JoAnn Jacoby opened the meeting, and announced the beginning of renovations for the Literatures and Languages Library and the International and Area Studies Library. The Slavic Reference Service will be moving in Fall 2010 to temporary quarters in 200 Library (the Main Library Reading Room) while its former home in 225 Library is renovated for the Spring 2011 launch of the new Literatures and Languages Library.

The Slavic Reference Service will become part of the new International and Area Studies Library to be housed on the 3rd Floor (in 321 and 325 Library) once that space has been renovated to suit its new use. All Library services will remain available to their users throughout this transition.

The Literatures and Languages Library is scheduled to open in 225 Library in Spring 2011, and the International and Area Studies Library is scheduled to open by Fall 2011.

**Biology and Life Sciences Implementation Team – Susan Avery (Team Leader)**

Overview of Final Report

The Team met with EC Thursday July 29 – report approved.

The focus of the report was divided into 3 main areas: space, collections, and service.

**Space**
- Library to vacate space in Dec 2011
- Molecular and Cellular Biology and Integrative Biology have requested that the space be reassigned to them to renovate the space student services.
- This will include office space for Biology librarian in Burill Hall – consultation space, possibly with related librarians. Will have temporary space during renovations.

**Collections**
- Materials will be housed in Funk, Main Stacks, and Oak St. The criteria for assignment may be found in report.

**Services**
- Walk-up reference services in Funk, chat services structured to stagger hours between natural history, survey, etc.
- Web presence as a portal – modeled on LIS library. Expanding library instruction, targeting classes, developing a program (workshops, savvy researcher, biblio. management, data services, etc.) remote sessions in Burrill Hall
- E-science and bioinformatics: sustainability of services and skill sets of new hires – to support these new models.
Questions:

- Did the Team discuss having a single Life Science website/portal?
  - No, recommended Biology portal.
  - However, as ACES moves toward their integrated system, could be good model.
  - Over time the primary workspace of the Biology librarian may be in Funk, this should be continually be reevaluated.

- About items transferring to Oak St: We don't know what's been accessed back to 1990, Voyager can't tell us that.
  - 1990 is the publication date before which books will go to Oak St., not the use date.

**Reference Services Team – Paula Carns and Kathleen Kern (Team Leaders)**

**Overview of Interim Report**

Met with EC in May, they recommended that the Team continue to work to complete their charge to provide a solid foundation for future action.

Five main recommendations for Reference Services:

1. Consolidated reference desks
2. Coordinator of Reference Services
3. Reference Services committee
4. Create Research Support Unit
5. Identify expectations for subject specialists reference consultations

Centered on a tiered reference model:

- Tier 1 – answering basic reference questions
- Tier 2 – beginning with a topic, introduction to library research and use of databases, known-item searching
- Tier 3 – In depth subject consultations, advanced searching, meet with faculty members, dissertation research, finding primary sources, comprehensive research. Using specialized resources.

The report made a distinction between a reference desk and services desk.

- Services: check out books, ask about library operations, then make a reference query and a consultation can be set up
- Reference: always has someone present to address Tier 1 & 2 questions.

Recommend 4 main reference desks and a virtual “desk”, that would take email, IM, phone, etc. The growth of IM questions has become difficult to sustain at the main desk.

Advantages to model:

- Streamlined entry for reference questions
- Fewer places to go to start research
- Longer service hours
- Sets up expected level of services, takes smaller library hours out of the questions.
• Creates a team environment, encourages communication.
• Decreases number of librarians and GAs while maintaining services.

Coordinator of Reference Services: will provide leadership across the library, chair reference services committee, oversee operations of desks, and work at multiple service points.

Reference Services Committee: people interested in reference services will look at standards, training, assessment tools, and New Service Models. Identify group responsible for staying abreast of developments.

Research Support Unit: will bring together Scholarly Commons, RGIS, etc. Core group working on library-wide research issues.

Subject/research responsibilities: codify expectations – office hours, work on curriculum/grants, collaborate with other librarians on interdisciplinary questions, develop small ad hoc teams to cover across disciplines.

Questions:

• Coordinator of Reference: 1 slide has relation to UGL reference, the draft report does not?
  o UGL reference would still be under UGL, Coordinator would meet with person in charge (not supervisor) but they would talk about the committee. Not an authority role, but meets with people in charge of reference in different libraries. Would make sense to have certain things about virtual desk coordinated together, having one person who will keep hours consistent.
  o July 29th version doesn't quite reflect that, no mention of UGL.

• Looking over duties of Coordinator – common training assessment and skills program: Research support services: has same. There seems to be a number of areas where Coordinator and RSS have similar roles, why not have the head of RSS be the Coordinator? 1.5 administrators vs. 1.0.
  o Since we're consolidating into one desk a lot of resources are coming from subject areas. Politically could be problems if the head of the research unit is also head of library reference.
  o Probably is enough work for a person and ½.
  o Recommend that Coordinator sit outside of unit to work across departments, does need to be separate because the position is library-wide.

• Unclear what the relation of UGL librarians is to Main Reference desk/Main Librarians. Could you clarify that part of recommendation? If level of UGL questions could be answered by second year GAs, where do librarians offer service?
  o Could be at virtual services point, online office hours.
  o In the document as written, seems like librarians will be working in Main, and GAs in UGL. There may be more fluidity.
  o Recommendation that service unit support what is already covered under Learning Commons in UGL.
  o Difficult to word topics without subject homes but nor necessarily undergraduate.
• Librarians may be reluctant to have second year GAs on their own entirely, still need expertise of librarians.
  o The Coordinator could identify busy hours, when is it advantageous to have librarians there?

• Are there any things currently in RGIS that will not move to RSS unit? (e.g., ESL orientation series). Will these things find new homes, or if it exists in RGIS it will move unless it has new home somewhere?
  o This will involve an assessment to decide what belongs in the new unit, not just mashing units together. See what fits and what should be elsewhere. If it doesn't seem to be part of RSS, could it work equally well elsewhere?

• Main Library: reference desk people will have training to answer to some level of questions for other libraries. HPNL, English, Soc Sci – will they still have reference?
  o Vision: consolidated reference desk. HPNL has circ desk, they can have someone to come out to desk if there's a question if they are available. If that librarian is not available, there will be Main Reference desk there to take research questions. Currently ESSL has the only manned reference desk.

• What GAs are allowed to do? If combining circ/reference duties, they may need to do both? In MLA, GAs have projects and don't work the circ desk. Under new model this would stay the same.
  o Main Reference desk is not circ services point.
  o One goal for this is to deal with fewer GAs, will need them to man longer hours. Main Library doesn't seem to be getting smaller;
  o Will need to see how many librarian/GA hours work the desk, try to get balanced GA load of public services and other projects.
  o Reference is not the primary function for GAs, just the focus of this report. Need to have a balanced assistantship.

• In the past we have discussed improving/maintaining quality of service – now there is the added issue of changing structure. Past conversations ended up derailing on feeling that this is not in people's agenda, not going to be a problem, etc. Clearly not, since the trend of numbers of staff/GAs is going in one direction. Group has issue of trying to develop staffing model in environment in flux, that doesn't meet our agenda.

• When charged in Feb, there were reports already written that may not mesh, future reports also might not, (hopefully they will). Current team needs to decide what is best going forward.

• In this report we are trying to identify the basic competencies, and need feedback from a variety of subject specialists. Need to get a generalized idea to make recommendations. IAS worked hard to get a consolidated reference desk (with low amount of IAS reference questions, need for primary desk isn't there).

• Exciting what work is laid out for subject librarians to take on. This report goes from people currently doing office hours to having all people have them. Asking subject librarians to hold office hours outside of their main library, and also asks them to schedule at central reference service point. This is a lot of scheduled time. Do they have a sense of what subject librarians
will give up to meet this commitment?
  o This is an issue: we see central model as a safety net – committed to having a place where people can always go to get good reference services. This will be logistically difficult and will need to develop on person-to-person basis.
  o JoAnn Jacoby: On pg 8, that model might include office hours, but isn’t necessarily a requirement. Not proscribing a set schedule.
  o Is a trade off – give 3 hours a week to make sure that people are getting a certain level of reference support.
  o Having access to pool of trained GAs,
  o Money to hire students keeps going lower and lower – having to spend more time on circ desk support, let alone reference service on top of that.

Deadline to send comments: Next Friday at 5? (will determine in consultation with the Team)

What process will happen after EC gets this draft?
  • The report will be posted for comment,
  • Team leaders will discuss report, EC will either approve or select among implementation options.
  • An implementation team will then be charged, with some overlap of membership with the planning team.