Library Council Meeting

November 15, 2016

1. Introductions and announcements:

Attendees: Deborah Jakubs, Lisa Huettel, Dave Hansen, James Roberts, Manoj Monahan, Nivedhitha Subramanian, Tom Hadzor, Emily Daly, Joyce Chapman, Paolo Mangiafico, Tom Hadzor, Len White, Bob Byrd, Tim McGeary, Tom Witelski, Doug Boyer, Sean Bissell, Ann Elsner, Anthony Kelley, Dominika Baran

David Hansen is our new Director of Copyright and Scholarly Communications. Dave came to us from UNC Chapel Hill. [Link to his bio.](http://www.unc.edu/~drhansen/) He was very familiar to us because he had been an intern in 2010-2011. We’re really excited to have him here. He is the successor to Kevin Smith, and he’s had a lot of people emailing him already.

1. What do students want and value from the Libraries? – Emily Daly and Joyce Chapman

We ran our first University-wide user survey in 2013-14 aimed at faculty, staff undergrads, researchers, grads, and we planned to run it again 2 years later and ended up doing it again for our faculty in the Fall and we realized we didn’t want to re-survey in the Spring. We decided to focus our efforts on students, which gave us an opportunity to focus on students’ needs and develop a recruitment strategy.

Our goals were the same. We wanted to get feedback on existing and potential services on our student populations. What are we providing that students know nothing about? We also wanted to involve and engage library staff from the start in this survey. Staff heard about the survey months before it began, they had the opportunity to give feedback and become aware that the survey was going to take place. Staff would be more likely to provide recommendations if they were involved from the start.

We weren’t able to do as much trend analysis as we had liked, but we wanted to make sure the questions were really valid. The survey’s structure was that students were asked to identify what their primary library was. Do they visit physical library and why? What do they view as important, independent of the library? Materials, space, physical presence? We were asking students what is important. We asked how fully these aspects of the libraries meet their needs. The questions we asked the music library respondents were different from those we asked Bostock students. We wanted to know more about what students don’t know about the library.

We had a question related to expanded services. They were able to pick three top priorities for expanded services and options. We worked more closely with IR four months before distribution. We wanted a larger sample size this time around. We asked for as large a sample size as possible. We were really pleased with our response rate. 43% is really good. 2,522 responses. An additional 945 responses came from a public URL. 3467 total respondents.

We had a lot of findings, and I will be highlighting a few things. Perkins and Bostock was visited by 60%. Out of those 60%, 61% also visit Lilly Library at least twice a semester.

We asked students why they don’t physically visit the library - if they don’t. One thing we saw was a lot of people (45%) said they don’t visit because they got everything online. The biggest problem we found was issues between access and parking. When we asked folks about expanded services, we found a quiet individual study space is at the top with 45%. Desire for napping pods was one interesting request.

Satisfaction – less than 1% of patrons were unsatisfied in any way. We also saw 64% of PBR are here more than once a week. Lot of folks visit frequently. When we asked people what was important to them with physical spaces, many want quiet spaces, access to printers, enough electrical outlets, variety of seating options, late night hours.

We asked people to focus on services in the Libraries. Services important to students – IIL, Help with their computer, delivery of books or materials from other Duke Libraries, self-checkout stations, data support services, Chat/IM with a Librarian…

Which are important for teaching/research/coursework? Online journals/articles, ebooks, print books, physical books on reserve? People are not aware that we have streaming video, music CDs, Digital Maps, DVDs, etc.

Our most frequent comments were about: Available study space (21%), General positive feedback (18%), Library staff (11%), Noise level (6%), Library Hours (6%).

We held focus groups and brought together library staff to engage with the dashboards and to dig in to what we’ll do in response to all this data. Follow up projects: DUL newsletter, Diverse study spaces, Textbook lending pilot, Assessing and improving printing in the Libraries, Improved signage and wayfinding.

More to do:

* Learn about students’ needs for and awareness of physical collections
* Increase awareness of special formats
* Provide spaces to meet diverse needs and preferences

Emily Daly sent out links to the PowerPoint presentation to members of the council.

1. TriangleSCI – Paolo Mangiafico

A little history about where TriangleSCI came from and what it is:

SCI started at the University of Virginia in 2003. This was a Mellon-funded program. It was an annual event each year that brought a hand-picked group of people together about a topic for a week. At the end, a report is issued with recommendations around publishing, digital format, scholarship, things like that. This lasted about 10 years in U of VA. After that, they decided 10 years was enough. The Mellon Foundation wanted this to continue and was looking for someone to host this.

They approached Duke because they’ve always liked us and working with us. Here in the Triangle, we have four universities and two university presses. They thought that would help create a focus on scholarly communication that could make this a great home for this institute, which we did, and here we are. We submitted the proposal and it did get funded. In February of 2014, we announced that it was moving to Duke. One of the things we pitched was changing the model a little bit. Instead of a hand-picked group of usual suspects, we issue a request for proposals, and if their proposal was selected, they come to Chapel Hill and we pay all of their expenses. They get hotel, meals, and come to spend a week here on projects with other teams. Our goal is to broaden the diversity perspectives and to include people who weren’t getting invited as leaders in their fields. We wanted graduate students, we wanted researchers.

The most important thing to note is teammates. You don’t come as an individual. You apply as a group, and your team is invited and you work with your team on a project. We have about 5 teams that come. We encourage people to put together a working group that includes not just people you regularly interact with, but also people you want to work with but haven’t been able to. Build your dream team. You set the agenda, you define the deliverables.

We want people to come with their ideas and their energy, and something good will come out of it. For the past 3 years we’ve held it at the Rizzo Center in Chapel Hill. Each team has their own table for working, there is a lot of whiteboard space, a lot of technology, a lot of natural lights. There are also smaller breakout rooms for the teams to work on their own around a central theme. We have it in October or November. It’s usually nice outside, we keep it informal. In our plenary meeting, we move all the tables and chairs in a circle. The Rizzo Center also keeps us incredibly well fed. They bring us candy, popcorn, coffee, things like that. The site of the Rizzo Center is an old estate called the DuBose Estate. We have lunches inside the parlor of the old house. There are gardens, we put time in the schedule for people to have lunch outside. In the evening, we take people outside to visit Raleigh, Chapel Hill, and Durham. One night, we had a reception at the National Humanities Center. This is the only part of the entire thing where there was someone standing at a podium talking.

Over the course of a few days, people really get to know each other and have fun. You’re maybe asking yourself at this point why we pamper everyone so much. We really want it to feel like a retreat, break out of their usual mindsets and constraints and think about how things could be rather than how things are.

This is not a traditional academic conference. There really isn’t any agenda other than the topics that people are bringing to it. We want to foster risk-taking. We want people to come without the fear that people have to come and produce something concrete.

The theme for 2016 was Incentives, Economics and Values: changing the political economy of scholarly publishing. It was a really big picture kind of question. The application is pretty simple: 1,000 words for the proposal, 500 words of what you plan to do next, and who is going to be on your team.

We had 20 proposals from over 100 people. We only choose about 5-6 teams. The proposals came from 8 different countries: US, UK, Canada, India, Brazil, Mexico, Ukraine and Greece.

People were from 77 different organizations: universities, university presses, government agencies, non-profits, MLA, some commercial publishers, technology companies and open software projects.

During the course of the event, some of the teams were blogging daily, live tweeting using the hashtag #TriangleSCI. When printed out, the tweets were over 170 pages long.

At the end, we sent out a survey. 81% left feeling that it exceeded their expectations. People left energized, inspired, exhausted, etc.

Some of the projects continue after SCI is over.

1. BorrowDirect – Bob Byrd

Are any of you familiar with BorrowDirect? If so, what do you know about it and what are your impressions of it?

BorrowDirect is a library resource-sharing partnership encompassing twelve (soon to be thirteen) Ivy Plus academic institutions that supply over 250,000 books, music scores, CDs, DVDs, and other returnable library items to one another’s library users annually.

Here is some Interlibrary Loan data:

Items Borrowed from other libraries by DUL in FY2016:

Total 20,582

TRLN 9,037 43.91%

BorrowDirect 2,970 14.43%

ASERL 1,945 9.45%

Items Loaned by DUL to other libraries in FY2016:

Total 28,999

TRLN 5,021 17.31%

BorrowDirect 11,973 41.29%

ASERL 4,466 15.40%

BorrowDirect Plus is a program, established in October 2014, that provides reciprocal on-site library borrowing privileges for students, faculty, and staff from the institutions that participate in BorrowDirect.

Guest users who have been verified and have home library accounts in good standing will have in-person access to materials at any of the participating libraries.

Items, collections, and participating libraries available will vary by institution. The lending library’s policies and loan periods apply to guest borrowers, and borrowed items may be returned at either the lending library or the user’s home library.

Questions for Library Council: Is there a need for more publicity and promotion for BorrowDirect and BorrowDirect Plus? If so, what methods of promotion do you think might be effective with faculty and students in your school or department?

Meeting adjourned at 1:15 pm.