University Libraries Management Team
May 6, 2014
Location: N210

Attending: Reynolds, Maness, Moeller, Montgomery, Fong, Knievel, Hayworth, Hollis.
Attending for QUES*TT: Jenn Sanchez, Adam Lisbon, Alison Graber

1. QUES*TT presentation on draft new forms for data collection, Sanchez, Lisbon, Graber
   The team has been working with depts at service points and has 11 different, customized forms for service point/dept specific needs (can do up to 20 on their current license). Most depts collect for a fiscal year period. Program has analytical functions, and team can give permissions to individuals as needed (depts already have access to their results). Useful for annual reports, comparison across branches, tallying use of specific collections, quantified personal accomplishment (logging function), time stamp function available. Team displayed a sample form from Archives. The left side has standard questions: what did patron come to ask, # of items, several types of questions (including directional) and if tech wasn’t working. The left side includes the ARL stats, which are standard across all forms (they work with Amy Arenson on these). Right side questions are specific to each collecting point.

   Data is useful for meetings with dept supported by subject specialist, data-driven decisions of any kind (though not a lot of historical depth as yet), could be used to document Library value to campus with specific details of services.

   Tracking patron types is problematic, confidentiality issues, some things difficult to discern, inappropriate to ask, and stats would not be complete or consistent. The complexity of a given form is limited by time at desk per transaction to complete the form. The team is still developing a consistent vocabulary and working on other suggestions. The team will present at Collections and Access too.

   Link to prototypes:
   https://docs.google.com/a/colorado.edu/presentation/d/1aMlezhCqB7W02uXo9bAyI0S29wlqlTbqZfebnjKW9ok/edit#slide=id.p
   Use your CU Google login.

2. Preservation Service Reduction Issue – Yem and Paul
   Yem had a document from the CAWG meeting. Basically Preservation needs to drop some work to focus on higher level preservation work with the loss of preservation staff. Circulation will identify and review damaged circulating books (Preservation will train and monitor), Metadata will do bundling and item conversion per Preservation lead on quality, binding and bindery concerns, and Preservation will also do triage on items SRD (and when needed, subject specialists) will then find replacement pages, etc in replace and rescue situations.

   MT approved the current plan Yem submitted (Addendum 1, the 4 proposed changes).

3. Pilot consultation space in faculty office suite – Gene
   Gene received a suggestion that there be an additional place for consultations, as the space available in front of the E260 instruction rooms is usually in use by a librarian or occupied by students despite the signage. Some librarians find it awkward to kick students out. The pilot would be temporary, as the Research Suite office will eventually be needed for faculty. Some discussion of details. Pilot approved.
4. **Digital Humanities Panel on Task Force Recommendations**

Thea sent some info and process on how to establish a Digital Scholarship office, to eventually develop into a Center, supported & hosted by the Libraries.

How does this fit into the campus digital scholarship horizon? The support would be a new faculty position funded by the Library to develop, advocate & manage the campus involvement partnering with this.

MT needs to revisit the DH report, perhaps, and reflect on the panel recommendation before continuing this discussion. There are also LIT factors in such a center, and LIT support will need discussed. Thea will return in two weeks, and could participate at that point. There is also overlap with some of the working group plans, so should take a look at that.

Will discuss again in June.

5. **Revisit Norlin Renaissance Plan** –

(https://ucblibraries.colorado.edu/adminservices/NorlinRevisedRenaissancePlanSummary_2011jan05.pdf)

Not enough time for the whole discussion, but the intention is to see how much of the Plan is still relevant now, what to revise, what has changed or what should be changed, and what should be researched or discussed as part of the strategic plan process. Discussion might need to include the proposed SPC/Arc cube (& how to repurpose the vacated space) and the stacks. There were some questions from outside faculty that came up in the Program review on how the Libraries make space decisions. Plan on 60 minutes at some point for the Renaissance plan at a future meeting.

6. **LIT has proposed to form a Storage Task Force, to do the research on how to support the issues (and others) the Digital Archives Task Force is going to discuss, including a draft on storage policies and other concerns that LIT will need to support.** Holley Long is on both groups and will work as a liaison. The LIT Storage TF will work with the DATF and others as relevant and requested. They will ask for some other people to work with them on the Storage Task Force as well. There are needs for archive space and for working space. The LIT Storage Task Force was approved by MT.

7. **Updates**

   a. Supposedly there is a server room in Business, Gene would like to know if this is still needed.
   b. Yem needs someone from OIT, Marlon, to work with BePress on the LDAP with Jennifer Chan, and her proposed timeline is to have this working by September. Debbie will look into this.
   c. Yem also reported on the Open Access fund; it is being spent down, and so need to look at further funds for OA.
   d. SPWG wants permission to proceed on signage to “go over there”, just directional signage. Okay with MT.
   e. LIT Director interviews are being scheduled, will be 1.5 days long, like the AD interviews.
   f. Notification that SCWG is forming a digital archive task force.
   g. Website redesign schedule update – approved, below

April – May

Finish coding of all prototypes: Branches, Collections, User Types, Finding/Doing, Guides, Subject Pages

Mid-June

Train the trainers
June – ongoing  Training of Libraries personnel
       Content Migration (after people have been trained)
Aug mid-late  Go live with Beta Site
Sept-Nov  Collect feedback on Beta Site
December  Incorporate changes to Beta Site from feedback received
Jan 2015  Go live with new Drupal Website and CELEBRATE!

Upcoming meetings

May 20 – CANCELED

June 3 – Lissy Garrison – Advancement, Working Group Proposal #3, Open Access fund discussion (Yem will do a report); Plan strategic plan timeline, kickoff speaker?; SPWG Charge.

June 17 – VP Working Group Proposal #4

Management team minutes are available online:  http://ucblibraries.colorado.edu/adminservices/management/index.htm

Addendum 1, Proposed Changes: Preservation Task Reduction/Redistribution, Christine DeVries

1. Circulation identifies and refers damaged circulating books. We are working with Circulation to implement training and monitoring plan.
2. Bundling and item conversion for print serials ready to bind. We ask that Metadata Services assume responsibility for bundling and item conversion (cataloging and inventory are not preservation tasks). Preservation will continue to set standards for binding both serials and monographs, prepare bindery tickets, handle shipments to and from the bindery, and perform quality control. Those are clearly preservation tasks.
3. Rescued Books review procedures – We proposed discontinuing or significantly altering the brittle and damaged books review procedure. If discontinued, we would no longer
   a. Research circulation statistics and CUB, Alliance and World Cat holdings.
   b. Assess condition of other copies held by CUB (no statistics available)
   c. Research possible replacements, order replacements or withdraw replaced books. (Note: MS could process the withdrawals if we continue to order replacements.)
   d. Obtain Archival facsimiles except by subject specialist request.
4. Rescued Books Treatments discontinued:
   a. Obtain replacement pages for monographs or serials to remediate excessive highlighting and/or underlining.
   b. Erase pencil underlining (has been performed by community service workers, but still requires staff time for organizing, training, supervising.)

Addendum 2 provided by task force chair Thea Lindquist:

The task force has concluded the faculty panel review process requested by Management Team. The recommendations garnered enthusiastic support from four members: Mark Amerika (Art & Art History), Lori Emerson (English), Paul Sutter (History), Mark Werner (OIT). The co-chairs of the campus Research Data Advisory Committee - Lori and Rob Guralnick (Ecology & Evolutionary Biology) - have also contributed an unsolicited letter of support.

The panel members also made some suggestions, which we incorporated into the report and
recommendations. These were mainly to bring our emphasis on campus partnerships more strongly to the fore, for an external audience, as well as to add the point that a center would seek to bring research dollars to campus through grantwriting and fundraising. The revised documents may be accessed here:

Executive summary:  
https://docs.google.com/a/colorado.edu/document/d/1X58UZBw6Ff_Ugb7Wa8_oPowJnRdyBC4fPEXcEyoyzRYg/edit?usp=sharing

DHTF Report:  
https://docs.google.com/a/colorado.edu/document/d/1_p_AH2mS1xFnAXxpPbG9N0xDHmvBjaNSAKrNQKVFOgU/edit?usp=sharing

Additionally:

1) 34 registered for the Rob Nelson DH workshop - 11 faculty and 15 grad students, plus 5 from the Libraries. In addition to History, Art History, English, Geography, Linguistics, and Communications/ASSETT once registration was opened. Lynnette helped accommodate the larger group in E113.

2) Vilja Hulden will be joining the History Department on a three-year contract. 25% of her time is dedicated to DH activities, including a liaison to any initiative we spearhead. She's already been in contact to talk about where she might focus in this role.

Vilja also had a look at the report and recommendations, which she thought were thoughtful and well worked-out. She also offered the following, which are there, but maybe not elucidated as strongly as they might be:

1) We could expect to make much more rapid progress in creating a DH community on campus today than the flagship centers that were started a decade ago (assuming a sustained source of funding). Things in DH are beginning to gel, and there are far more examples of interesting research projects as well as resources for independent and guided learning.

2) If we can show we have invested in DH and have something substantive going, we may be able to get some additional grant funding for a center/promotion of DH on campus, in addition to digital research projects. In the past there has been, e.g., Mellon funding awarded for this purpose (http://www.mellon.org/news_publications/annual-reports-essays/grants/). She also recommended grants for research be highlighted a bit more (Digging into Data, NEH Office for Digital Humanities, etc.), to make more concrete that giving people on campus the resources to get going with DH could pay off in high-visibility future grants.

I tend to agree with her on these points. If would like additional information for the discussion or have thoughts to share, please let me know.