational structure of the new unit

4. Work with the Assistant Dean for Library Facilities and the NSM Coordinator to develop timelines and schedules for implementation, including:
   • a breakdown of the steps needed to complete the integration of services and staff, including a table of staffing and resource needs for each phase in the transition
   • a timeline for transferring collections to the new unit and to other locations, and integrating collections within the new unit
   • the development of specific criteria to determine the location of materials. Following the process described in the Special Collections Guidelines for Library Moves or Closures, the Team should work with the Special Collections Division to determine the disposition of any administrative records, rare books, and maps.
   • a plan for communicating the transition to the new services profile to campus and library constituents, including the creation of a unified web presence.

5. Recommend a plan for assessing the effectiveness of the new configuration of collections and services.

6. Provide a report of the Team’s discussions and planning recommendations to the University Librarian and Dean of Libraries by February 15, 2012. [New due date = March 1.]

Conversations with relevant campus communities - The Planning Team consulted users, but our team has not. Sue will add this as a needs assessment or formative assessment activity in the assessment plan.

Role of staff in Communications, Geography, and LIS – Personnel from the Communications Library will contribute time to the central reference hub. Lisa will train SSHEL, RRSS and UGL personnel on communications resources and search strategies. The Communications Library website will be enhanced, and Lisa expects to make use of the SSHEL instruction space. The integration of Geography into SSHEL is essentially completed, except for transferring collection development responsibility. The LIS Librarian will affiliate with SSHEL but maintain embedded services at GSLIS. The
relationship of the LIS Virtual Library (and also the Labor & Employment Relations Digital Library) to the new SSHEL website needs to be determined.

- Relation of SSHEL to the “broader array of Library service programs supporting scholarly work in these areas (e.g., in the Scholarly Commons, Funk-ACES, and the UIC Library of the Health Sciences-Urbana)” We have yet to discuss ties to the Scholarly Commons and Funk/ACES. The new Biomedical Librarian will be SSHEL’s primary connection to the UIC Library of the Health Sciences; the new Behavioral Science Librarian will also be a point of connection.

Nancy will present us with a draft of the report by next week. We will continue working through the same agenda.