JoAnn Jacoby welcomed attendees and described the meeting as an update on NSM teams and an opportunity for questions.

Reference Services Team: Paula Carns & Kathleen Kern (See powerpoint)

- This Team has been in existence for 7 weeks, with a report due soon.

- What the Team has been doing:
  - Reference Services Team's Charge is posted on NSM site.
  - Began by asking asked Team members to come up with a list of their most radical ideas about reference.
  - The Team considered core values for reference services and what users want/need.
  - The Team then split into two subgroups:
    - Librarian-initiated - reference activities and tools: Created a list of current and suggested activities they do for reference. This lead to a discussion of the relation between instruction and reference.
    - Patron-initiated - organizational models: Looked at current and new organizational models for the library.

- Reference Team's proposed organization models operated on the baseline assumptions that:
  - The library should provide quality reference services at all places/times.
  - Subject specialists are the best individuals for providing in-depth reference.
  - Reference is becoming more virtual – chat services, etc.
  - These models are for reference services, not unit administration.
  - There should be more communication among librarians across the library.
  - Described three general levels of reference:
    - Walk-in/circulation – for known-item searches.
    - Consultation, where a patron makes an appointment with a subject specialist.
    - Everything in the middle: This is harder to deal with, e.g., when a student needs several sources for a paper, but not a full consultation on the subject.

- Organization Model A : Cluster
  - All levels of reference are done in disciplinary clusters; no longer a central reference desk in current form.
  - Main Library – SSD, Humanities/general, Scholarly Commons, IAS, Special Collections. 6 desks total.
  - Outside: reference desks in: UGL, ACES (Life Sci), Grainger (Phys Sci), Arts (Music & Art/Arch)
  - Advantages: Librarians are located near to their print/circulating collections, model follows unit and divisional structures.
  - Disadvantages: If there are fewer staff, librarians may be working evening/weekends, Doesn't encourage to cross communication between divisions.
• Patron perspective – Allows access to subject specialists and to physical collections, but patrons could have questions when subject specialists are not available. This model does not foster interdisciplinary research.

• Model B – Consolidate Research Desk
  - Desks in Main library & outside. Possible virtual service in UGL. In Main - four consolidated desks that provide middle level of service (Soc. Sci, Arts & Humanities, RRGIS (general inquiries/gov't), IAS). Supports middle tier of reference, shares responsibility among librarians, staff, and GAs to free time for other activities. Helps accommodate decreasing staff, encourages cross-training across disciplinary boundaries.
  - Disadvantages- Librarians may be expected to staff outside of unit library's space, and will need to dedicate time to learn about materials outside subject/discipline area.
  - Patrons: Will have only one desk to find in Main library, increases likelihood of one-stop assistance. However, they may need to return to meet with a subject specialist.

• Virtual organization Models: IM, email, SMS & Phone
  - Model A – virtual services staffed at physical desks at same time as in-person services.
  - Model B – option for separate chat desk. Physical desk will have just walk up, possibly phone service.
  - For both: subject specialists can still sign on for chat services from their own offices or units.
  - Email: subject specialists monitor own email for referrals, consultation, etc.
  - Telephone: available in library units.

• Questions:
  - What are the anticipated staffing and hours for Model B at departmental level?
    - The main desk would be staffed with staff members/students for basic level of services. There would not be research desks in library units, just one main reference center.
  - Reference question level expertise – how should we staff for “mid-range”?
    - In Cluster model (A) it is assumed that the patron will show up and get the middle level. There would be librarians there, but they might staff at certain times of day, with G.A.s, etc.
  - With UGL becoming special collections building, what model are we moving toward?
    - An assumption is that it's up to the unit to define what is expected of people working at desk, particularly with Model A, has the concept that there would be a consistent level of reference skill across the board. Making more or fewer desks will not address that.
      - The team still needs to define they will work as a group. It is clear we want a base level of competencies, but still determining how to work toward that.
      - In model B it seems that staff/G.A. at desk will have ability to provide mid-level of service. They should have this even if we don't implement these models.
    - The intro mentioned an assumption of a downward trend in staff. Is the cluster model sustainable for more than another year or three if this is true?
      - It doesn't give us savings in staff, so probably not. It is not very radical, but is what people are more comfortable with. “It could be outdated as soon as it opens”
• Not an NSM team, but relevant
• This team came out of a retreat facilitated by Provost consulting group, charged to synthesize materials from brainstorming session.
• Opportunity to have closure on ongoing work, to celebrate changes, and to recommend updates.

• List of services to review, highlighting three:
  ○ **Bookplate service:** Came out of discussions of things to let go of. Started this about a year ago, but it was added to the list to disseminate back to community what they're doing.
    ▪ Will stop applying physical book plates, to do virtually instead.
    ▪ With approval of office of advancement.
    ▪ Notes – include generic terms they want applied to materials to recognize use of funds. Voyager 7 will allow to scan actual bookplates.
    ▪ Each book purchased with fund support will have this note, can be used to show donors' names.

• **Serials check-in/claiming**
  ○ History of Voyager check-in
  ○ Claims: putting for policy that they will not be claiming what is online with print.
  ○ Went back and looked at claims being done by acquisitions. Only about 400 through EBSCO were showing any result, many saying none could be had.
  ○ Publishers aren't keeping them
  ○ For print plus online, recommendation is that they do only one claim.

• **Campus book delivery:**
  ○ Why do it when it's costly and labor intensive?
  ○ The Team collected excellent statistics, Voyager reports, info from business office for cost, and were able to determine cost per transaction of $2.
  ○ Looked at cost to do a pickup: even a cost to move something across campus
  ○ How to enhance/explain service?
    ▪ Like ILL – through state-wide delivery service – use reusable delivery bags. Will start a pilot of this in the summer, replace paper bags.
  ○ Got marketing funds to buy bags, make fliers, build website describing program, and compare delivery vs. pickup options to users in conjunction with a campus map.
  ○ Will not do away with campus mail (mobility issues).
  ○ Will survey users about use of service.
  ○ Hoping to be greener, publicize the service, look at fact that volume has dropped and negotiate with campus mail on price.

• **Questions:**
  ○ In the report, it talked about check-in procedures: will there be difficulty with no documented check in for audits with state? We want to be sure we're getting the materials.
No, they don't do this with the e-journals. Moving to hybrid model of shelving and checking.
- Is there a place to see reviews that have been completed? (Yes, see report linked above and sent with email)
- Moving to electronic annuals, is it now up to subject specialist to see that e-issues are showing up?
  - One thing to add to service list is ways to take care of that responsibility.
- Is this going to show up on NSM site?
  - Not technically, will show up under page for this stuff session. It is currently up on the EC site.

- Next steps – soliciting survey for Library for things to add to this list.
  - e.g., letting go of book-stamping.

IAS Team – Nancy O'Brien (See IAS Implementation Team final report)

- Team was combination of teaching staff, librarians, and members from previous planning team.

- Organizational Issues: administration of unit
  - Strong service orientation.
  - Loyal user-base.
  - The intent of the report is to support the existing services and expand/enhance through consolidating service points, making staff available, etc.
  - Subject expertise – concerned about what exists in libraries (Asian, Slavic, Africana, Latin/Carib., Global studies/E.U.)
  - Model: a non-circulating collection, related reference collection in physical facility, journals, micro-form.
  - Recommends new head of IAS Library, with internal search for someone w/ strong team-building skills.

- Facilities Issues:
  - English space becomes service point.
  - Move backlogs out of Asian to provide space.
  - Relocate specific staff.
  - Close access to main stacks Asian library – allow staffing to be relocated, security issue.
    - Recommend that facilities install some study tables in that area.
  - Library should have space for visiting scholars. Create space on 4th floor that is available to any disciplinary visiting scholar, this benefits the whole library.
  - Integrate parts of LC collection that are divided in Middle East/South Asian language in own classification scheme – one continuous segment to help users/shelving staff.

- Recommendations have time sequences listed – currently under review by EC committee.

- Questions:
• Reading room: would there be an entrance through the main stacks?
  ▪ No, current Asian location will be all staff/librarian offices. Only Asian library staff will have access to the stacks.
  ▪ On the east side (English library) it will be user services, collections, some offices, etc.
• How much space will reference collections take up?
  ▪ Huge amounts of space, will take up what is currently English stacks.
  ▪ This model will allow bringing in journals.
  ▪ Full space program is in the report.

JoAnn Jacoby concluded the meeting and invited people to stay for the prize drawing.