INRS Library Advisory Task Force
June 17, 2010, 10:00 am
Room 1005 Forbes Natural History Building

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

1. Minutes from the previous meeting had not been reviewed by some, and approval of minutes was held until the next meeting. Comments should be sent to Susan Braxton.

2. Recommendation document – a new intro paragraph was added by Don and shared at the meeting. Short range target for document presentation is INRS retreat on June 22. This will be an opportunity to present progress of the task force and share the draft report. Don noted the goal of this document is to provide background justifications, hit key points considered and zero in on recommendations. Don was very interested in task force member reactions and comments. Susan agreed to take discussion points (below) and make the first bulleted list more general, brief statements about approach to libraries (not specific library actions). She will balance consolidating bullets while keeping it short for readability and add to recommendation verbiage that based on the core ideas resulting from discussion and survey results, the task force came up with the recommendations. Don would like the task force members to sign the final recommendation document (or cover letter) and all present were willing/interested in doing so. Don will share the draft report on Tuesday and ask Directors for feedback and modify as needed. Some specific suggestions:
   a. Facilitated access to info – loud and clear need. Importance of making that point.
   b. Order of survey results was discussed. Info was presented in order of survey questions and some preferred a different order.
   c. Add page numbers.
   d. Reorder recommendation bullets: move renaming library to follow consolidation and forming committee later in list. Move expand librarian role higher on list. Given the potential for an Institute name change, naming of the library will not be included in the recommendation document. Reminder that this is not an implementation document and many details like this are not yet spelled out.
   e. Two bulleted lists were discussed with concern about both lists including recommendations. One suggestion was to consolidate first bullet list to more narrative, then move to recommendation list. Point is to convince Institute leaders that these moves help us meet the goals.
   f. Training was an important, major finding. If we have 2-3 main points/findings from the staff survey, we need to make sure we present these upfront in the report.
   g. Number recommendations and bullet general list.
   h. Include in “current”: ISAS has no librarian (for consistency sake).

3. Administrative Scenario – Discussed library workload and need for equal commitments from librarians for the Institute library to work. Admin #1 scenario might happen for a short time to get organized,
but job descriptions would set x# hours at INRS library and have equal obligation to work on the process of consolidation. Creating a common space with contributions from all surveys/center with scientists guiding the effort and reviewing and evaluating needs is the goal. The consolidated library will serve all institute staff. Brenda felt the scenario that leaves salaries in divisions makes librarians more susceptible for division reassignment. Equitability issue is important and Directors will work through budgeting issues.

4. FY11 Budget – Gary reported the budget bill for our Institute dollars has passed with funding consistent with last year. Gary/Susan are pulling together budget info from each library (operation dollars spent now) and then what a consolidated library budget might be. It’s a conservative budget but covers reasonable support (work study), grad hourlies, historical operational needs, what the institute has already contributed, acquisition dollars, professional development dollars (new), etc. For next year, the main point is an overall small increase for personnel for appropriate library assistance to free up librarians to implement this plan. The budget document under development includes narrative and justification. It will be important to define a personnel model, acquisition needs, and emphasize the unique value we can bring to UI. Don would like to increase dollars for the library unique collection development, believing this is a cost center that deserves more resources. VSIP will cost the divisions this year, but in the future there will be savings available. We are trying to set up the library for the future when resources become available as we demonstrate value of library to our institute staff. This plan also envisions work more closely with UI to bring value back to them. Librarians would also help apply for grants (explore what’s available), build on unique characteristics, and become a unique repository. The budget will be shared with assistant directors for feedback.

5. The Monday, June 21 task force meeting was cancelled so that some librarians may attend an “Embedded Librarian” session being held on campus.

Recorder’s Note: Tom Teper, who was not able to attend the meeting, shared the following comments/observations:

(a) **Embedded Librarians**: I think that it is important to bring this up because the model that is being proposed is one similar to models that we have in the Main Library. From the outside, I believe that our embedded librarians have been most successful when they have a strong tie to a unit in the library system. It’s a fine distinction, but there is a difference between a librarian that works for the INRS Library and is embedded in the Geology Survey and a librarian that works in the Geology Survey and works in the INRS library. My observation in this regard is that a successful INRS Library will require that it becomes the primary point of loyalty for the librarians since they serve the INRS as a whole.

(b) **Time**: We have been running through a number of NSM projects for a while now. Some of the discussions about consolidations even pre-date the NSM program. Again, this is just my observation, but I believe that a clean break is better. Set a date for X unit to be consolidated or for the position descriptions to be reviewed by and stick to it. My reason for saying this is that I believe that the uncertainty of when things are going to happen is more detrimental to the people. This is really something for the INRS to consider, but it is an observation from our experiences.