NSM Stuff Session – Meeting Notes
Jan 26, 2010, 1:00 – 2:30
Grainger Commons

25-30 people attended, with a mix of faculty and staff.

JoAnn Jacoby introduced the meeting, and gave an overview of the agenda, which includes four of the NSM Teams presenting their reports:

- Geology Planning and Implementation Team: Completed a final report and work on plan has begun.
- Biology And Life Sciences Planning Team: Completed a draft report. Held an Open meeting last week, and will submit a revised draft in February.
- Health Information Services Planning Team: Draft report in for revision, will be completed in February
- Literatures and Languages Planning Team: Completed a final report, about to charge implementation team.

She invited feedback on the presentations– what is good, what might be overlooked, other perspectives/insights, and any concerns to be addressed.

**Tina Chrzastowski – Geology Team:**

Tina thanked JoAnn for her guidance as Administrative Liaison for the Geology Team and NSM Coordinator.

The Geology Team was charged in late August, and included librarians, staff members, and faculty from the School of Earth, Society and Environment.

Work on the draft report began in November – many discussion revolved around the best way to serve communities of researchers. The team began with discussions of resources, what was needed, what was available. Many resources were not yet available:

- Better access to monographs headed for Oak Streer – discussion about access: better cataloging and analytics.
- How to improve access for researchers - (first do no harm) began by looking at statistical data, what was the format of the piece, circulation, time-frames, how many duplicates, online availability, how to put together a program that takes this data into account.
- Data made a huge difference (e.g – 2/3 of the collection hadn't circulated). Team resolved to move much of the collection to Oak Street, with better finding aids. Assumptions based on data, what services they can promise.
- The report will be finalized on Monday, Feb 1st.

An open meeting was held on Dec 10th, with about half of the Geology Department in attendance. People at the meeting were concerned about things like:

- Getting books from Grainger back to their offices, etc.
- Where to return books? Book-drop in Union? Chemistry Library?
• Assuring the same services without the physical building, will users still know how to find collections, reserves, map collection. (A lot of physical space issues)

The team made a proposal to do an inventory of maps, the collection needs more control and examination before taking action. Jenny Johnson (Map & Geography Library) served on the team and gave a presentation at a meeting in November on getting maps in and out of Oak St., which included the process of figuring out how to address needs and move forward.

• Jenny's map process: A folder of 20 related maps in circulation packet, folder is sent to location, so users don't need to order 40 different maps to make sure you get the area of interest. Her presentation (linked from the Geology Team page) included good before/after pictures of stuffed map cases in the basement of NRB vs. clean folders organized in Oak St.

Team recommendations are also in a table in the final report:
• Beginning specific implementation phase that begins to examine cost, time, and specific recommendations.
• Major rethinking of how we service this particular clientele.
• Plan to move many things between Geology/Grainger/Oak St. will take some time, but the transfer process has begun.

Questions:
• Has there been evidence of mold in the collection?
  ○ They haven't found mold in books, but have found black mold growing on walls. Nobody at Oak St. has noticed anything, but before sending things they'd like to double check. In which case the process would be to clean anything coming into Grainger using the same process that is used for cleaning transfers to Oak Street, rather than doing an item level evaluation.

Greg Youngen – Biology Team:

Thanked JoAnn for her work coordinating and providing resources.

Noted the difference between Planning and Implementation teams – Biology is still in the planning phase.

Biology Team has a three area charge:
• Assess services in Life Sciences.
• Identify areas with unmet needs, non-traditional services, reinvigorate the library.
• Determine the future of the Biology library (with March 09 assessment in mind).

Good representation in the Team: Two schools in the life sciences: Integrative Biology (IB) & Molecular and Cellular Biology (MCB) are two separate institutions, so they needed representation from both. The team included former IB Director Fred Delcomyn and Bettina Francis from Entomology, and David Clayton, the Director of Undergraduate Studies for MCB. The Team also included Romana Nowak (Professor, Animal Science, ACES) and John MacMullen (GSLIS, M.S. in Bioinformatics Steering Committee).
Life Sciences on campus range physically from Veterinary Medicine to Beckman, and everything in between. They needed a wide variety of input, so they decided to conduct a campus-wide survey:

- IRB approved.
- Tried to get direct mail out to faculty, students, etc.
- Over 240 responses, good representation, good response rate, though actually a fraction of total users, many other people don't know about the library, and likely didn't respond.
- Survey data was compiled and appended to team report. The data is of continuing relevance to shaping services, and will continue to be useful beyond this report.

Results:

- We are a big library with a good collections budget, so people are generally happy with the resources available to support biology and the life sciences is buying.
- People need help managing data (3 areas of responses, not necessarily related to Life Science – storing, manipulating, navigating data).
- Data will influence library internal development and future hiring.

Bottom line issue: do we keep the Biology Library, and in what form? Reference question, item re-shelving, etc. is on a strong downward trend, with re-shelving of all materials now at 10% of the 1997 level (from 90,000 to 9,000 volumes per year). However, the survey produced equal numbers of people saying do / do not close the library.

The Team recommends to downsize library, while keeping it as a physical location:

- Reduce from 150,000 volumes, which will be easy to do with many serials, etc., available online.
- In Spring 2009, LSD proposed combining the Biology collection with ACES, but are now proposing moving most of the collection to Oak St. with the rest split among various libraries, including ACES and Main Stacks.
- Keep core collection together, with a presence left in Burrill Hall.

The Team was challenged to think more boldly at the Open meeting on Jan 22, and are still taking feedback and responses. Meeting again on Thurs 2/4, looking to adapt and rethink the proposal.

Questions:

- What is core volume number?
  - The Biology Library will be down to ¼ of current space, reduced to public space. IB/MCB would like to consolidate in that space, we could work in tandem to meet their needs and maintain a core presence in Burrill Hall.

- When will the implementation process begin?
  - Probably by the end of Feb at earliest, or in March. Planning team report will be reviewed by EC/Administration, then an implementation team will be charged. They are looking at a significant reduction of the Biology collection, which will take time to implement.

- JoAnn Jacoby showed the graphs of the re-shelving statistics. She noted that the way people are engaging with literature is changing, and libraries should take that into account when considering how we can best serve our users in the current environment. How do we provide relevant, high impact support better attuned to current research and learning practices? That is
the most important question that all of these teams, indeed all library professionals, need to grapple with.

- Did the team find any library models they wanted to emulate? How are other institutions engaging faculty/students?
  - They were generally inwardly focused – based report on what we have here.
  - Merging/downsizing is a trend in other institutions that have similar scope of collections.

**Linda Smith: Health Team**

Linda distributed a single sheet handout with the January 22 Open Meeting slides. Team members included a good mix of faculty, with faculty from Applied Health Sciences (AHS) and other health related perspectives, Nutrition in ACES, a faculty member with Anthropology with a joint appointment with UIC College of Medicine in Surgery, etc. This is illustrative of the need to better connect the Health Sciences Library (administratively part of UIC, but located on the Urbana campus) with UIUC Library’s support for health research and learning.

Linda thanked JoAnn Jacoby for helping to integrate NSM goals and processes with the team's work.

The original goal was to have a final report by Dec 15. The draft was circulated on Dec 14, revised slightly based on input from the team, and is still out for discussion/open forum/ messaged to Dean and Department Heads (DDH) list. They are pushing awareness of the proposal to get feedback broadly, making sure to not overlook segments related to the team. An issue from the open meeting was the need to target potential stakeholders such as McKinley staff. Still getting input, will generate a final draft in mid-February.

Examples of feedback:

- Dean of the School of Social Work: excellent report, but need to expand the focus to include behavioral health.
- Data storage needs/need for data coordination center. This perspective reinforced the fact that AHS is leader on campus in terms of UIUC programs, but we are seeing a health focus in other colleges that are identifying these services as important to them. Trying to assure that this team in integrating these perspectives.
- In terms of handout findings: AHS Masters of Public Health, and programs in other parts of campus. AHS faculty emphasized physical space for college identity, want to assure there will still be a place for face-to-face use while promoting virtual services.

The team contextualized the report in terms of campus planning: leveraging expertise of faculty and staff in the library, increasing support. Trying to identify complementary collections and expertise. Determining how to focus collaboration in terms of a broader vision of health on the campus.

The team looked at three scenarios that accounted for this interdisciplinary nature of HIS, but these need to be located someplace physically:

1. HIS as part of planning process for Social and Behavioral Science in Main Library.
   - AHS with a strong social science perspective (despite being historically part of the Life Science Division in the Library’s structure, health research on this campus has an equally
strong alignment with the social and behavioral sciences). The Team talked about a closer alignment with ACES and/or the biological and life sciences, but there wasn't active support for this model.

2. Expanding the mandate of current Applied Health Sciences Library
   ○ The working title of Health Science and Wellness Information Center didn't satisfy the Open meeting attendees. More than Health Science, but keeping original context. The potential for collaboration, more space for individual and group work, satisfying those requests with current resources is easier in merged form, but health focuses should not be obscured.

3. Expanding current Health Information portal – identified as successful virtual portal. Potential for different views, supporting different perspectives, onto this information.

Team will next meet in mid-February with this feedback.

Questions:

• Did we get input from student in MD./Ph.D. Program?
  ○ No, Mary Shultz (Health Science Library) said that we could contact the director to get input, that's another involved constituency.
  ○ How about the Ph.D. in the University Librarian’s Student Advisory Committee (ULSAC)? Yes, we should send all draft reports to them. JoAnn agreed to send a note to Dean Kaufmann to forward to ULSAC linking to the reports and inviting comment.
  ○ Linda Smith: We are still trying to identify all these disparate pockets (and UIUC/UIC collaboration) and are making an effort to address all service issues. The report identifies the desirability of taking advantage of our large, multi-campus institutional structure.

As Greg Youngen pointed out with regard to the Biology survey, by bringing together all this feedback the Health Team report should be an important influence on planning to come.

John Wagstaff - Literatures and Languages Team:

They relied on JoAnn Jacoby for information and providing context. It's nice to be at a place in the NSM process where we're seeing results. (Another thing he'd like to emphasize is that this process is fun!) It was also nice to have a weekly meeting with faculty outside the Library – the opportunity to make contacts with colleagues elsewhere on campus has been enriching. Recommends taking the opportunity to do this work, one can get a tremendous amount out of it. Believes that the team came up with an interesting report.

The team had a good representation of academic/library faculty and staff.

They also sent out a survey to faculty, students, and staff, were heartened to see that people still care about their library environment, collections, buildings, and services. This came out in the survey responses.

• People in literatures and languages are still very passionate about print and browsing, they want extensive collections available. People reported that if English and Modern Languages libraries are combined in a new space on 2nd floor, they wanted assurance that books will not be sent to
Oak St. (*synonymous with oblivion!*), but they are comfortable with material being sent to the Stacks as long as it's still available.

- The main recommendation is to integrate the English and Modern Languages libraries on 2nd floor, space in 225 and 200D. They will combine reference collections within main room 200, which will need de-duping. This work has already begun, along with moving materials to Main Stacks.

They held an Open meeting on Dec 16th, which addressed the advantages of moving to main space. People seemed to like the idea that the new library configuration will be closer to main stacks/HPNL. (Humanities set great store by Main Stacks). This plan means that the top five most frequently used libraries for Humanities will be on the same floor. People outside the Library were very enthusiastic about this collocation.

What needs to happen:
- Books will need to be moved,
- De-duping and rationalization of collections,
- New shelving configuration for room 225.
- This could take several years or a short time, depending on process.

An implementation team will be assembled, and be responsible for enacting recommendations.

Questions:
- JoAnn Jacoby added that the Implementation team charge should be going to the Library Executive Committee this week, there will be a comment period, which should be in by early February.
- Lura Joseph, Geology Librarian reminded the group that physical browsing is also important in the sciences. Journals are fine online, for humanists as well as scientists according the the Literatures and Languages survey results, but faculty continue to state the need for core collections of monographs and any journals that are not online.
  - John was tempted to wonder whether faculty think students browse more than they do? But attractive space could encourage this.
  - JoAnn was surprised how extensively and enthusiastically online journal use had been embraced by the humanists, and how digitized text/access tools had effected their research and teaching. Survey comments on the impact of digital texts and tools were rich - something that could be looked at for future services planning.

JoAnn thanked the Team leaders for their presentations, as well as their hard work and able leadership of these teams, and began the raffle drawing of white-elephant prozes

The meeting finished with a YouTube viewing of Suzy Snowflake.