INRS Library Advisory Task Force
May 20, 2010

Present: Jim Angel, Laura Barnes, Susan Braxton, Anne Huber, Don McKay, Kishore Rajagopalan, Gary Miller, Brenda Molano, Beth Wohlgemuth, Tom Teper, Scott Elrick.
Absent: Laura K.

Susan will send out revised minutes from 4/29/2010 for approval.

Questionnaire:
• Noted that comments on additional services desired interesting in context of Alex Scheeline's presentation.
• Suggestion that research teams need “parts” of librarians on team to provide services to make the research teams more efficient.
• How would tf like to see the info presented?
• Need to present what percent of staff participated in survey.
• Need to present of data relevant to the potential impact of closure or moving of the library.
• Comparison of library use by staff in a unit gives some clue as to disciplinary affiliations (e.g., ISWS use the Main Stacks a lot; possible explanation is that there are old weather and climate records in STX.) ISTC staff use a wide variety of libraries.
• Challenges question: Primary answers had to do with services and not collections.
• RE Survey: Overall and broken down by unit; all samples probably representative except ISWS sample. ISGS has 180 people, >60 respondents.
• TF agreed that results should be shown by unit, by location, and also lumped; also want comments lumped and broken down by unit with some gathering of common themes; requested a format easier to read than excel.
• Report should include the context, why questions were asked and what survey tells us about what we wanted to know.

Implications were discussed
• Counterproductive to have librarians at INRS doing clerical activities. It was noted that the Physical Science and Engineering Division has 5 librarians serving a much larger researcher and student population than is served by the 4 librarians at INRS.
• Collectively INRS libraries have fewer visitors than Biology had library alone.
• Could have each librarian work public desk 1 day per week, 5th day ‘shared’ rest of the time embedded work with staff out in the units.
• Need organizational skill of librarians brought to data management.
• Librarians can also be very good at communicating the science to lay audiences. Some others within Institute doing outreach and we don’t want librarians duplicating efforts, but librarians can work with others doing outreach.
• Want to identify other things that all librarians can do, but keep in mind what else is already happening.
• Still unsure of the potential VSIP – impact. Still don’t know if all approved people will leave, but look at communications, incl. editing, graphics. Will have to share editors and graphics people across the Institute, another TF will look into that area.
• Use and reshelving in Biology Library has dropped 90% over the last 10 years.

Revised INHS Library Assessment
• Advantages were added for services, collections, workflow, budget. Not really limited to INHS Library or INHS.
• It was noted that some of the potential negative impacts are temporary, and we need to think in terms of change management vs. long-term impact of service. Can represent as short-term vs. long-term. Which direction?
• Noted that weeding of collection means actual withdrawal—no journals that are online and in print should be sent to Oak St. (don’t add multiple copies to Oak St.) Recommend sending dups to the UI Library book sale to raise funds for collections support.
• Cost-benefit analysis may be instructive.
• Gov docs: Destructive digitization. Unit libraries with identified duplicates already starting digitization. Big goal is to digitize every US govt doc and make available through HATHI trust. 35,000 items in UI library system that are duplicates. Items will be sheet fed destructively and withdrawn. Some items are unique in UI collection and are asking State Library to review. (We are providing lists of materials to the project for materials not yet in the catalog.) Items unique in the CIC consortial collection (which includes UI) will not be destructively scanned.
• As far as collection budget, Tom Teper indicated that disciplinary areas of the INRS other than INHS are covered to some degree (e.g., Engineering, Chemistry, Geology) and that any reallocation of collections funds without evaluating what UI is already buying to support INRS research needs is inadvisable. Redistribution of the natural history line would be marginal benefit to other surveys and detrimental to Nat Hist collection. Need to identify any specific gaps and address those.

Library trends discussion.
• University library is working to build up staff to support additional services needed. INRS has a higher proportion of librarians to staff than most departments, which gives us opportunities to use streamlined operations to invest in developing things that will meet NSF mandates for data plans, opportunities to have the Institutional Repository be more integrated into INRS operations, and to push research out.
• If we have even one physical service point, we need to staff it appropriately for the use. Reading room staffing model is different from the current model. Need a librarian to deal with hidden collections. Many things need attention of librarians.
Sell the service to obtain grant funds. Consolidation of the physical points frees up more time.

- Think of librarians as functioning members of the scientific community. Also be aware of the large professional community of librarians in the UI that would be happy to work with people in INRS.
- One of the strengths of INRS is long term data sets. Central to the mission of INRS to do something with them. Noted that an important Lake MI dataset was recently uncovered at ISGS, as was an important unpublished manuscript by David White.
- Need to pull together the magnitude and value of the needs for data curation, management. There is grey literature and grey data (mine data).
- Specific recommendations on data curation/preservation beyond the tf charge, but librarians should be considered partners in the effort. Similarly in issues of Institutional Archives and records management.
- Association of Research Libraries conference: biggest topics other than succession planning and budget, were eScience/digital curation and special collections/hidden collections.

Possible scenarios for the library.
- Don, Gary, and Susan have begun to identify the possible scenarios.
- Scenario needs to acknowledge the changing roles of librarians and INRS mission, including promoting and preserving research, outreach.

Report deadline:
No longer realistic. Poll members for every week in June.