The team reconvened to consider revisions suggested by Library Executive Committee. There was agreement that forming working groups might not be necessary due to the over-arching nature of the issues. The group seeks to discuss all issues together at this point. Nancy provided an agenda that outlined the main topics for discussion.

**Tiered Service**

First the group discussed revising the service profile to describe how SSHEL will further develop tiered reference and referral services offered within the context of the Main Library/UGL/Central VR Hub. The term “service desk” will be used consistently. Other language will be strengthened to articulate SSHEL’s commitment to this concept, and the idea that SSHEL is part of a larger model of tiered service. Some of the uncertainty is that this model hasn’t been used before, so will require everyone to think in a new, more collaborative way, and take some time to see how the model will be used in our environment.

We discussed the tiered approach within SSHEL, with students initially at the service desk (READ scale 1-2 questions), and with referrals to other subject specialists in the unit. Librarians will provide office hours. When the service desk schedule is set, we will designate which librarian is “on-call” with available hours to offer assistance, as required. We will focus the revised explanation on “office hours” with a defined schedule each week at certain hours. This approach will drive more of the consultation toward individual/group appointments and email contact. The embeddedness of several librarians (biomed, global studies, labor, LIS) will be part of this and can also be accommodated with office hours.

Graduate assistants now provide generic social science service; they will contribute to the Main Hub through virtual reference, but will also be available at the SSHEL service desk to help out in a consistent way. We will set the GA project desk behind/near the “service desk” so GAs will be more available to offer assistance that doesn’t require subject expertise (READ level 3-4). Referrals can easily be made to subject specialists (READ level 5-6); thus we will utilize a 3-tiered triage model. This approach affirms our commitment to providing GAs with varied pre-professional experience. We know that student assistants can do more 1-2 level assistance with proper training. Staff can be integrated into the schedule also, as appropriate. The group recommends that signage in the Marshall Gallery be used to point users upstairs for general questions; this will ensure that SSHEL functions more as a subject library.
Lynne and Kathleen will work on writing this section. Appendix 7 of the first SSHEL final report offers good description of librarian roles.

**Space**

Discussion focused on development of innovative areas (the sandbox idea) within SSHEL where students can try out new software, collaborate, prepare presentations, work with statistical/demographic/geographic/economic/biomedical/social science/educational software, etc. This is similar to the UGL Media Commons/Scholarly Commons concept, but within the scope of a subject-based library with subject specialists involved in innovative instruction with individuals/small groups, as well as class-sized groups. We want to offer clusters of 3-4 computers with new applications where we can encourage innovative learning. We advocate SSHEL as a domain being interdisciplinary and problem-focused, with longer hours to accommodate more users. The unit also needs space for consultation, private if possible, so it won’t be disruptive.

The group agreed to ask NSM coordinator and Facilities for a floor plan, so we know what they are planning for the space. If the Reference Room on the 2nd floor is a model, it is possible to offer open space, open sight lines, along with some collections located unobtrusively on the north and south ends of the main rooms on lower shelving.

The group does not agree to close part of the space, even with a reduction in staff. We will closely monitor use statistics to determine when shorter hours might be appropriate.

**Collections**

With the goal of reducing collections by another 25% (from 121,470 vols to 91,100 vols), the group questioned where the extra 25% would go? We assume stacks. One plan might be to use “last 5 years” as a rolling target. We will ask for numbers that reflect the following criteria:

- monographs published in or circulated in the last 5 years (since 2007)
- S collection books published in or circulated in the last 10 years (since 2002)

After seeing the numbers, may need to revise further.

EC expects that all circulating material will be located together on one side.

Avery Brundage Collection in the AHS Library: Mary Beth will work with Archives to establish a process for transfer, and a plan for the revised final report.
Kathleen and Nancy will consult with BEL about reference/other material that may need to be located in SSHEL.

**Staff**

Many journals are still received direct; binding still must be done; claims; records maintained. In order to function with a reduced staff level in SSHEL, these functions will need to be done centrally or in another way. The group discussed now to articulate the role of staff in SSHEL: what functions can be logically combined? Review Appendix 7 to look at positions/functions. Nancy will follow up with this.

**Other**

Sue and Nancy will explore the possibility of merging the Center for Children’s Books with the S collection.

Overall scope of SSHEL should accommodate a strong outreach mission. There is need to push out social, cultural information to study abroad students; collaborate with partners to offer more health information; in general, collaborate to enrich services and collections that the Library offers.

Next meeting: Wednesday, April 25th, 9am