Social Sciences, Health, and Education Library

Implementation Team Meeting

February 27, 2012; 9-10am

428 Main Library

Present: Mary Beth Allen, Kathleen Kern (recorder), Lil Morales, Nancy O’Brien, Lisa Romero, Lynne Rudasill, Sue Searing, Beth Sheehan, Tom Teper

1. Changes or corrections to minutes from Feb 20th
   a. **Action:** “self-service” changed to “circulating” in first paragraph
   b. Tom – some of the one-time purchase priorities have changed because: OUP are subscription only and are not eligible for this purchase, a few other titles are already being purchased
   c. **Action:** If there are more changes, please send to Nancy by Wednesday and then they will be posted
   d. Tom - clarification to minutes that we have *not* decided at this point to have all circulating collections on one side.

2. Space for services, collections, staff
   a. Nancy sent a message to all staff who will have offices and consensus seems to be clear panels with blinds
      i. **Decision:** 4 offices on one side and 5 on the other so that we have a shared office space for GAs/practicum students
      ii. **Decision:** Offices in the front rooms on the west side near light courts
   b. Collections –
      i. 5500 linear feet in each of the back areas in BEL and ESSL spaces. This is with 15% growth space factored
      ii. 1 inch estimate is what was used for IAS and LLL. It was a little more accurate for monographs than 1.5 inch
      iii. Lynne – do we have linear foot estimate for the front room?
      iv. Mary Beth – concerned about the perception with our users if ¼ of our space is devoted to children’s materials. It seems like a tremendous amount of space
      v. Beth – may make a perceived division between Education and the rest of the collection. It won’t seem integrated.
      vi. Nancy – other students do use those spaces currently. When you walk in you won’t seen children’s materials because the front room would be test materials, reference, periodicals etc.
      vii. Sue – more S Collection than before. It is one of the treasures of the U of I collection. It should be prominent and have visibility.
      viii. Lynne – we need to focus more on what our services are and less on the collections. S Collection does not need a footprint equal to the rest of the subject collections.
ix. Beth – makes sense to have the S Collection consolidated in the new space.

x. There will be a new storage space for kits and low-use items that cannot go into Oak St. (Room 131 by Library HR)

xi. AHS also has kits that will become part of the circulating collection in SSHEL probably as part of Reserves

xii. Plan A and Plan B

1. Plan A is to have stacks space on both sides (the plan already included in the draft report) with journals, reference, reserves, school collection together on one side and regular circulating collection on the other

2. Plan B is to have all circulating stacks space on one side

3. **Decision:** It was agreed that both plans will be presented as part of the final report

xiii. Switch to LC? Not going to change what is already in Dewey based on the UGL experience. Perhaps when the remaining collection in Dewey is small enough we can then do a conversion to LC (Tom). Reference serials and continuations are a complication that will need to be determined later how to handle. **Decision:** Newly acquired items will be classified in LC.

c. Room 100B

i. Group study space or microfiche and locked test cabinets? The room would remain with a big table in the room.

ii. Preference was stated for using this space for microfiche and locked test cabinets.

iii. **Decision:** room 100B will contain the microfiche, viewing equipment, locked cabinets, and large table

d. Group study/individual study

i. **Decision:** Facilities will determine mix and configuration of group study tables, individual study spaces, and comfy chairs

ii. **Decision:** Recommending one enclosed user space on each side for group projects. Northwest room 100/southwest room 101.

e. Avery Brundage collection – discussion about where to place this material. Some of the materials are in the catalog with call numbers which is atypical for Archives. Mary Beth – most people who use the Avery Brundage collection in AHS also use the Archives so it would make sense to have all of the materials together. Archives will need to determine how to deal with integrating cataloged materials. **Decision:** move Avery Brundage materials to Archives

f. **Decision:** Collection alternative 2 provided by Tom Teper and based on figures from CAM is the model we are going with.

3. Services –

a. **Decision:** stay with what is in report in terms of student staffing and assess that level after a year. Criteria for this assessment will need to be decided.

b. **Decision:** Have one GA staff evenings to provide reference and student supervision.

c. **Decision:** Incorporate librarians into all hours of reference services using the experiences of the InfoDesk in terms of times of semester/day/hours to staff with librarians
d. Tom: it may be difficult to have 5 staff and 8 librarians and say that we aren’t able to have a permanent staff member in the evenings. There is a liability issue with staffing with students/GAs only in the evenings. We could have a staff person hired to work evenings if the assessment supports it.

e. Beth: it is important to maintain the level of reference service that our researchers need.

f. Mary Beth – one of the promises of this merger would be to have improved reference presence

g. Lynne – the new service model would be to have a librarian there in the evenings and then assess after a year if that was needed.

h. Sue – VR Desk staff seem to get used in the evening to assist with the UGL desk and there are a lot of UGL questions received via VR.

i. Lynne – Makes sense to have VR Desk in the SSHEL library

j. Perhaps with the mandate for all Main/UGL hub librarians to participate in the VR Desk the concern over relocating due to perception of it being undergraduate-focused is not as important.

k. Where would VR Desk be located? Behind the staff area. Is there space? Where would we put it? Nancy – behind the staff space/circulation desks. Mary Beth – considering all of the other space needs in SSHEL maybe this needs to be a secondary priority. **Decision:** in the report mention the VR Desk relocating to SSHEL as a possibility but not a priority.

4. Website and timeline? Who is going to develop it? When can it be ready?
   a. Nancy – maybe we could ask for funding to extend Kelly’s hourly contract to work on this.
   b. Beth – we need to be sure to have a timeline for this so it can be ready when the new unit opens.
   c. **Decision:** Phase in the website to match with the phased construction.

5. **Decision:** Sue will update the Assessment plan to be added as an appendix

6. **Decision:** The Services and Staffing plan will be updated and included as an appendix

7. Do we need to squeeze in a meeting on Tuesday or Wednesday? Our report is due on Thursday.
   a. There is no time that we can all meet. Most people can meet Wednesday 11-12. **Decision:** tentatively meet Wednesday at 11. Nancy will find a room.