INRS Library Advisory Task Force  
June 4, 2010, 9:00am  
Room 1005 Forbes Natural History Building  

Participants: Don McKay (Chair), Laura Barnes, Susan Braxton, Anne Huber, Gary Miller, Beth Wohlgemuth, Jim Angel, Kishore Rajagopalan, Cathy Bialeschki (recording).  
Absent: Laura Kozuch, Brenda Molano-Flores, Scott Elrick, Tom Teper  

1. Minutes of the May 20 meeting were approved and will be posted for staff information.  

2. Library scenarios were distributed in advance and discussed at the meeting. Susan asked task force members to express any concerns and to help clarify any language that might lead to misunderstanding about what we are doing/recommending. All agreed the goals set forth in the INRS Libraries scenario document are important to agree on and how scenarios are evaluated should be based on how these scenarios help us reach our goals.  

Don shared that after much discussion and review, he believes the Institute library should be one location with individual libraries reporting to one manager of operation. Space wise, in order to accommodate the most important and unique materials there will need to be reduction of duplicates, movement of least used materials to Oak St., and separate handling of some special collections, like large ISGS map collections. Don conveyed previous program moves such as this initially cause angst, but in the end can work out well. He reminded of the importance of viewing the Institute as a “collection of us (the Surveys)” and value added. He indicated that at present, given the lack of acquisition budgets and other limitations, we have essentially one library and three book cemeteries. The TF’s recommendations will be aimed at correcting that. Kishore suggests we review goals to determine what our most important priorities are. Add to goal list: “don’t spend time doing things already done in the UI system”. Examples: digitization (rather feed into UI), instruction (use UI offerings). Don noted that in the new model Survey librarians would facilitate use of UI library services, provide research training and support, and liaise for Survey staff. Having a librarian with expertise available on site is an important component that continues to be important for Survey staff and will be further developed in terms of services provided.  

3. Collection acquisition – except for INHS, due to budget issues, other libraries are not currently adding to their collections. One way to add value is to buy only what others do not have. The Institute can become a larger repository and place to bring/pull info together and even pursue grant funding to build the repository. It was suggested we should use budget dollars to acquire reference materials not available elsewhere that could be shared across campus. Institute scientists should be reminded to tell a librarian every time they look for something in the library system and can’t find it.
4. Library Budget – at some point the Directors will need to decide how best to manage the budget. The task force should figure out a staffing plan and operating budget. Identifying funding sources and levels will be left to the Directors. Since scenarios have more to do with service than how we pay and who reports to whom (admin), it was agreed Susan will pull admin/budget from the scenario document and distribute an updated draft ASAP. She asked task force members to send her any additional feedback. Gary suggested meeting with Directors to bring them up to speed on Task Force deliberations. In addition, the Institute Library will be discussed June 22 at an INRS retreat. We must define why we are moving to an Institute library, value added and a basic services level. Then if individual Surveys want additional service, they need to pay for it. All will need to contribute to funding of the library perhaps via a central Institute budget. The TF reiterated the importance of not duplicating what the University is doing. The Institute becomes a contributor of those things UI doesn’t have. Task force discussed importance of our staff seeing what the UI library is ordering.

5. Report/Outline components discussed:
   a. Susan asked each Survey librarian to provide a summary document of major issues for their particular library as an appendix to the recommendation document. Summaries should include whatever librarians think is important about the library and why it matters.
   b. Brief bullets of what’s happening at UI libraries. Look at the model UI is moving towards and include narrative that describes these moves, e.g. UI Geo library plan on campus. Task force discussed specific UI library moves to “virtual library” and “office hours” versus desk coverage, librarians spending time in units they serve, but less happening at the main desk. It was suggested our report include those elements that would work for us. Our librarians then train staff on how to use these models to make them work for us.
   c. What’s the unique value of our library, e.g. field notes, maps, databases, special collections, access to materials housed elsewhere in hardcopy or digital, results of research (not available elsewhere).
   d. What’s our Institute library to become in the future? Thoughts of value of their collections and services to the individual Surveys are important to include and capture in next version.

6. Tasks Assignment document developed in April will be distributed. For next week, those who have tasks assigned need to have created a document representing what’s been done thus far. The task assignment list will be distributed following today’s meeting. If nothing is to be produced by 6/10, please let Susan know. Need to push to assemble what we can by this date.

7. Next meeting will be held Thursday, June 10 at 10am, then again June 17 at 10am and June 21 at 9am as needed. Don asked all to focus on conclusions and recommendations and few paragraphs of what we want to do. The background says we did our homework, but is less important than summary conclusions/recommendations.