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

1. Minutes of the June 4, 2010 meeting were approved and will be posted for staff information.

2. Assignments - Susan updated and sent out via email the Assessment Task Assignments list last week to remind all Task Force members what still needed to be done. Don asked how everyone was doing with their assignments. Laura is pulling things together and should be done with the ISTC piece by Tuesday of next week. She met with Director Monahar Kulkarni and updated him on the work of the Task Force. Susan reported she contacted a few of the UIUC librarians that are serving as embedded librarians and discussed how they provide service after the closure of a library. She will be able to provide some information on this topic for the final report. She also initiated a dialogue with Cherie Weibel to discuss the issue of having to go to the Main library to pick up books from the Interlibrary Loan Department. Currently faculty have the option to receive ILL items through campus mail. They are exploring the possibility that Institute staff would also be eligible for this service and will investigate if this is a service that would or would not be frequently used by INRS staff. Gary is working on item 6, Exploring the models of other service areas within the Institute and beyond. He has found reports primarily on digitization vs. print and is looking for any other reports or articles besides the NSM that would serve as models. The Ithaka reports were suggested. Also the formation of the 2CUL site, a Columbia and Cornell University 501 3c entity for the sharing of resources. Don encouraged everyone to keep working on their assignments and reminded everyone the INRS retreat is June 22nd and he would like to prepare a report for the Directors. Gary asked Laura if she could prepare a summation of the survey comments as a bullet point summary or synopsis.

3. Scenarios - Don thought there were still too many scenarios and a need to collapse the document and simplify. The current scenario is necessary but split appointments awkward. He suggested breaking it down to two scenarios, the first being an improvement on the present situation and the other 100% appointed to an INRS account with library staff reporting to Susan and then to Gary. Susan suggested her latest scenario take the place of scenario one and two if everyone is agreeable. She agreed split appointments were problematic and an inefficient use of supervisory effort. Tom mentioned that Library Faculty split appointments can be very difficult with each department having different expectations and that simpler was better. An interim step arrangement may be necessary and its success may depend upon each unit’s
commitment to the INRS Library. One concern was how do we assure that the quality of service per Survey/Center library continue if supervision is at the institute level? Will the needs of Surveys/Center still be met? The formation of the Library Advisory Committee, which will have representation from each Survey/Center, should help monitor this. Final job descriptions must reflect the needs and services of the individual Surveys. Will each librarian be viewed as their Survey/Center Librarian or exclusively as an INRS librarian? Gary mentioned that the INRS budget and the Directors will decide if a librarian is replaced if they leave. Kishore mentioned that the basic level of services need to be identified and staff time allocated to these and then anything beyond that can be left to the discretion of the Head Librarian to see if resources are available, but basics must always be covered. Susan mentioned one benefit is that other librarians can collaborate and back up other librarians in their absence. Librarians share a level of expertise and develop referral scenarios. It was mentioned that there was a need for a paragraph on a modern service model. Also the service goals on the first page are very general and need to be broadened including a basic level of service that each unit can expect. A homework task? What types of services are optimal and what level of service can each survey expect? It was discussed that the current Administrative Scenario needed to be fleshed out. Susan asked that each unit send her broadened descriptions of their contributions. Also reporting lines are not included nor is an assignment of effort (percent time going to home vs. Institute), dollars or salary lines. Susan will try to put this information in a tabular format. Should ISAS be included? If not, describe in the caveats why not. Perhaps begin by building a relationship with ISAS over the next few years, let them get assimilated and then look at their responsibility to the Institute Library. But it is important that they should have a member on the Library Advisory Committee.

4. Operational Scenario- Don mentioned that Operational Scenario one and two should be labeled phase one and phase two and prefers to think of them as phases into the big plan and not separate options. Major differences between scenario one and two is that in scenario two ISGS moves to FNHB, each librarian does the same amount of desk time and the number of service points change. Tom suggested that we define what the modern service model is before we describe the operational scenarios. Do the scenarios describe what we are doing and what are the benefits? What are we looking to do? Have librarians more actively engaged in grants and partners in research process. These kinds of services should drive the operations we choose. Elaborate under the goals the evolution of the Institute Library to a modern service model which includes librarians working with the scientists on data curation, digitization, e science, engagement, management of historical collections and instruction. Also mention a reduction of duplication and a focus on what we have that is unique. Laura was asked to pull together an outline on the New/Modern Service Model for the Task Force to flesh out.

5. Report for the Directors- Gary asked what could be pulled together for the Directors at the upcoming retreat. A revised Scenario document can be used for talking points. The Modern Service Model statement would also be important. The Advantages list can be
used to outline benefits. Maybe include potential loss of service and explain how those issues will be addressed. Also cost will be a main question. Try to come up with some numbers and pull together a budget including the projected need for additional INRS Library staff in the form of pre professional assistance and/or graduate hourly’s and students. Can contact JoAnn Jacoby for estimated moving costs, i.e. $1.30 per book (cataloging, packing, student labor).

6. Tasks for Tuesday (June 15) - Susan, Gary and Don meet Monday, June 14 at INHS library to develop talking points, Susan revises scenarios, Laura develops Survey bullet points and Modern Service Model statement.

7. Next meeting Thursday June 17, 10:00 am. Don encourages members to work on their Assessment Task Assignments.