

MAIN LIBRARY HUMANITIES HUB PLANNING TEAM REPORT, DECEMBER 2012

Introduction

The Main Library Humanities Hub Planning Team was formally established by the University Library's Executive Committee in early August 2012. It was given a multi-point charge, which appears at Appendix 2 to this report. The Team looked at each of the eight elements of the charge individually, and the report is structured charge by charge. Some elements of the charge fall under space utilization (nos 3 and 4), others under research (principally no 2), and others under administration (nos 5-8). The Team was energized by the prospect of really being able to achieve something bold and long-lasting for the Humanities through its report: a goal in which the Main Library will ultimately become a Humanities and Social Science Library, including the libraries currently on its 1st and 3rd floors, the IPRH, digital humanities spaces, and incorporating Government Documents, is exciting, desirable, and, we believe, achievable. Such a goal will clearly bring economies of scale in terms of library operations, and will open up new opportunities for service provision.

The Team's discussions benefited from its broad membership, listed in appendix 4 to this report. In addition, we received input from the following: their expert contributions are very much appreciated.

- Jen-Chien Yu, the Library's recently-appointed Coordinator for Library Assessment (particularly as regards element 8 of the Team's charge)
- Professor Diane Koenker, Chair of the Department of History (in the context of a discussion regarding the possible involvement of the History, Philosophy, and Newspaper Library in a humanities hub model)
- Department of Classics academic faculty Antony Augoustakis, David Sansone, Arianna Traill, Angeliki Tzanetou and Brian Walters
- Jeff Schrader, Assistant Dean of Libraries for Facilities (on space issues)
- Tom Teper, Associate University Librarian for Collections (concerning options for moving materials into the library's Stacks area or elsewhere).

Partly because of a comparatively short timetable we did not undertake a paper or online survey of humanities libraries users as some previous NSM planning teams have done.

The Team held meetings on the following dates, with each meeting lasting about an hour:

- October 3, 10, 17, 24
- November 7, 14, 28
- December 4

The Team's discussions have focused on coming up with both a long-term and a short-term plan for a Main Library Humanities Hub, due to the fact that room 220, currently occupied by Content Access Management, will not become available for at least two years but is likely to be critical to the development of a logical assembly of humanities collections on the 2nd floor of the Main Library. (The importance of room 220 to the plan is recognized in the "Background" opening paragraph to the Team's charge, and the Team is unanimous in **recommending the transfer of the Classics Library to Room 220 from its current space on 4th floor of Main Library.**) We have tried in this report to deal both with integration of humanities at the service level and at the collection level. The short-term goals set out below are intended to be carried out in the two years prior to room 220 becoming available, and they have the advantage that even if room 220 ends up being allocated by the Library for some other purpose, they will remain valid and useful. Our suggestions for goals to be achieved within the next two years are as follows:

1. Weed, and then reclassify, materials in Classics and in room 200, preferably also material in the History, Philosophy, and Newspaper Library.
2. Create an integrated "humanities" collection space in Main Stacks that will form a useful and logical storage site for materials that, while not sufficiently heavily used as to justify keeping them in Main Library reading rooms, are too heavily used to justify moving them to Oak Street.
3. Continue to consult with the widest possible constituency of stakeholders.
4. Develop a robust assessment plan for the 2nd floor libraries as currently constituted.

It should also be noted, in conjunction with the second point above, that it may be desirable to move some material that currently *is* in Main Stacks out again into a reading room – one Team member particularly mentioned Medieval Studies material in this context.

Four further points should be emphasized before launching into the major part of the report. These are:

- Humanities subjects still rely to a great extent on printed texts, and the layout of humanities libraries is likely to continue to reflect this reality for some time to come. This is not, we believe, because humanities scholars are wedded to print in any discussion of "print vs digital": it is, rather, because of the slow pace at which digital products for the humanities in general have developed. Product development in the humanities is generally less economically attractive than products in science, technology, medicine, and business, where higher funding tends to be more readily available and where historical depth may be less of a desideratum than having the latest information. If the development of electronic databases and digital corpora had been based on intrinsic scholarly, rather than shorter-term economic, calculation, humanities scholars would likely be much better off in terms of digital resource provision than they currently are. The current situation is simply a reflection of today's financial realities. Related to this point is the continued importance of having print collections that can be *browsed*:

although digital collections allow more searching possibilities, print collections are superior to digital when it comes to browsing. Implicit in this statement is the idea that having a particular subject's print collections scattered in various locations (e.g. 2nd floor of Main Library, Main Stacks, and Oak Street) can be problematic.

- The services currently provided for humanities patrons in Main Library are, in general, working well. Future plans for services need to take account of this reality. However, **the Team did discuss, at its final meeting, the desirability of having a central circulation point for the collections and services on 2nd floor of Main Library.** Although this needs further discussion, the idea received general approval.
- The Team had to tread a fine line between, on the one hand, coming up with a bold vision for humanities units on the 2nd floor of the Main Library, and, on the other, producing a set of shorter-term recommendations that, while perhaps less ambitious, are likely to be implemented without problems. If ultimately we have stepped back from recommending the physical integration of humanities collections into a single “humanities library” it is not, we believe, a concession to inertia. Humanities is organized into distinct disciplines and is likely to remain so organized; and library organization ought to follow the disciplinary organization of scholarship. Administratively we are also not recommending that humanities should, for the present, have a single unit head, and this is discussed further in point (5) below. Ultimately, **the Team's preference is for the Main Library to become the home for both Humanities and Social Science collections and services** (including International and Area Studies), and future planners should keep this in mind. Appropriate administrative oversight of such an HSS library will clearly need to evolve over time.
- This report attempts to reflect the nuances, as well as the broad thrust, of the Team's discussions, but even so is probably only a weak reflection of the intellectual energy that went into our team meetings. This was a particularly successful team because every member contributed fully, and often made time to attend the meetings in spite of some personal scheduling inconvenience or other. This shows very well how, for both academic and library members of the Team, the library continues to be regarded as an essential part of our university's mission. In short: *it matters*.

A point-by-point examination of the Team's charge, with recommendations

Charge no. 1. Engage in conversations with relevant campus communities and Library advisory groups...to inform all aspects of planning for the new unit

As already noted, the Team, or individual members of it, did meet with several experts. We were not able to consult with all potentially interested parties, which would have comprised a vast number of individuals and groups. However, the two-year “window” before room 220 becomes available will enable a Main Library Humanities Hub Implementation Team to consult more widely if it feels it appropriate (the Planning Team does feel this would be useful). Specific groups that the Planning Team believes should be consulted include the following:

- “ethnic studies” groups
- English library committee

- Religious studies
- Medieval Studies advisory committee

2. Working toward the goal of creating a second floor Humanities Hub, articulate a service profile that supports the expanded focus on-campus and nationally on digital humanities [etc.]

Sarah Shreeves (for Scholarly Commons) and Harriett Green (for Digital Humanities) made short presentations, and led discussions, about their respective areas at the Team’s meeting of October 17, and of course the Team continued to keep these matters in mind at its later meetings. There clearly is a growing demand for both Scholarly Commons and Digital Humanities services on campus, with Harriet, for example, reporting that a very successful Digital Humanities symposium this semester had attracted around 40 people. It is clearly important for both Scholarly Commons and Digital Humanities to be part of a humanities hub “vision”, and this is reflected in the fact that, when drafting a position request for a Classics Librarian (submitted for consideration by the library’s Executive Committee in November 2012), the request specifically listed “to contribute to the Library’s digital humanities and other technological initiatives” among the job duties. It is unrealistic in the medium to long term to expect just one member of library faculty (Harriett) to cater for all future digital humanities needs.

Additional staffing and technology resources are likely to be a requirement for the Scholarly Commons as well; but whereas there is clear logic in having Digital Humanities librarians on the 2nd floor because of the location of many humanities collections, the Scholarly Commons has a wider, “all-library” brief, and may be better retained in its current accommodation on the library’s 3rd floor, to avoid the appearance of “belonging” to one constituency or another. Therefore the Team is not making specific recommendations about the future staffing needs of the Scholarly Commons.

This portion of the charge also mentions connections between the Humanities Hub and the current History, Philosophy and Newspaper Library. In a meeting on November 12, 2012 with Marek Sroka and John Wagstaff, Professor Diane Koenker did note that history as an academic discipline is currently tending to move its focus away from the social sciences in favor of the humanities. This clearly means that it would be appropriate, from a discipline-specific perspective, to try to include HPNL in any future “Humanities Library” model. Partly with this in mind, the Team gave some attention to proposing that the offices on 2nd floor of Main Library between HPNL and room 220 could be usefully repurposed from their current use as offices for the library administration, and converted into multi-use space for humanities librarians and patrons – for offices for librarians of the various humanities units on the one hand, and for collaborative study spaces and a seminar room for library patrons on the other, perhaps also with a dedicated “digital humanities space. Furthermore, it is felt that having these spaces may well

help in fulfilling the Information Literacy portion of the Team's charge (the final part of charge no. 2). While the Team recognizes that this would displace library administration to another space in Main Library (4th floor, perhaps?), and did not have time to discuss an exact configuration and layout for humanities library purposes, we **recommend that this proposal be given serious consideration over the next two years, and subsequently if appropriate by the Implementation Team.**

Finally, point 2 of the charge also notes the importance of continuing or deepening the provision of on-demand reference through the Main/UGL Reference Hub. Nothing in the Team's recommendations speaks against this idea. Mark Wardecker (Acting Librarian for Classics) already contributes effectively to general reference effort in the library, and this has also been included in the list of duties for the Classics Librarian position submitted in November 2012.

3. Explore ways to array collections, services, and staff offices within a footprint that includes 225, 200 and 220 library [etc.]

There is unanimous agreement among the Team that Classics should be moved from 4th floor to room 220. The current square footage allocated to Classics, using figures supplied to the Team by Jeff Schrader on October 10, 2012, is 2,375 ft² in room 419A (the main Classics reading room), plus a total of 900 ft² for the three rooms across the corridor from 419A, making a grand total of around 3,100 ft². The total square footage of room 220, including the space formerly occupied by the library's Billing Office, is 5,248. (Room 200, incidentally, occupies 13,466 ft².) Therefore, in terms of raw numbers, room 220 is approximately 2,100 ft² larger than the whole of the space currently occupied by Classics, including the three corridor rooms. However, it needs to be kept in mind that there is effectively *no* staff workspace in the current Classics Library, so some will need to be created in room 220, plus – potentially – office space for the Classics Librarian, either in room 220 or in one of the offices between 220 and HPNL. Nevertheless, it would be disappointing (to say the least) if, in spite of the extra square footage made available by a move to room 220, the amount of shelving available in the current Classics configuration on the 4th floor had to be reduced. We strongly recommend that further detailed work on how much shelving will be available in room 220 is carried out before moving ahead with plans for an actual move.

Other relevant figures here are:

- Room 225 (the Literatures and Languages Library) occupies 4,664 ft².
- Shelving occupancy for reference materials and journals in the current Classics Library in 419A is as follows: Reference section: 693 feet; journals in main room: 573 feet. A further 654 feet of journals are normally housed in room 409, one of the three “across the corridor” rooms annexed to the Classics Library.
- Total capacity of perimeter shelving in room 200 is 1,890 feet. Of this 1,890 feet, 520 feet is given over to Literatures and Languages reference materials; 310 feet to Government Documents; 270 feet to “general reference,” much of which consists of

dictionaries and biographies, the majority relating to humanities; and 260 feet to Literature and Languages periodicals.

The Team extensively discussed the best use of room 200, especially in the context of making it a humanities reference room only. E-mail correspondence with Nancy O'Brien (SSEHL) and Steve Witt (IAS) indicates that these two libraries have very little reference material in room 200, so any such material that *is* there could, if required, either be moved to those reading rooms, to Stacks, or disposed of. Moving Government Documents materials would be a tricky, sensitive, and drawn-out process, and for various reasons (including the clear usefulness of government documents materials to historians) the Team has decided *not* to propose this as a recommendation at this time. Nevertheless, there seems to be good sense, from an administrative and patron-service point to view, to eventually move towards a model in which humanities are the main/sole user of room 200.

The Team notes the following as among the advantages of moving Classics from 4th to 2nd floors:

- Such a move would take Classics out of its currently isolated and cramped space on 4th floor
- It would bring Classics into closer proximity to Literatures and Languages, to main reference, to HPNL and to Main Stacks. Main Stacks remain an attractive option for housing material weeded from Classics over the next year or two.
- It gives Classics a remodeled and redesigned space that will better attract and serve users, as well as provide more efficient staff workspaces.

Given the current layout of room 220 there are several possibilities for where to site a main entrance to 2nd floor Classics. The final decision on this should be a matter for the Implementation Team.

It is clearly important that the integrity of the Classics collection not be compromised in any move from 4th to 2nd floors: on several occasions team members stressed the national and international significance of the collection, and the importance of making as much of it as possible easily accessible in one place. As one member of the Team has put it:

It may [...] be worth reiterating that the Classics faculty [...] are committed to maintaining the integrity of the current, internationally recognized Classics collection (with a few tweaks, perhaps). A move to LIB 220 would be terrific in terms of added space, greater proximity to the other libraries that would together form the new Humanities Hub, the possibility of a Digital Humanities and/or Scholarly Commons presence in some fashion, etc. But any move that ended up scattering the current collection over several libraries would, I think, be counter-productive from the point of

view of the patrons who actually utilize it most.

4. Consider whether any other collections and services related to the humanities, in addition to those currently provided by Classics and Literatures & Languages, should be integrated into this footprint.

This point in the charge goes to the heart of how best to configure the 2nd floor to suitably accommodate humanities subjects. The obvious candidate for integration into what the Team has come to call the humanities “neighborhood” is the History, Philosophy, and Newspaper Library, both because it is already located near related humanities subjects on 2nd floor and because there are clear disciplinary connections between it, Classics, and Literatures & Languages. However, before integration of HPNL in this way can become a reality, the concept will need to be further discussed with the History Faculty and other interested parties (while the talk with Professor Koenker reported earlier in this document was useful, it would clearly be advisable to meet with more History Faculty, and other stakeholders, before taking a decision on the matter, and Professor Koenker indicated that this could not be arranged before February 2013). The Team on several occasions discussed what “integration” should mean in the context of our charge: does it mean reclassing materials in the “neighborhood” libraries so that they are all in Library of Congress classification? Does it imply eventually rearranging humanities materials in a single (print) sequence? Our view is that the first goal (of reclassification) is desirable, but that the advantages of the second are not immediately obvious. (Even if bibliographically it were possible, the physical architecture of the second floor would hinder organizing materials in a single sequence.) On several occasions, different team members stressed the importance of being near the collections for which they are responsible, and for which they have the appropriate subject expertise. For this reason, it is appropriate at this point to state the Team’s recommendation that, at least in the short to medium term, **the humanities collections that potentially will form the humanities “footprint” or “neighborhood” on 2nd floor of Main Library should remain in their current areas (or its “new” area of 220, in the case of Classics).**

5. Develop a staffing model for the new unit, including recommendations for the administrative responsibilities for leadership of this and possibly other related units in the Main Library building.

On the assumption that Classics will move to room 220, it is clear that the different library units in the Main Library Humanities Hub (Classics and Literatures & Languages, maybe HPNL) will be able to work closely and cooperatively in regard to sharing staff resources and expertise. Currently there are three different unit heads in the proposed Hub, i.e. in Classics, in HPNL, and in Literatures & Languages. However, the Team **recommends, at least in the short to medium**

term, that the Main Library Humanities Hub not move to a model in which there is a sole unit head for the whole Hub. In part this is because we feel that that it would not be the best use of the University Library's scarce staffing resources to create a new "Humanities Hub Unit Head" position that would be almost entirely devoted to administration. At present the subject specialists (including the Classics specialist) are succeeding in fulfilling both their subject-specific and unit-head-specific responsibilities. Given that the current structure seems to be working, the Team remains to be persuaded that it needs to be changed.

That being said, given that a proposal for a permanent Classics Librarian is currently under consideration, there might be some sense in making either the Unit Head for HPNL or the Unit Head for Literatures & Languages also the Unit Head for Classics. Given the very large number of duties required of the HPNL librarian, combining the unit head positions in Classics and Languages & Literatures seems the more logical proposal.

6. Draft a position description for a librarian whose duties include collection development and liaison responsibilities for Classics as well as related responsibilities.

This has already been done, and sent to the library's Executive Committee (November 2012). The position request includes responsibilities within digital humanities, plus reference support for the Main Library/UGL reference hub. However, it should be emphasized that the request submitted in November 2012 was an intentionally rudimentary description: it will be more fully developed as plans evolve for the new service model.

7. Make proposals for the name of the unit

The Team discussed this matter at more than one of its meetings. Our initial intention was to recommend the name "Humanities Library" to cover the area proposed to be occupied by rooms 200, 220 (Classics) and 225. However, upon further discussion it was felt that, unless and until the libraries in this area of 2nd floor (perhaps also with HPNL) become more fully integrated, and because a true "Humanities Library" would encompass more than what it being proposed, **we recommend that, while it may be appropriate to informally refer to the different units on 2nd floor as "humanities libraries", for now the different areas should formally retain their separate identities as the Classics Library, the Literatures & Languages Library, and the Reference Reading Room.** Had it been decided to push for the removal of non-humanities materials such as Government Documents from room 200 there might have been good sense in renaming room 200 the "Humanities Reference Room"; but we are not proposing that, for pragmatic reasons relating to the difficulty of finding a new home for Government Documents. We are not proposing the retention of the current names for short-sighted, "territorial" reasons, but because we consider that the current system seems to work for library patrons and staff.

8. Recommend a plan for the ongoing assessment of collections and services, focusing on impacts and outcomes and including metrics and other means of identifying whether the desired outcomes have been achieved.

A meeting between John Wagstaff (Team Chair) and Jen-Chien Yu (Library Assessment Coordinator) led to the following conclusions:

- “Ongoing assessment” as listed in the Team’s charge is going to require a combination of quantitative and “ethnographic” approaches
- Decisions need to be carefully taken concerning what kinds of data are going to be collected – libraries have traditionally focused on gate counts, user surveys, and circulation statistics, but clearly these do not tell the whole story
- An “ethnographic” study (as such things are currently referred to in the library literature) might involve close observation of how patrons actually use our spaces within a defined period, and give us much useful data that cannot be reduced to raw numbers
- There is, according to Jen, little point in setting targets such as “we aim to increase circulation of materials by 50%”. More important will be the assessment of patron and staff satisfaction with humanities hub spaces as a whole.
-

The Team therefore **recommends that librarians involved with providing services and collections on 2nd floor of Main Library continue to work with Jen to come up with sensible assessment methods to judge and compare the impact of current and future models.**

APPENDIX 1: SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: “Short Term” goals (p. 2)

1. Weed, and then reclassify, materials in Classics and in room 200, preferably also material in the History, Philosophy, and Newspaper Library.
2. Create an integrated “humanities” collection space in Main Stacks that will form a useful and logical storage site for materials that, while not sufficiently heavily used as to justify keeping them in Main Library reading rooms, are too heavily used to justify moving them to Oak Street.
3. Continue to consult with the widest possible constituency of stakeholders.
4. Develop a robust assessment plan for the 2nd floor libraries as currently constituted

Recommendation 2: The Team is unanimous in recommending the transfer of the Classics Library to Room 220 from its current space on 4th floor of Main Library (p. 2). However, we strongly recommend that further detailed work on how much shelving will be available in room 220 is carried out before moving ahead with plans for an actual move, and stakeholders, including academic faculty, will need to be fully consulted.

Recommendation 3: the Main Library should eventually become the home for Humanities and Social Science collections and services, and future planners should be made with this in mind (p. 3)

Recommendation 4: The Team recommends that serious consideration be given to repurposing the library administration offices between room 220 and the HPNL as a multi-use study/seminar/office space over the next two years (p. 5), and to creating a central circulation desk for the 2nd floor libraries, probably in room 200 (p. 3).

Recommendation 5: , The Team recommends that, at least in the short to medium term, the humanities collections that potentially will form the humanities “footprint”, or “neighborhood” on 2nd floor of Main Library should remain in their current areas (or its “new” area of 200, in the case of Classics). (p. 7)

Recommendation 6: The Team recommends, at least in the short to medium term, that the Main Library Humanities Hub not move to a model in which there is a sole unit head for the whole Hub (p. 8)

Recommendation 7: The Team recommends that, while it may be appropriate to informally refer to the different units on 2nd floor as “humanities libraries”, for now the different areas should formally retain their separate identities as the Classics Library, the Literatures & Languages Library, and the Reference Reading Room for the time being. (p. 8)

Recommendation 8: The Team recommends that librarians involved with providing services and collections on 2nd floor of Main Library continue to work with Jen-Chien Yu to come up with sensible assessment methods to judge and compare the impact of current and future models

APPENDIX 2

Main Library Humanities Hub Planning Team

BACKGROUND

In the next two years, Content Access Management (CAM) will be vacating 220 Library. The availability of this prime space located in a high-traffic area down the hall from both the History Philosophy and Newspaper Library and the entrance to Main Stacks, provides the opportunity to bring humanities-related collections and services currently dispersed throughout the Main Library together on the 2nd floor.

CHARGE:

1. Engage in conversations with relevant campus communities and Library advisory groups to further define existing and emerging needs of students and scholars in order to inform all aspects of planning for a new unit bringing together the collections and services currently provided by the Classics Library, Literatures and Languages Library and other areas that may be suggested by the Team.
2. Working toward the goal of creating a second floor humanities “hub,” articulate a service profile that:
 - Supports the expanded focus on-campus and nationally on digital humanities and new approaches to humanities research such as large-scale text mining, visualization and spatial analysis
 - Considers opportunities to incorporate specialized services and technology-rich work spaces provided by the Scholarly Commons
 - Proposes an overall program for supporting humanities research that includes the broader array of Main Library service programs supporting scholarly work in the humanities, such as the History Philosophy and Newspaper Library and the Special Collections Division. Streamlines access to collections and expertise by further co-location of material and people.
 - Continues or deepens the cooperative approach to providing on-demand reference through the Main/UGL Reference Hub
 - Considers opportunities to deepen engagement with teaching as outlined in Information Literacy Considerations for New Service Model Teams < http://www.library.illinois.edu/export/nsm/Information_Literacy_Considerations_for_New_Service_Model_Teams.doc>.
3. Explore ways to array collections, services, and staff offices within a footprint that includes 225 Library (the current Literatures and Language Library), 200 Library (the Reference Reading Room, which currently houses the Literatures Language reference books and serials, along an interdisciplinary reference collection) and 220 Library (which Content Access

Management (CAM) will be vacating). Adjacent spaces may also be included in latter phases of the planning. These spaces should provide attractive and functional multi-use space within the library for scholars, including space for collaboration, as well as for individual contemplation and reading¹

4. Consider whether any other collections and services related to the humanities, in addition to those currently provided by Classics and Literatures and Languages, should be integrated in this footprint.
5. Develop a staffing model for the new unit, including recommendations for the administrative responsibilities for leadership of this and possibly other related units in the Main Library building.
6. Draft position description for a librarian whose duties include collection development and liaison responsibilities for Classics as well as related responsibilities.
7. Make proposals for the name of the unit.
8. Recommend a plan for the ongoing assessment of collections and services, focusing on impacts and outcomes and including metrics and other means of identifying whether the desired outcomes have been achieved.
9. Submit a report with its recommendations to the University Librarian by December 14, 2012.

Submitted to the Executive Committee for consideration: August 2, 2012

Approved by the Executive Committee: August, 8 2012

¹ This may be an opportunity to take advantage of a deferred gift to support a reading room or nook with comfortable seating for individual readers.

**APPENDIX 3: DRAFT POSITION REQUEST FOR CLASSICS LIBRARIAN POSITION,
SUBMITTED TO THE LIBRARY'S EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE IN NOVEMBER 2012**

FACULTY & AP POSITION REQUEST

Proposing Division, Unit, Group or Individual	Main Library Humanities Hub Planning Team
Proposed Title	Classics Librarian
Faculty Rank	Faculty position
Estimated Salary	\$52K-\$58K
Potential sources of funding for position	Funds released following Bruce Swann's retirement; Academic pool
Reports to	University Librarian
Recommended time frame for filling (immediate need, 6 months, 1 year, etc.) and explanation	Fill within 1 year; responsibility for Classics is currently being covered half-time by Visiting Assistant Professor Mark Wardecker, whose position will come to an end in January 10, 2014.

<p>Position Need & Rationale: explain how this position contributes to the Library's strategic goals</p>	<p>The Main Library Humanities Hub Planning Team has been charged to develop a position for a “librarian whose duties include collection development and liaison responsibilities for Classics, as well as related responsibilities.” The Classics Librarian serves a critical role as subject liaison with various programs and departments, overseeing the University Library’s world-renowned collections in Classics and offering expert research guidance to interdisciplinary humanities researchers from the UIUC campus and from other institutions as well. The Team is developing a position description that will be submitted by mid-December along with the team’s final report. Please consider this a placeholder for a position that will be fully developed in the context of the Team’s broader discussions of the Humanities Hub.</p>
<p>Brief position description and job duties</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build and curate collections in multiple formats in the disciplinary area of Classics, including relevant aspects of interdisciplinary campus programs such as Medieval Studies; 2. To develop and provide instructional and reference services and materials in support of teaching, learning, and research; to serve as liaison to relevant campus departments and programs, including the department of Classics and the Medieval Studies program.

	<p>3. To contribute to reference service provision in the Main Library/UGL reference hub.</p> <p>4. To contribute to the Library’s digital humanities services and collaborate with colleagues in other digital scholarship initiatives.</p> <p>5. To assume other responsibilities that may be identified by the NSM Humanities Team.</p>
How might this position evolve to meet continuing Library needs in 5-10 years?	The library’s collections, including Classics, are likely to continue to be increasingly “hybrid” – involving a mixture of print and digital resources – in the coming years, and the current interest among Classics researchers in doing large-scale projects involving digital texts is likely to become increasingly sophisticated. What is not likely to change is the need for a librarian who possesses expert-level subject knowledge and an up-to-date familiarity with trends and developments in current research and criticism. This

	<p>will need to be allied to an interest in digital humanities efforts, and a strong service ethic.</p>
--	---

Library EC, rev. Sept. 2006

APPENDIX 4: LIST OF TEAM MEMBERS

John Wagstaff, Music & Performing Arts Library (Chair)

Robert Cagle, Literatures and Languages Library

Paula Carns, Head of Literatures and Languages Library

Harriett Green, English and Digital Humanities Librarian

Dianne Harris, Head, Illinois Program for Research in the Humanities

JoAnn Jacoby, Head, Reference, Research and Scholarly Services

J.-P. Mathy, Department of French

Kirk Sanders, Associate Professor of the Classics and Philosophy

Sue Searing, Interim Associate University Librarian for User Services

Sarah Shreeves, IDEALS and Scholarly Commons Coordinator

Marek Sroka, Acting Head, History, Philosophy and Newspaper Library

Caroline Szylowicz, Kolb-Proust Librarian/Curator of Rare Books and Manuscripts/French Studies Subject Specialist

Mark Wardecker, Visiting Classics/Reference Librarian

Charlie Wright, Director of the Program in Medieval Studies and English