SURVEY RESULTS
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction
As the web emerged during the last decade, technological change continued to influence deeply, rivaling growth as a constant in many libraries. As a result, library administrators confronted such phenomena as the increased provision of online content (particularly journal content in the sciences), such demographic phenomena as staff retirements and the graying of the profession and, in many cases, reduced budgets. A time of great uncertainty for research libraries, the purpose of this spring 2011 survey is to assess the impact that such factors had on the service provision in ARL libraries. Of particular concern in this study are two broad categories of library-staffed service points, staffed service desks and branches (defined broadly) that report to main libraries. While we acknowledge that a trend towards consolidating and reconfiguring library-staffed service points indeed existed before we started compiling the data for this SPEC Kit, with this study we hope to collect, document, and reveal some of the newest changes in order to better characterize and explore what is emerging.

The survey instrument asked respondents to provide background by considering changes in their staffed service points during the last three years. Having done that, respondents then were asked to provide details pertaining to one or two of their changes. Next, respondents provided comments on whether the drivers for the change were one or more of the following: a physical or philosophical change, a change in financial or staff resources, an opportunity afforded by changing technology, or an opportunity to increase collaboration and/or outsourcing. Questions about user participation in the creation and assessment of each change followed. There were ample text boxes for further explanation included with most of the questions. At the end of the survey, respondents were asked if they anticipated any further changes during the next three years and to briefly characterize these future changes. Additional comments and/or supporting documentation such as articles, related organizational charts, or other documents and/or websites were also sought.

The survey was conducted between May 9 and June 13, 2011. Sixty respondents at 59 of the 126 ARL member institutions completed the survey for an overall response rate of 47%. Forty-three replies came from public universities, fifteen from private universities, and one from a national research institution. Six of the public universities were Canadian; the rest of the respondents were from institutions in the United States. All were distributed geographically throughout both countries. Because the respondents did not respond to all the questions, readers may detect discrepancies in the numbers reported that need not be cause for alarm.

Definitions and Methodology
As library administrators continue to focus and hone the services offered, the definitions of the service points themselves also may change. As recently as 2003, when Joan Kreitz was collecting the data for her Dictionary for Library and Information Science, a service point was defined as “a fixed location within a library or information center staffed to provide a specific service to users, for example, the circulation desk, reference desk, serials desk, interlibrary loan office, etc.” and a branch library was defined as “an auxiliary service outlet in a library system, housed in a facility separate from the central library, which has at least a
basic collection of materials, a regular staff, and established hours, with a budget and policies determined by the central library.”

For the purposes of this survey, the authors decided to study ARL libraries’ staffed service outlets, service desks, and branch libraries, to learn whether they are being newly added, closed, consolidated, or otherwise reconfigured during the last three years. The authors learned that the concepts of added and closed are relatively straightforward, but the concepts of consolidated and otherwise reconfigured are not. Although Kreitz does define consolidation as “the merger of two or more separately administered libraries, or organizational units within a library, into one unit under a single administration, usually for reasons of efficiency and/or economy or to improve quality of service,” survey respondents often described their library’s changes by using verbs that more adequately defined what they were describing including integrate, combine, merge, and expand—a situation that somewhat complicated comparisons. Many libraries mention integrating service desks (where integrating and consolidating seemed to the authors to be roughly synonymous), but when discussing branch libraries, integrating them seemed to be a very different thing from consolidating them (where integrating meant to interfile all the books in LC call number order and consolidating meant moving and housing more discrete pieces).

Kreitz’s dictionary defines reconfigure in terms of systems terminology “to change the way the data is structured in a computer system” that has been borrowed and broadened in the present day to encompass library organizational systems. In the survey, respondents reported additional service point and branch library reconfigurations ranging from a change of hours or aesthetic remodeling to more drastic rearrangements that reflect changes in the nature of the service such as changes in staffing, organizational reporting structure, or replacing a physical service desk with a virtual one.

To study all of the changes in staffed service points that this survey afforded, the authors both read each respondents’ answers as a case study and also considered the compilation of responses in total as is reproduced in its entirety for readers as the Survey Questions and Responses section of this document. A comparison of variables such as size of library, enrollment, budgets, number of staff, and even total number of branch libraries and/or staffed service points was beyond the scope of this analysis.

Changes in Library Service Points and Branch Libraries
The survey first asked whether any staffed service point in the main library or a branch library that reports to the system had been added, closed, consolidated, or otherwise reconfigured during the last three years. Fifty-two respondents (88%) answered yes; seven (12%) answered no. When asked to quantify changes in their libraries, 47 respondents reported 149 changes to service points, and 27 reported 53 changes to branch libraries. The changes were both minor and major in scope. The respondents who changed service points reported more consolidations (56) and reconfigurations (53) than closures (27) or additions (13). The respondents who changed branch libraries were more likely to close them (27 branches) than to consolidate (11), reconfigure (9), or add them (6).

Each of the fifty-two respondents provided details for one service delivery configuration (questions 3–17). Twenty-one of them provided details for a second service delivery configuration (questions 18–32).

Although the survey recorded reconfigured changes made in the last three years, there was diversity in the changes that the respondents had made. While seven respondents reported that no changes to either service points or branch libraries occurred during the last three years (and two of the seven did not anticipate changes in the next three years), on the other side of the spectrum, several respondents confirmed that changes in service points and/or branch libraries have been a constant feature in their organizations for at least 15 or more years.

Additions
The authors looked closely at the many changes reported for trends that could be considered typical, but instead found very unique changes that fulfilled the library mission and reflected the nature of the institution. In considering service points, the most common change reported was the addition of a consolidated...
service desk by combining reference with circulation and/or more services such as interlibrary loan, reserves, periodicals, technology assistance, or media services. Proponents of the consolidated service desk believe that it centralizes patron service. Because consolidated service desks are staffed with paraprofessional staff and even students in many instances, the librarians who take appointments or serve on-call are freed from the demands of frontline service to more closely engage with patrons and work on the strategic directives of the institution.

The second most common addition in service points was an information commons. This approach couples a technology-rich space, specially equipped for collaboration and group work with library and other university services that may include advising, math or writing tutoring, career placement, or study abroad services. The information commons is generally coordinated virtually through a web space although some have service desks attached as well. Respondents were very enthusiastic about these additions and quick to note how popular they are with students.

Although not quite as prevalent as consolidated service desks, consolidated/central research desks were the third most common addition. This configuration may result from combining reference desks with other research desks such as government publications, or the consolidation of two-or-more subjects’ reference services (e.g., science or music reference) to create a consolidated approach. Proponents of consolidated/central research desks note the librarians who staff these desks provide excellent service to patrons taking advantage of the range of available expertise. This mixing that occurs among the specialists amounts to effective cross training and efficient triage of patron questions.

The fourth most common addition in both service points and branch libraries was a small, but very interesting category that the authors tagged notable innovations. Only a small group at present, notable innovations may be harbingers of future service configurations to come. Examples include virtualizations (defined as replacing a service point or branch library with its virtual counterpart) of many kinds—library collections, service points, and embedded library service providers for strategically targeted groups of users. Although the ownership for these virtualizations most likely will be the library, the ownership of a virtualization may be shared or even owned by a department where a librarian only participates instead of being a wholly owned subsidiary of the library.

There were only a few additions of branch libraries in new educational facilities consistent with the lean budgets that most institutions experienced; in one case, the library took over the management of a branch library from a university department.

Closures
The most common service point closure reported was a reference or service desk closed in the making of a consolidated service desk followed by a service or research desk closed as a result of the creation of a consolidated/super research desk. Interestingly, closures as a result of consolidated media service points appeared often enough to make special note. In some cases, media service points were closed after the media was moved from a closed stack to an open access arrangement. In other cases, media services were closed as a result of a consolidation with circulation desks or other “older” library technologies such as microforms, periodicals, or music media.

In terms of branch library closures, science branch library closures outnumbered other branch library closures even though several respondents didn’t distinguish a field other than “branch library closure.” Because some respondents also reported a connection between the easy electronic delivery of scientific periodical literature and diminished gatecounts at branch libraries, the authors observed a trend in these science library closures.

Consolidations
The most common service point reconfiguration, the numerous consolidations figured prominently into all of the additions, closures, and other reconfigurations reported. As noted previously, the word, consolidate, may not be standardized in library lexicon as respondents often used other terms such as integrate, combine, merge, or expand for consolidate. Also, there seemed to be a nearly limitless way that library service points could be consolidated, although library
collections could be either integrated into a precise order or consolidated into many open and closed stack arrangements.

As noted in the additions and the closures, the most frequently consolidated service points were service desks, media service desks, central research desks, and expanded research commons service points. Other notable innovations include the consolidations inherent in replacing service points with virtualizations of all kinds. Likewise, many ARL libraries reported consolidations in their science branch libraries, consolidating the smaller ones into the larger ones or into the main library.

Otherwise Reconfigured
The possibilities for tweaking library service points and branch libraries are nearly limitless. Each retooled aspect of a service point or branch library’s operation may be considered a reconfiguration qualifying it for an additional inclusion in this survey. The authors created four categories of “otherwise reconfigured” from the many reported by respondents. These are staffing reconfigurations, hours reconfigurations (of which there were many), organizational reconfigurations, and aesthetic remodeling.

The many configurations of newly consolidated service points and branch libraries encourage changing staffing patterns to take advantage of all the local resources, including retirements, and even serendipity in lean times. Each service point and/or branch library closing frees personnel to be reassigned to other areas. Library staffs pushed to the brink of barely covering the multiplicity of service points of an old configuration are finding relief in these newly reconfigured spaces, making institutions really able to accomplish more with less.

Consolidated service points that combine reference services with circulation and/or other service points commonly included a plan for downsizing the needed staffing. In many cases (but not all), paraprofessional staffing and/or students provided the frontline staffing in these new arrangements freeing professional librarians for more collection development, liaison, instruction, and/or other pursuits. Mechanisms to provide “on call” professional assistance and/or appointments with librarians completed the change.

Another reconfiguration, consolidated/super research desks, also benefits from the work of many to provide improved staffing. The approach taken in the provision of service might be an improved triage of customer needs at one service point guided by consultants within the space or offsite, or two previously separated reference services on one floor electing to share the staffing.

Because patrons have virtual 24/7 expectations for service that are very difficult to maintain in the physical world, library administrators are experimenting with the provision of open hours for a given service. At every library service point or branch library, the hours can be increased or reduced; each also may be augmented or supplemented by other services to create a unified whole. The more creative and intricate the scheduling, the more difficult it becomes to communicate all the many possibilities in open hours. Online newsletters, blogs, personal email, and RSS feeds are all virtual means employed to improve communication.

Organizational changes figured prominently into the service point and branch library reconfigurations that the respondents reported. Often the result of a library strategic plan to realign the structure of an institution, organizational changes also emerged through opportunities in the relationships that have developed. Examples of the organizational changes that accompanied reported reconfigurations include new or realigned structures to manage new functions or new reporting relationships created to reflect the new service point or branch library changes made. Examples of organizational changes that emerged through opportunities include learning commons collaborations, faculty and departmental relationships resulting through their embedded situations, or the changing management of departmental library facilities (respondents reported both situations of the library assuming the management of a departmental library or reading room and a university department choosing to maintain a previous library space).

Lastly, aesthetic remodeling figured prominently in this category. Examples include actual changes to the counter space of service points or a service point’s location, enhancements to existing learning commons installations, whole branch library remolds, changes
or improvements to the technology offered, or patron-friendly improvements such as comfortable reading room furniture or more group study rooms.

Driving Factors in Service Delivery Reconfigurations

In addition to looking at the types of reconfigurations that ARL libraries have experienced in the past three years, the survey asked respondents to consider the driving factors that served as the impetus for the reconfigurations that were described. The survey listed a broad range of factors that reflected external, more concrete drivers such as changes in physical facilities, financial or staff resources, and/or the availability/application of new technologies; internal, less tangible drivers such as changes in service philosophy or responding to user demands; and drivers beyond the library such as collaborating with a partner outside the library or outsourcing delivery of a particular service. Finally, respondents were provided the opportunity to briefly describe other factors that might have influenced the reconfigurations they had described (see questions 4 and 19). In the vast majority of cases, respondents indicated that more than one of these factors were significant drivers in the decision to reconfigure library services. See Figure 1 below for the percentage of responses for each driving factor.

Physical or Philosophical Change

Given the current economic downturn, changes in financial and/or staff resources might be expected to be the most significant driver in the decision to reconfigure library services. Based on the responses received, though, ARL libraries are driven most by a changing service philosophy to provide better customer service. Just under three-quarters of the libraries that responded to this question indicated that a change in service philosophy was a driving factor in reconfiguring services. Additionally, slightly more than half of the responding libraries indicated user demands are a driving factor. Frequently, descriptions of a change in service philosophy accompanied the physical reconfigurations reported, such as creating an information commons/research commons space approach, providing centralized, one-stop service points for users, making services more user friendly, and making the best use of librarian time by changing to a just-in-time model as opposed to a just-in-case model. A change in service philosophy could also be expressed in a library’s internal organization, documentation, or routines. One responding library noted a changed service philosophy in its development of baseline expectations of levels of reference service in various subject areas so that service desk staff will know when to refer users to subject specialists.

Figure 1. Driving Factors in Decisions to Reconfigure Service Delivery
Forty-three percent of the respondents reported a wide variety of physical changes to buildings or facilities, making this the next most significant driver of service reconfiguration. A few fortunate libraries managed to open new facilities in new or renovated building spaces. Several libraries relinquished space to other departments by closing or consolidating branch libraries. Other libraries relocated service desks, created learning or collaboration spaces, or provided more seating, all with an eye to better serve their constituents.

Financial Resources or Staff
A little more than 40% of the responding libraries reported that changes in financial resources or staff resources were significant drivers of service reconfiguration. But libraries that experienced stagnant or diminished funding far outnumbered those that received augmented funding. The majority of responding libraries have seen continued budget reductions for the past three years. Staffing levels in several libraries have been diminished by retirements without replacements, recapturing salary funds to cover budget reductions. Some libraries indicated that the number of hourly/part-time employees had also been reduced to help cover budget cuts. Other libraries have relocated/reallocated positions to provide new services needed by constituents. Consolidation of service desks appears to be a major method of freeing librarian time to be able to spend more time in faculty departments or provide more research-intensive services.

New Technology
Although new technologies seem to be surfacing daily, about one third of the responding libraries indicated that the availability or application of new technologies is a driving factor for service reconfiguration. Accounts of projects throughout the survey responses describe technology-rich services being developed by some of the libraries. Multi-media equipment and software are being added along with collaborative working spaces to meet the needs of students and faculty. Examples of some imaginative application of new technology include the use of web-based software to schedule appointments with library faculty, the addition of software to produce library instruction, subject specialist and collection information, integration of library services into course management systems, and providing multi-media hardware and software in designated spaces within the library. Several of the responding libraries indicated that the availability of archival collections of serials and/or the movement to online collections has greatly enhanced service capabilities, helping to move the library “presence” outside the physical building.

Collaboration and Outsourcing
The opportunity to collaborate with a partner outside the library was a significant driving factor for about one quarter of the responding libraries. Most commonly that partner was the information technology unit of the parent institution. In other cases libraries partnered with discipline-specific departments, student services, and/or the provost’s office to develop ideas and generate funding for projects to reconfigure library services.

Fewer than 10% of the responding libraries indicated that the opportunity to outsource a particular service was a significant driver in the service reconfiguration process. One library transferred responsibility for student printing to the university’s information technology unit. Another library was able to merge the billing part of the access services unit into the university’s billing system, allowing users to pay library fines and replacement charges through that system. Two libraries reported that they also participate in collaborative 24/7 chat reference services that provide users with around the clock reference assistance.

Other Factors
Slightly more than a third of the responding libraries chose to describe other factors that were significant drivers in the decision to reconfigure their library services. The common theme to nearly all of these is the more effective and/or efficient use of library spaces. Whether it is the need for more collaboration space, more space for computers in a learning or research commons, returning branch library space to specific departments, or merging public services into one service desk, nearly every library that responded to this question is dealing with space issues at one level or another.
Impact of Service Delivery Implementation on Personnel

The impact of changing service delivery on personnel was central to the survey and deserves special consideration here. The most common impact (reported by 68% of the libraries responding to questions 8 and 23) was that existing staff, regardless of staff level, was being moved to a new service point. The next most common impact was reassigning personnel within the library (46%). One quarter of the responding libraries reported that the number of positions in the library had been reduced through attrition. Slightly fewer than 10% reported that staff work hours had been reduced. A fortunate few, slightly less than 20%, reported that staff had been hired to fill newly created positions as a result of the reported reconfigurations. As can be seen in Figure 2 below, support staff have experienced the most impact in all categories but one, that of new hires, in which librarians were the benefactors.

The descriptions of impacts on library personnel varied across respondents although there were a few common threads. By far the most often cited impact was the need for training. For example, support staff members were trained in providing reference service, including activities such as the reference interview and use of sources. Some librarians serving at consolidated service desks were instructed in the ins and outs of circulation, interlibrary loan, reserves, and other activities that commonly are transacted at the circulation desk. As previously noted, this cross training eliminated silos and helped personnel develop insight into and appreciation of how the “other guys” work.

Both moving staff to new service points and reassigning existing staff to other positions within the library created some imaginative reporting relationships, including dual-reporting lines for some of the staff. If reporting relationships were not changed to a different unit, at least new organization chart relationships were established.

For librarians, a general trend was for fewer hours of reference desk coverage while moving to either a consultation or appointment mode for more in-depth
reference questions. Several respondents reported that librarians’ time had been freed to concentrate on development of new or additional services.

When asked to describe other types of impact on permanent library staff, respondents’ varied perspectives were much the same as outlined above. Training or cross training in procedures and technology was again the most frequently mentioned impact. Better use of permanent library staff time was a close runner-up.

Opportunities for User Participation in the Planning, Implementation, and Assessment of Reconfigurations
Questions 14 and 29 asked whether user participation factored into three phases of a service delivery reconfiguration: planning, service implementation, or assessment. Overall, slightly fewer respondents engage users in various aspects of the reconfiguration process than don’t. At the libraries that do, users most frequently participate in planning and assessment activities.

Planning
Based on the descriptions of methods used to engage users in the planning process, it is clear that working with focus groups was the most frequently used method. Several of the libraries have student or faculty library advisory groups that were involved at one level or another in the planning processes. Working with faculty in specific departments was the method of engagement most often mentioned when the reconfiguration involved either the addition or closure of a branch library. Other methods described included using LibQUAL+® data, online and in-house surveys, informal discussions with students, and observation of use patterns and questions asked.

Service Implementation
Only a few libraries involve users in implementing service reconfigurations. One library had assistance from a department for the physical movement of the collection in a branch library. Other respondents indicated that departments provided funding to hire students for various aspects of the service implementation process.

Service Assessment
Perhaps understandably, this category received the most comments from respondents. By far the most frequent method used to obtain service assessment from users was surveys, either library-developed or including questions on reconfigurations in ongoing assessments such as the LibQUAL+® or COUNTER surveys. Libraries reported a varied frequency of delivering surveys ranging from six months to three years. One library performs an annual action-gap survey for each of its service desks to learn what services are most valued by users, which those users believe are accomplished the best, and what areas of service need improvement. Other methods include using focus groups, providing comment cards at service desks, and analyzing various data collected through other channels.

Respondents reported several different methodologies for completed or planned-for assessment of service reconfigurations. While a few of the service changes were too new to assess, none of the responding libraries reported negative reactions from users. Respondents reported increased usage of collections and services, users staying longer in visits, and more favorable/positive comments from users as well as diminished numbers of complaints. Several of the respondents provided descriptions of assessment methods specific to their particular reconfigurations.

Regarding future assessment techniques, respondents reported including assessment of their reconfigurations in LibQUAL+®, Balanced Scorecard, and service gap analysis as well as other regular ongoing assessment activities. Additional methods of assessment included creating focus groups on the reconfigurations, measurement and analysis of usage data, user feedback through various mechanisms including listening sessions, and anecdotal data from staff interactions.

Benefits and Challenges of Service Delivery Reconfiguration
The survey asked respondents about both the associated benefits and challenges of their service delivery reconfigurations. In general, the responding libraries weighed in heavily on the side of benefits that resulted
from reconfiguration. Benefits appeared to accrue both for the user and for the library and its personnel.

Visibility of service, service points or particular collections that had been relocated was the user benefit most frequently mentioned. One-stop shopping, with several services combined at one service desk, was listed as a major benefit by many of the respondents. They pointed out that both of these benefits have led to less confusion for their library users. Improved study spaces, collaborative and/or well-equipped student workspaces resulted at several of the libraries responding to the survey. Reference service appears to have become more personalized and individualized for users. Other libraries indicated they were able to expand hours of operation for users through the reconfiguration of their services. One library stated that the library was now “a draw for students who had never been there before.” In sum many responses to this question indicate that the reconfigurations have created spaces and services that are more welcoming and less intimidating for users, that these libraries are striving to provide services their users want and need.

Many benefits from the library operation viewpoint were listed as well. Cost savings was evident in the responses that stated student/hourly budgets were reduced to save funds. It appears that in many cases the reconfigurations have resulted in more effective and efficient use of personnel. Librarians and staff have been cross-trained or retrained and the result is more flexibility for the library and a better understanding by library personnel of each other’s knowledge and capabilities, helping the libraries to put those skills to use for best advantage. The additional training also has resulted in more consistency in the answers users get for the questions they ask. One respondent commented that librarians working at a single service point desk were able to serve as mentors and model good service behaviors for staff.

Several respondents pointed out that a librarian advantage was spending less time at a reference desk. The operating efficiencies provided by service reconfigurations allow personnel time to be redirected to other activities such as classroom teaching, outreach to departments within the home institution, advanced reference service through appointments and question referral, librarians becoming “embedded” in subject discipline offices to provide services on-site, creating online learning materials and credit courses, pursuing more assessment activities, and establishing new services such as an institutional repository. Improvement of “back room operations” was noted by several respondents, as was the ability to provide better workspace for library personnel.

Unlike benefits that were achieved for both the libraries and their constituents, the bulk of challenges seemed to accrue to the library side of the equation. For constituents the challenges were adjusting to physical rearrangements or being philosophically opposed to the changes (e.g., branch library closures). Respondents reported that library personnel also had some difficulties adjusting to the reconfigurations. Several mentioned that getting staff buy-in or overcoming resistance to change has been a difficulty. Helping staff adapt to the changes and maintaining staff morale were noted as areas that needed a great deal of attention. Training and retraining were noted as being both labor-intensive and disruptive to providing services. Some respondents acknowledged that the physical arrangement of the service points turned out to be not as beneficial as anticipated. In the case of branch library closures, the integration of library collections was noted as time consuming and complicated, requiring physical relocation of materials and adjustments to bibliographic and location records in the libraries’ catalog systems.

In balance, the benefits noted far outnumbered the challenges. It is left to libraries considering reconfigurations to consider the impact of both when planning to make significant changes such as those described here.

**Anticipated Additions, Closures, Consolidations and Other Reconfigurations**

In the final segment of the survey respondents were asked if they anticipated reconfiguring a branch library or staffed service point in the next three years. Forty-nine (83%) replied yes. Forty-seven of these anticipate a total of 70 service point changes and 40 branch library changes. As with completed service point changes, they expect more consolidations (33) and reconfigurations (21) than additions or closures (8
each). While respondents indicated that only one additional branch would open and 12 would close within the next three years, they anticipate 16 consolidations and 11 other reconfigurations.

Conclusion
This survey investigated recent trends in service point reconfigurations in main libraries and branch libraries, the driving factors behind the changes, the impact such changes had on personnel, opportunities for user participation in the projects, the associated benefits and challenges, and future plans for anticipated additions, closures, consolidations, and other reconfigurations during the next three years.

The most common reconfigurations are the consolidated service point, the information commons, the consolidated/central research desk, and virtualizations of many kinds. Virtualizations are exciting to consider as brand new innovations and perhaps harbingers of service point reconfigurations to come. Additionally, science branch library closures, in particular, seemed to out-number other branch library closures and may reflect the easy electronic dissemination of journal literature in the sciences.

Philosophical changes appear to be the most important drivers for service delivery reconfigurations, followed by user demands. Interestingly, respondents noted that a change in service philosophy often accompanied a physical change such as consolidation of a service desk or the creation of an information commons, emphasizing the new method in which the service is provided.

The impact of service delivery reconfigurations on staff is considerable. Because staff often don’t have continuing appointments in the same way tenured librarians might, they are in the most vulnerable positions for elimination or reassignment. Although there are benefits to the mixing of staff from various service points, including the sharing of expertise and elimination of silos, respondents noted that training is a significant challenge.

According to the respondents, the level of user engagement in each project varied because some of the reconfigurations were mandated by physical or financial situations beyond the control of the library. Several of the respondents described imaginative and creative methods for obtaining user’s views and suggestions. Although some of the reconfigurations were too new to assess, most libraries have determined a strategy for assessment over time.

Given the breadth and depth of the types of reconfigurations described by survey respondents, it is obvious that ARL libraries have become dynamic microcosms proactively responding to the needs of their environments. In these days when the death of the research library is bandied about more than ever, it is refreshing to note that libraries such as those responding to this survey are continuing to strive to provide the materials and services their constituents require. Libraries, and particularly ARL member libraries, have always been in the forefront of applying new techniques and technologies to provide better service to their users. The responses to this survey indicate that is still the case, now more than ever.
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Survey Questions and Responses

The SPEC survey on Reconfiguring Service Delivery was designed by Kay Vyhnanek, Scholarly Communication Librarian, and Christy Zlatos, Subject Specialist Librarian for Architecture & Interior Design, at Washington State University. These results are based on data submitted by 59 of the 126 ARL member libraries (47%) by the deadline of June 13, 2011. The survey’s introductory text and questions are reproduced below, followed by the response data and selected comments from the respondents.

Research libraries face increasing challenges to providing relevant library services to their constituents. As the information needs of their constituencies have grown, research libraries have changed their service strategy from simply providing sufficient collections to fulfilling a panoply of user research desires. As the range of services has evolved, so have the locations and methods of service delivery. In some cases, service points have increased through the opening of a new facility or the need to provide a new type of service. In other cases, the number of service points has been reduced or consolidated in response to use patterns or budgetary reductions.

The purpose of this survey is to investigate whether and how ARL member libraries have reconfigured staffed service delivery points in the main library and in any branches that report to the main library. It explores whether service points and/or branches have been added, closed, or consolidated; the drivers for those decisions; the impacts on staff; the changes in delivery methods; and whether there have been any collaborations with other institutions or consortia, or outsourcing of service delivery. It also explores user involvement in the planning for service changes and whether the effectiveness of new service configurations has been assessed.

The survey uses a case study approach to reveal developing patterns, unique applications, and anticipated changes in the physical or organizational arrangement of service delivery that may be widely adaptable in other libraries so that they can continue to be the primary information providers for their constituents.

For this survey a service point may be any library-staffed desk, office, or other physical location that is maintained to provide service to a specific constituent group.
BACKGROUND

1. During the past three years, has any staffed service point in your main library or has any branch that reports to the main library been added, closed, consolidated, or otherwise reconfigured? N=59

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

A separate document delivery/ILL service point in the main library has been closed, with the delivery aspect included in circulation functions now.

A service point dedicated to periodicals and microforms was converted to a media services area so it is now the service desk for media services. Also, we moved the location of our reference desk and acquired new furniture for the desk. A branch library was closed and consolidated into the main library.

Combined the circulation and reserve service desks (includes service for our microform collection).

Consolidated Reference with Circulation.

ILL/Document Delivery moved to space adjacent to Circulation/Reserves. Added service point at new business campus. Will add service point at center serving business & education on July 1.

In August 2008, we merged three previously separate service points (Map Room, Microfilms Center, and Reserve & Media Services) into a single service point. In December 2009, we closed the Physical Science Reading Room that was housed in the same building as the university’s Chemistry and Physics Departments.

Minor changes so far. These mainly consist of the consolidation of some desk service hours during certain times of the day and times of the year. For example, we have shared reference points during some weekend, early morning, and late evening hours.

Not described elsewhere: Library hours extended fifteen hours weekly to provide students better access, shifting security and circulation staff hours to monitor building. The newly added IT Help Center includes two transferred full-time IS&T employees and work-study students staffed 108 hours weekly and the newly added IT Print Center one transferred full-time employee and work-study students staffed 123 hours (all hours library is open) weekly.

Our major consolidation, the consolidation of Media Services with Music Media, will be the focus in your question 3. We also phased out our Distributed Technical Services/Serials service desk at our Library of Science and Medicine. We closed down Presentation Services, and we placed our Chemistry and Physics branches under one supervisor.

Reconfiguring of reference, circulation, liaison roles, & ILL around cooperative effort to answer needs balancing physical and virtual presence; presence inside and outside library walls.

Reference, circulation, and reserve desks have been consolidated to one service desk.

Several of our changes are unstaffed service points. Here’s the list: The Fine Arts Library has been working with the Digital Media Lab to repurpose dormant spaces in the Fine Arts Library to create the FAVE (Fine Arts Visualization
Their first project in 2009 was the Library Video Niche, the redesign of a corner of the Fine Arts Library Great Room to display video art. This project, funded by a UVA Arts Council grant, was quite successful both inside UVA and outside with a greater audience. Last year in 2010, Fine Arts converted an unused office space into the EyeLab, a collaborative work space featuring two LCD screens and a smart overlay. The space is available for online bookings and it stays filled. They have also “recycled” their former Slide Collection space into a ScanLab with high-end Macs and scanners. Their current year project for 2011 in the ScanLab is creating a lounge area for group work and visual display as well as a space for informal lectures using digital technology. This space will include comfortable seating for more people as well as providing a large LCD screen display for public access. The Digital Media Lab has added an AV studio as a staffed service point in the past two years. The main library reduced the physical size of the Reference Desk and reduced professional librarian staffing at the desk from two to one. The second librarian now works the shift from his/her office to concentrate on virtual reference (chat, SMS, and email). A staffed service point in the science/engineering library, the Research Computing Lab, was closed. Student employees were not rehired at the end of the semester and the staff are now working in a different group. The Education Library was reconfigured as a commons area for the Education School.

The following changes in service points have taken place over the last three years: Collections and services of the Botany Library were relocated to a new service point in Spring 2008 and merged with those of the Zoology and Chemistry libraries, which had relocated approximately a year earlier. The Kenan Science Library opened in Fall 2010. Activities are currently underway so that the merged BioChem services (see above), plus the services of the Math-Physics Library and the Geological Science Library will all be consolidated in this new service point in Fall 2011. Collections from these libraries will be merged and consolidated with the BioChem collections in their former service point. The City and Regional Planning Library moved from its former location as a stand-alone branch; collections and services were merged with those of the main humanities and social sciences library. The service points for the North Carolina Collection and Rare Books Collection (both in the special collections library) were merged in Fall 2010, as part of a longer-range plan to re-vision special collections service points. [Note: These have all been identified below as “consolidations” rather than “closures.” No library services or collections have been discontinued in conjunction with physical relocations, even though specific service locations are no longer used as such.]

We are in the midst of a transition to a new building to serve as our main library. This past winter we opened a small subsection of the services while continuing to maintain the old library. In the fall we will be completing the transition to the new facility. A couple of our branch libraries have moved to a consolidation of service points as opposed to consolidation of branches, hence referring to “otherwise reconfigured” below.

We closed the government documents services desk and consolidated services with the main reference desk/department. We closed the service desk for the “secured collections” (medium rare materials). We closed the Palm Desert branch library.

We do not have a main library, instead 11 disciplinary libraries, an undergraduate library, and an archives and special collections.

We have four branch libraries on the main campus. Although Zimmerman Library is the largest branch, it is not a true Main Library or Undergraduate Library. It only houses Education, Social Sciences and Humanities, and Government Document collections. Other collections are housed in the other three branches by subject (call number). Additionally, we closed the Science and Engineering Library branch on Saturdays during the regular semester beginning Spring 2011.

We have closed three service points and consolidated.

When we renovated the first floor of the main library we used it as an opportunity not only to re-imagine our physical spaces but also to re-imagine our service model. Prior to the renovations we had three separate service desks on the first floor to support reference, circulation, and interlibrary services. In terms of staffing, the renovation saw us combine
the circulation and reference units into one unit called Public and Research Services while Interlibrary Services remained in place. In terms of service points, we combined all three service desks into one service point, our AskUs desk. Interlibrary services that are public facing (i.e., check out of interlibrary loan material and basic inquiries), basic reference services, and circulation services are now all performed at the AskUs desk and staffed by individuals from Public and Research Services. Librarians, who had been previously called to the desk to assist with complex reference transactions and extended reference assistance, now serve scheduled time in our new consultation area adjacent to the single service point. At the same time as the renovations on the first floor, we also moved/consolidated the course reserves/current periodicals service point (and work unit) on the second floor of the main library with the media service point in annex building (attached to main library). The result was a move of most of the current periodical collection to the stacks and the remainder to the first floor nearby the reference collection. Staff and the course reserves component of the old service desk were moved to the Media unit which became Media and Reserves. In total, this means we consolidated five service points into two (3 service desks to 1 and another 2 service desks to 1).

2. If you answered “Yes” above, please indicate how many of these staffed service points and/or branches have been added, closed, consolidated, or otherwise reconfigured in the past three years. Enter 0 if none has been added, closed, or consolidated. N=52

**Staffed Service Point**

47 respondents reported some change to service points; 5 reported no change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Added</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otherwise reconfigured</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Added</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otherwise reconfigured</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Branch Library

27 respondents reported some change to branch libraries; 25 reported no change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Added</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otherwise reconfigured</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Added</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otherwise reconfigured</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you answered “Yes” above, when you click the Next>> button you will continue to the Examples of Service Delivery Reconfiguration section of the survey.

If you answered “No” above, when you click the Next>> button you will jump to the Anticipated Additions, Closures, Consolidations, or Other Reconfigurations section of the survey.
EXAMPLES OF SERVICE DELIVERY RECONFIGURATION

In this section of the survey we ask you to tell us about one or two examples of a new physical arrangement or configuration of library service delivery that has occurred in the past three years in your main library or in any branch that reports to the main library. First, briefly describe the change, then answer some questions about the details of the change process. We are particularly interested in examples that you consider an innovative approach to service delivery or that had a high impact on library resources (e.g., facilities, finances, staff).

Example 1: Description and Driving Factors

3. Please briefly describe one type of service delivery change that occurred (for example, a new service point was established; service points A and B were consolidated to form new service point C; branch X was closed and services are now delivered at point Y; a new facility was opened with service points A, B, and C). N=52

A branch library was closed and services delivered at another branch library.

A new 24/7 space with computers, group study rooms, and quiet study was collaboratively created in our main library.

A new service point was added combining a campus information service (KU Info), IT help, and Research/Reference support.

A new service point was added in a new university laboratory building; service hours at the primary reference desk were reduced.

A new Tech Help Desk was established near the Reference Desk. Also, our Government Documents librarians were cross-trained for service at the Main Reference Desk.

A service point next to a computer lab and staffed by student assistants was closed last year. The purpose of the service point was to provide basic technology assistance for students (primarily) using the computer lab. The service point was within 20 feet of the reference desk and any type of reference question was supposed to be referred to reference.

Added service point at new facility (downtown business campus).

Additional staff support was provided for services at the main reference service point in order to remove liaisons from this desk. Liaisons are expected to spend more time being out on campus engaging with faculty and students with a focus on the strategic initiatives of the organization. Responsibility for digital reference services (both chat and email) was added to the four library service points (in various locations across campus). Our busiest service point has handled a majority of these interactions. Digital reference was previously handled by individuals in their offices during assigned shifts; chat and email shifts were handled separately by different individuals.

An existing reference assistance point in the Education Branch Library was closed and replaced with on-call reference assistance.

Art+Architecture+Planning and Science/Engineering combined reference desks, two desks on two separate floors into one combined service point on floor 3 of The Irving K. Barber Learning Centre (IKBLC), described in more detail in question 18.

Audiovisual services point was closed and services are now delivered through Circulation.
Biomedical Library reference and access services consolidated.

Circulation service points and reference service points have been consolidated into one service point in libraries.

Circulation/Reserves desk was closed and consolidated to one service desk with reference assistance. An additional service desk opened combining Reference and Circulations. Reserves available at one service desk.

Consolidated reference desk and Main Service desk.

Consolidation and coordination of expertise in Access Services, Research & Instruction, and Collection Development staff to work cooperatively to triage simple questions, cooperate on staffing reference desk, cooperatively staff two virtual reference services.

Consolidation of information services desk with loan desk in the Ayala Science Library.

Forestry and Environmental Studies library was closed and services now delivered in Kline Science Library.

Former Reference Desk combined with desks in Government Publications and Science to create Research Desk.

Hours were reduced at three service desks, staffing was changed from librarians to staff & students.

In August 2008, we merged three previously separate service points (Map Room, Microfilms Center, and Reserve & Media Services) into a single service point. Permanent staff (six classified positions) were initially retained but two of those were eventually reassigned. The budget for student employees who staff the desk evenings and weekends was cut by $40,000/yr.

In our social sciences/humanities library and our science/engineering library, circulation and reference services were merged into consolidated information desks.

Media Services, which was located at our Kilmer Library on the Livingston Campus, was moved to the Douglass Library on the Douglass Campus where it was consolidated in new space with the Music Media resources and staff.

Moving librarians off of our Information Commons Reference Desk.

Reconfiguration/enhancements to an existing information commons area.

Reconfigured reference and access services desks as part of a remodeling effort. This helped to expand counter space in each area and made for a roomier and more attractive setting.

Reference, circulation, and interlibrary services were consolidated to form a single service point (AskUs Desk) in a prominent space nearby the front entrance of the building. Extended reference help is referred off the AskUs desk to subject librarians in the nearby consultation area.

Science branch libraries are being consolidated, effective Fall 2011. There will be a single service point, the Kenan Science Library, which will be nearly bookless. Print science collections will be consolidated in the Wilson Library Science Annex, an on-campus annex to the special collections library, which had, since 2007 and 2008, housed consolidated biology and chemistry collections. Kenan Science Library was originally designed as the Kenan Chemistry Library and was part of the complete demolition of the former chemistry building on campus and construction of a new facility. Changing needs, circumstances, and opportunities have led to the new configuration.

Separate staffed service point for Media and Microforms was closed, and the materials were moved to open shelves, reserves, and a satellite shelving facility. Microform reader-printers were moved to the Digital Media Laboratory.

Service point closed and moved to another existing desk.
The Biology and Math libraries were closed in 2009. Service is now provided in the main library by the Biology and Math Subject Librarian.

The circulation and reserve desks were combined. However, the microform, media, and music monument collections remained behind. We are currently planning for microform equipment to move to an area where an existing service point can provide support and we are making plans for making the media and monuments collections open and self-service. We also added a new service point—the Teaching Commons—but we did not use staff from either of the consolidated service points to do so.

The education library had long occupied a space within the education school belonging to that school. In collaboration with the ed school, the library space was reconfigured to something like a learning commons. Except for reference handbooks, the juvenile book collection, and a small area to hold recalled books, the physical collections were moved to the main library creating an open space for student and faculty collaboration. The computer lab was retained, and the equipment was purchased, and is now maintained, by the school.

The Library and Information Science Library was closed and a “virtual library” was established, along with an “embedded librarian” service approach for the subject specialist, and the integration of core collection materials into remaining physical units.

The library created a new media services department and its service desk was located where there was a previous service point, but that service point (periodicals) was eliminated.

The library serving physics, chemistry, and the preclinical sciences was closed and services are now delivered at the Main Library.

The media collection moved from an in-house use model to an open access, circulating model (with some media housed in a closed area behind circulation) on the most public floor of the library.

The MIT Libraries recently reorganized. Our previous organization had a ‘divisional library’ structure where there were libraries aligned with each of MIT’s schools or divisions, each with its own facility and acting as its own organizational entity. Now, access services functions in each of these four buildings are managed by one department, the new Information Delivery & Library Access department. These changes are largely organizational and few patrons have noticed. Prior to the start of the reorganization, our organization went through two years of budget cuts, layoffs, and mandatory furloughs.

The Periodicals Desk was closed once the current periodicals collection was moved to a different floor across from the Circulation Desk. The Media Desk was moved to the former Periodicals Desk and the Media staff now provide service for the microfilm collection which remains in the space it always has been.

The reference and circulation desks were integrated so that all public service operations are done at a single service point in all our unit libraries. We had initiated this transition at our larger unit libraries first, and the four smaller units made the transition two years ago.

The reference desk in Zimmerman Library: the largest was shutdown at the end of 2007 and in January 2008 the Combined Service Point was born with Reference moving into the Circulation area. The reorganization later that year created the Access Services Unit and the responsibility for the Circulation and Reference area became the responsibility of the director of Access Services. In the spirit of declining staff resources (in number and reference expertise) and dueling outreach/data librarian responsibilities, the reference desk at the science and engineering branch was closed in 2009 and the circulation desk was renovated to accommodate reference consultations. The University Libraries Virtual Service Desk became the responsibility of Access Services in 2009. The VSD is staffed by UL staff from all four branches.
The Reference Desk on the first floor of the main library, Mugar Memorial Library, was moved and reconfigured during a remodel incorporating an information commons approach, and was renamed Research Center.

Three separate branch locations were consolidated into one physical location. Math, Chemistry/Physics, and Maps/Geology were consolidated into the Science Library.

Three service points in our library were consolidated into one.

Two subject libraries located on adjacent floors of the main library building offer shared staffing during selected early morning, weekend, and late evening hours. Staff are shared between the two libraries and conduct roving reference to the other floor. Signs direct patrons to the correct floor for in-person assistance.

"Virtualization" of health sciences library collections in Alden (main library) and consolidation of services to medical college at the OU-COM Learning Resource Center.

We closed the government documents services desk and consolidated services with the main reference desk/department.

We closed the separate Information Desk at the front of the library and moved the Learning Commons existing desk near to the entrance.

We consolidated our Natural Sciences services and collections into the Main library and reconfigured the space and services as a Research Commons. The space is technology rich, enables collaboration and group work, and is much more heavily used than its predecessor. We also consolidated one branch library and two service points into one interdisciplinary service desk (Micro-Newspapers, Gov Pubs, Maps). Gives much better visibility and longer hours to Maps which had been in an out of the way location and provides great opportunities for cross training and staff awareness of resources and services, which in turn provides better service to users.

We are in the process of consolidating three separate service points into a single service point. Government Documents and Microfiche, Circulation, and Reference are all separate physical service points in the library, however, beginning this fall these service points will be consolidated into a single “library service desk.”

With the move of our Information Commons into the new Taylor Family Digital Library, we have integrated two service points (Circulation, Reserve Services and Document Delivery pickups) and the Information Commons Service Desk (Reference and Technology Assistance) into an Integrated Service Desk.

Woodruff Library consolidated three service points into one: Circulation, Reference, and Learning Commons support, as well as closing another Learning Commons support service point.
4. Which of the following factors were significant drivers in the decision to make this service reconfiguration? Check all that apply. N=52

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in service philosophy</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User demands</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical change to a building or facility</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change to library financial resources</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in library staff resources</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability/application of new technology</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for collaboration with a partner outside the library</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for outsourcing service delivery</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other factor</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please briefly describe the other factor.

Academic department requested their space back.

Changes in university enrollment [a factor] in branch closing.

Consolidation was driven by a desire to make the most efficient use of staff, to make services offered available more hours, and to bring more services together on one floor—centralize patron service as much as possible.

Having two service points with different purposes so close together was not efficient and very confusing to users. It was also often difficult for students at the computer lab service point to separate technical questions from content questions.

Library Strategic Plan.

Need to reclaim prime space on busy main floor.

Offer consistent level of service to all constituents.

Our model for offering reference service at the desk has changed over time. In the new organization, most of our library service desks are staffed by access services staff (mostly paraprofessionals) with on-call reference service Monday–Friday, 12pm–4pm. On call arrangements are made via telephone, walkie talkie or Instant Messenger. This was a response to trends in reference transactions at the service desk over time, and to permit librarians to work on liaison activities, outreach, instruction, and collections activities.

Provost offered to invest in space that would expand informal learning locations and options for students (Research Commons).

Recently implemented data gathering mechanisms allowed us to identify locations that had the capacity to take on additional work.

Reduction in support staffing and reconfiguring staff positions led to fewer open hours.

The education school has been transitioning and shifting focus in terms of curriculum and research. It is becoming more research oriented and wanted a collaboration space.

The space and division of work among the service points was inefficient. The division of services was confusing to users. The configuration of space wasn’t optimal for providing services.
This change occurred with the construction of a Learning Commons.

This decision was primarily driven by user input. Users indicated a desire to be able to check out materials and interact with reference staff in a single point of service. In addition, librarians are being asked to devote more time to proactively interacting with faculty and students for their respective disciplines, and less time servicing students at the reference desk.

Two factors led to this: We don't get nearly as many print subscriptions as we used to, so the questions at the periodicals service point had fallen off. Our Media Department is being split into the regular Media Desk (commercial collection) and the Media Archives, which will be in a new special collections building, so the Media Desk needed a home.

Two of the existing service points, Reference and Circulation, were located on different floors, making it difficult for the two service areas to communicate and for patrons to receive seamless, consistent service.

We needed to relocate our video collection that no longer could fit into the small space in our reserves; so it was a combination of wanting to offer a new service and correct a space problem.

Example 1: Physical or Philosophical Change

5. If a physical change to a building or facility had a significant impact on the decision to reconfigure this service, please briefly describe that change and the impact it had. If this did not have a significant impact, please enter NA for Not Applicable. N=52

30 responded NA.

A new “Learning Studio” concept was implemented in Anschutz Library. This included new user space, group rooms, and other improvements as well as collaborations with campus partnership (some of whom moved into the facility).

A new life science laboratory building was completed with general use space allocated for meetings and library support.

Kenan Science Library opened in Fall 2010. Originally designed as Kenan Chemistry Library, the facility replaced an earlier Kenan Chemistry Library in a large and outdated chemistry complex that was demolished and rebuilt.

New building for School of Forestry and Environmental Studies had already greatly reduced the physical space and collection size for the FES library. Within a year, it was determined to give over the library space to the school and provide services on a consultation basis.

New business campus; library collaborated with faculty on design of space and services.

Physical change was the decision (prior to the establishment of the Research Commons) to integrate Natural Sciences Collections into the Main Collection. This freed up space for more innovative use. Shelving was removed, two service points consolidated into one. Two other student support facilities nearby closed, one permanently (computer lab) and one for a two-year remodel (student union). This increased need for technology-enabled spaces for students.

Plans for renovating the Zimmerman Reference Area into a Learning Commons was cited as a factor in the closing of the reference desk. It was one of the first steps towards creating one-stop-shopping for UL patrons.
Previously these two service points existed on the opposite sides of a large boxed rectangle. Walls were removed which allowed for additional space for both service points, as well as patrons, and dramatically opened up the lines of sight.

The ed school built a new building about the same size as the old one. When it opened, faculty and students who had been in offices off-site were moved back into the old building, which now has a research purpose more than a classroom purpose. The reconfigured library space serves as a collaborative area and is staffed by library personnel who provide instruction and reference service.

The Irving K. Barber Learning Centre is a new building, bringing the two reference services/collections into closer proximity than previously. Users found it difficult to access the 4th floor (Sci/Eng) from outside the building. Building layout made the 3rd floor desk a more visible service point for both units.

The physical change came as a result of the decision to improve services.

The physical renovations enabled us to rethink our outmoded service points and build a new model with customer service at the forefront. Our first floor was redesigned to consolidate and thereby simplify the service experience of our patrons. Patrons no longer have to figure out what desk to go to for help, nor do they have to go to multiple desks to get the help they need when they have more than one task to complete.

The related move of the Digital Media Laboratory to a location adjacent to the high-traffic Learning Commons area enabled the Learning Commons staff and student workers to handle some media and microforms-related needs.

The renovation creating the Research Center was driven by the library’s need to reconfigure the library first floor and IS&T’s need to update an old large basement computer lab serving the campus that was even less attractive than the library’s outdated facilities.

This change was part of an ongoing effort to centralize service points. The Learning Commons opened in the area where the Reference Desk was formerly located. When the Commons opened, we saw a dramatic increase in the number of students using the library.

This is part of a planned renovation that has not yet taken place.

This merger allowed us to re-allocate space elsewhere in our main library building. The space previously occupied by the Microforms Center was split between new offices for staff in Library Instruction and a new computer classroom. The space previously occupied by the Map Room is being used temporarily to house collections displaced by a major rearrangement of bookstacks, but will ultimately become open study space.

University administration wanted to move a new research center into the library space.

Wanted to physically open up the first floor and provide more space for patron seating and collaboration.

We are in transition to a new building. The Taylor Family Digital Library brings together the main library, archives, museums, university press, student services, and alumni services into a new technology and information rich environment to meet the 21st century needs of learners and researchers. This past winter we opened the Learning Commons on the first two floors of the facility and next fall the full building will be opened. The building was designed with one main service point on the 1st floor to integrate services from the former Circulation desk (circulation, reserve, and document delivery pickups) and the former Information Commons Service Desk (reference and technical assistance).

Because the Learning Commons is on multiple floors in this new facility, a secondary technology assistance desk was established on the 2nd floor to ensure better access to assistance and maintain a physical staff presence on this very busy floor.

We created a large display space where the old Information Desk was located.

We wanted to relocate the loan desk closer to the building entrance/exit.
6. If a change in service philosophy had a significant impact on the decision to reconfigure this service, please briefly describe that change and the impact it had. If this did not have a significant impact, please enter NA for Not Applicable. N=52

13 responded NA.

After the planned renovation, there will be a single service point (there are currently two) and before the change there were three.

Because of evaluations that had been done, we knew there was an irregular delivery of service within the system. Changes made standardized and improved service offerings to our users and simplified how/where the users needed to go for these.

By centralizing service points, we can improve service to users as well as be more efficient with staff time. This change has certainly changed (lowered) the number of hours individuals spent at a desk, freeing time for other activities.

Comments from users indicate that there is a desire for a more efficient and streamlined experience for checking out materials and getting reference assistance. In addition, a single service also allows library staff to broaden their skill sets by becoming cross-trained on both reference and circulation processes.

Cross-training the Government Documents librarians for the Main Reference Desk is the first step toward reducing service points in the Main Library.

Customer service has always been at the forefront of our decisions to reconfigure our staffing and physical spaces. So, in this respect, there was no change in service philosophy just the opportunity (funding) to enhance our physical environment and subsequent staffing models to improve our key services.

Decision to increase the “one-stop shopping” possibilities for our users.

Desired to implement our current service philosophy on the new campus.

I don’t know if it was a significant impact, but the library administration definitely decided that we needed to offer media services to the campus because it was not being adequately offered elsewhere and our faculty were asking us to offer it.

In general, the Libraries is moving toward a combined service point approach/philosophy wherever possible, but the physical layout of the main library building presents obstacles.

In our new organization, we are trying to work across geographical boundaries toward the model of One Library, One Collection, in order to better support our institution’s interdisciplinary work and current trends in scholarship and teaching.

In Strategic Initiative 3 & 4 (of the strategic plan) there is a call for an appropriate mix of services, expertise management, and taking advantage of staff expertise. Work on reference questions that had been divided across departmental lines was expanded out to appropriate staff—simpler questions best answered by circulation or other staff triaged to their area, more complex & subject-related questions referred to appropriate subject expert—both in virtual venues and in physical (desk) presence. Bibliographers in Collection Development began to share a larger role in reference and reference librarians with collections responsibilities having a larger subject-expert role. All taking responsibility for answering questions appropriately and referring appropriately.
Increasing reliance in the sciences on electronic collections, combined with emerging areas of emphasis such as e-science, have led to a new service vision for sciences, with consultations and high-end equipment to be located in the science library and print collections available for browsing and consultation in an annex. In addition, the library instituted a liaison model in 2010; there is therefore a library-wide emphasis on proactive outside-the-library services and availability that is consistent with a new service model for the sciences.

It simply made better sense to combine the two media collections and to coordinate staff and equipment in one building in a redesigned, improved space. This also brought staff into closer proximity to our new Sharon Fordham Lab.

It was a change in service philosophy when we admitted that students and faculty were not and would not come up the hill to the main library to use print resources and that we needed to deliver our services and content in the way that worked best for them rather than insisting they come to us.

It was felt that user needs had changed over time and having a staffed reference assistance point was no longer necessary. It was in close proximity to the circulation service desk so staff at that desk could contact librarians in their offices for patrons with minimal/no delay in service.

Our goal is to have fewer physical locations on campus.

Provided user services in one location.

Reference service is now provided by trained library staff members who are scheduled to work service desks. Library faculty continue to do in-depth reference, but are not scheduled to work at service desks.

Services delivered via “touch-down” space, and collection materials delivered from other locations.

Since much of the journal literature in this subject area is available online, the physical allocation of space for print resources was no longer considered essential by the academic department.

The availability of e-journals and electronic means of communication meant that the physical library space was not as critical as it was in years past.

The change in service philosophy around reference mirrors the change that had occurred with information resources many years earlier—to focus on “just in time” rather than “just in case.” In reviewing the questions that were asked at our desks and the level of library staff person needed to adequately respond to those questions, it became clear that having a librarian stationed at a desk just in case a question requiring their skills and knowledge were to be asked was a poor use of our resources. We found that only a small percentage (often less than 5%) of the questions that were answered at our desks required knowledge beyond what a well-trained classified staff person could provide.

The changes implemented may not have been actual changes in philosophy but rather were a realignment of practice with expectations around services. For some time, we have supported a just-in-time model of reference rather than a just-in-case model of reference. During the process of moving digital reference services to the in-person service points we worked on explicitly defining expectations around such a model. Examples of expectations that were clarified through this process included: identifying baseline levels of reference expected at service points in a variety of subjects (still in development), how and when to make referrals to subject specialists (with the understanding that appointments in the future may be necessary), and expectations related to managing users in queue for assistance in a variety of settings (i.e., how to deal with chat, in-person, phone, and email questions all at once). In order to free up liaison/librarian time to take on new initiatives, we are always looking for efficiencies in our services. Making these changes moved work to staff at existing service points and allowed liaisons previously supporting these services to have more time to take on additional tasks related to engagement with faculty and students and our other strategic initiatives.
The combined desk allowed users to access services on the same floor as the Chapman Learning Commons (Example 2), simplifying the referral process by having service points closer. This service philosophy was more user-centered in that it emphasized access and visibility over historical organizational structures.

The decision to close the LIS Library was taken within the broader context of the discussion of service needs explored as part of our New Service Models program. Among the distinctive aspects of the LIS Library example were the growth of interdisciplinary approaches to LIS teaching and research, the growth of the LIS teaching and research mission beyond the traditional focus of the LIS Library on professional librarianship, and the increasing significance of distance learning and e-learning programs in LIS programs on campus.

The former library space is now a hybrid of embedded and traditional librarianship, accommodating reference and instruction but not circulation or tech services. This has freed up tremendous amounts of staff time to explore new services: videos, more online tutorials, providing a newsletter, much more consulting, etc. The staff that remain no longer have to check-out or shelve books. The focus is more on subject librarian tasks and materials selection.

The Head of Reference & Instructional Services had been following the information commons model and advocating that this was a logical direction for the library to move in addressing the need to renovate the library’s first floor and services. The first floor housed a very large and increasingly less used print reference collection. Print reference collection reduced by four-fifths. After consultation with library staff, decision was made to continue providing walk-up reference service in reconfigured space among offered services.

The library wished to provide a more accessible, centrally located service point that offers a broader range of services in one location. By creating this point, we were able to move circulation to a high-traffic area on the main floor of the library, as well as free up space in the previous location for future service development.

The opening of the TFDL comes after 12 years of the Library, Archives, Museum, and Press being part of the same organizational family. The facility will enable an acceleration of the convergence of these units. We need to provide new and different services to support our researchers and learners in taking full advantage of all the potential of the new facility and will need to have our academic staff practicing more outreach. Support staff, paraprofessionals, and student assistants will be available at the first point of contact, users are encouraged to use self-service options wherever they are available, and a simplified and expedited referral process will be available to provide more in-depth research assistance. At the point of writing, we are still in transition and cannot yet articulate the impact.

The other factor that led to the decision to close the computer lab service desk was that it was not staffed the same hours as the Reference Desk, further increasing the confusion about the purpose of the desk and role of the staff who worked there.

The library’s strategic plan focused on meeting students where they are, so the thought was combining would make it less confusing which desk to go to for help.

These changes emerged from the work of our New Models of Service Task Force. They recommended fewer, more consolidated service points as a way to free up librarians and staff to be more integrated in the workflow of our users, including expanded teaching and consultation as well as the provision of virtual services. We were also informed in our planning by a campus study of what characteristics students sought in informal learning spaces.

Usage of services at the reference desk and circulation desk had declined over the past few years. By consolidating those services, we were able to reassign librarians new responsibilities that were being requested by library users.

Use of three collections (maps, microfilms, and “hard copy” reserves) was dwindling, while use of the media collection (especially CDs and DVDs) was growing. There was anecdotal evidence (and certainly indications in library literature) that users might prefer to access all of these special format (or short-term loan) items from a single service point.
User need and use pattern changes were a major factor in the creation of the project. The opportunity for the libraries to collaborate with the university’s IT department, the provost’s office, and student government helped make this a reality.

We believed that informational questions should be answered in the Learning Commons.

We wanted to bring service points into one central area for patrons (as much as is possible in our building). Some patrons have complained because the circulation function is not on the entrance level (one floor below) but I think we have made adjustments that address their concerns and the perceived inconvenience.

We wanted to redesign our space to make it more user friendly as well as efficient. This is an important service, and we wanted the space to allow both access to resources and enable staff to do their jobs better.

**Example 1: Financial and Staff Resources**

7. If a change in library financial resources had a significant impact on the decision to reconfigure this service, please briefly describe that change and the impact it had. If this did not have a significant impact, please enter NA for Not Applicable. N=52

25 responded NA.

Budget cuts for the library and college of medicine led to loss of health science librarian positions through attrition.

Due to budget cuts and other factors, the number of librarians on staff has been gradually decreasing for many years. At the same time, new work for librarians has also emerged that has required us to move some of their work (like working on public service desks) to others.

Financial: Combining human resources (expenses) allowed service hours to be maintained with existing staff. It was accepted that there would not likely be increases in funding in the future.

In FY10, the library budget was cut and closing two science libraries was a way to reduce costs and help meet the budget reduction requirements.

In this era of scarce resources, all units, including the library, are being asked to operate in a more streamlined and effective manner. Although the desk consolidation project will not result in financial savings, the fact that librarians will not be spending as much time at the reference desk is a new way of operating. The hope and goal is that librarians will have more time to devote to user and faculty engagement.

NA, other than availability of funds to take on this large renovation project.

Our goal to have fewer physical locations on campus will help in reallocating existing library positions.

Overall budget reduction.

Science librarians will be brought together from the science annex, math-physics library, and geological sciences library, and will be based in the new science library. Although the library had lobbied for a consolidated science library for more than a decade, it was clear that funding for a dedicated facility would not be available. In the end, fiscal constraints led to a re-thinking of the chemistry library as a science library, albeit with a smaller footprint than desirable. We anticipate
saving approximately $140,000 per year, mostly from salaries for vacant positions that the relocation will allow us to eliminate, and also from equipment and supplies.

The combined needs of the library and IS&T services were addressed by the university providing the resources to renovate the library space and install a new thin client computer installation with the shifting of service points. Renovation provided the opportunity to reconfigure and relocate reference desk as Research Center.

The consolidation involved moving staff to a new service point. The development of the teaching commons was accomplished with a new librarian hire and hiring additional student hours.

The libraries budget has been impacted over the past few years so we are always looking for ways to utilize our staff in the most efficient manner possible.

The Libraries experienced a 10% permanent budget reduction effective in 2009–10, which had a significant impact on collections expenditures as well as staffing/hours of service at certain service points.

The Libraries sustained several rounds of budget cuts during this period—1.5% (mid-year recission), 12%, 5%, and 2.4%. We met the personnel budgets through elimination of vacant positions as much as possible, but did have to do some layoffs as well. As a result, we had to realign the distribution of resources, including staff, to areas of growth and high demand.

The library had a reduction in force (RIF) prior to the implementation of this service point, which was a factor in determining the need for a merged service point and the timeline for implementing it.

The library, along with the rest of the university, has experienced budget cuts for the past three years. One area in which we have some flexibility is the casual-hourly budget for student workers, and we have reduced this budget considerably. Since our service desks are staffed almost exclusively by student workers on evenings and weekends, consolidating (or closing) service desks is a way to save money.

The Libraries budget was reduced by 15% over the course of three fiscal years. These budget cuts reduced library service hours, reduced the size of our collections budget, and reduced the size of our organization.

The opportunity for the libraries to collaborate with the university’s IT department, the provost’s office, and student government helped make this a reality. The initial funding was shared among all groups and ongoing funding is shared between the libraries and the IT department.

The university’s budget was cut. Consequently, so was the library’s. A hiring freeze was instituted at the university.

This change did happen during the economic downturn and with many retirements in the offing, it was acknowledged that staff would need to be moved around. It has not been possible to hire to replace those who retired or otherwise departed.

Two of the primary government documents paraprofessional staff retired. They provided the majority of the hours on the service desk, along with the government documents librarian. We were unable to continue staffing a separate desk. The user demand at the government documents desk had also been dropping dramatically. Since the main reference desk and the documents desk were on the same floor, we decided to consolidate services and merge the two departments. The government documents librarian trained all the general reference librarians and worked closely with the political science librarian (who was himself a former government documents librarian). The integration of services (which included instruction) has worked very well. We have not received any complaints from faculty or students and the librarians are able to provide the research-level assistance needed.

Two years of across the board cuts to the library’s budget necessitated loss of both staff and vacant staff lines.
University administration provided us with extra funds to buy more e-journals and e-journal backfiles to make the library closure more palatable to users.

We desired to use the staff resources from the Information Desk for other functions in the library.

We need to deploy staff to new functions, the current budgetary reality does not permit the addition of new staff.

We needed to significantly reduce expenditures for student employees, which was achieved by eliminating the information desk as a separate service point.

While budget pressures were not a driving force in this decision, the change in service model did allow for needed flexibility during a time of considerable financial strain.

8. How did this service reconfiguration impact permanent library staff? Check all that apply. N=46

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Librarians</th>
<th>Other Professionals</th>
<th>Support Staff</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing staff moved to the new service point</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing staff were reassigned within the library</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position(s) was reduced through attrition</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff were hired to fill newly created positions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of work were reduced</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other impact</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please specify the other impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Librarians</th>
<th>Other Professionals</th>
<th>Support Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A new Team Leader position was added to manage the new service point.</td>
<td></td>
<td>An evening-weekend staff position is proposed for the Library Service Desk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the transition phase, librarians did assist with staffing this service point on a reduced basis.</td>
<td>IT assistance supported by Campus IT and jointly funded student positions.</td>
<td>Support staff working in two facilities, jobs will continue to change as we close the old building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Documents librarians now work hours at the Main Reference Desk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians cross trained to assist with some basic Circulation Desk services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians have time for other responsibilities.</td>
<td>Reference service is new for some.</td>
<td>Reference service is a new duty for some.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>Other Professionals</td>
<td>Support Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians need to work with/collaborate with staff from another unit and work toward a shared service philosophy.</td>
<td>Other professionals need to work with/collaborate with staff from another unit and work toward a shared service philosophy.</td>
<td>Support staff need to work with/collaborate with staff from another unit and work toward a shared service philosophy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians will be significantly reducing their hours at the reference/library service desk.</td>
<td>Increased cross training on new processes and technologies (for both circulation and reference).</td>
<td>Increased cross training on new processes and technologies (for both circulation and reference).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the two professional positions was moved elsewhere in the library.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reallocation of time from desk to in-office consultations, liaison, outreach, instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td>More responsibility for reference services and related administrative support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removed from the Reference desk with one exception.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Center: adopted single reference librarian staffing; introduced appointments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some reduction in the amount of hours on desk, consolidated service point.</td>
<td>Working at consolidated service point with campus partners.</td>
<td>Working at consolidated service point with campus partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We hired a new media services librarian position.</td>
<td>We hired a media services specialist position.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Many of the support staff now work at more than one service point, and staff who were formerly not assigned to service points may now work on a desk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In 2010, for the first time, the library actually laid off three classified staff (system-wide) to deal with budget cuts. One of the positions identified for layoff was in the newly consolidated Media Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Layoffs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Please briefly describe the resulting impact on staff, including number of staff affected, how assignments changed, whether reporting relationships changed, etc. N=42

2.5 FTE support staff positions were assigned new responsibilities within the same department, Access and Delivery Services.

Although reporting relationships will not change, combining services impacts almost all members of the circulation, reference, and special formats (maps, microfiche) departments. There is increased awareness about how the “other side” operates, and cross training across both circulation and reference processes.

As librarians were moved off of the desk, the overnight desk staff (classified staff members), who had previously reported to the Team Leader for Undergraduate Services (which was otherwise comprised of librarians) were moved to the Access & Information Services Team. This team now staffs all of our public service desks, ILL searching/Document Delivery.

Assignments didn’t change much, but there was some adjustment to reporting.

At the busiest service point, librarians were removed from the desk (as indicated by the hours of work reduced above; this does not mean layoffs, just a change in where effort was expended). Two half-time Library Assistant III positions were created for additional support for this desk. Digital reference services are now covered by staff at this desk (and others in the library), in addition to previous in-person and phone reference services provided here.

Closed branches: 3.25 Natural Sciences Librarians joined the Reference and Research Services Division, reporting to the Head, RRS. One assumed additional duties as Data Services Coordinator. Classified were transferred to other units/duties where there were critical vacancies (1.0), or increased needs (2.0). Each reported to a new supervisor in a different division of the Libraries.

Current business librarian now spends one day/week at new site. Hired 3/4 business librarian to cover additional days. Grad students hired for support.

During this past winter, staff were stretched to staff the old Circulation Desk in the old building as well as the Integrated Service Desk in the new building. We also needed to manage closed stack access so students were hired to retrieve materials. Staff began to understand the need to change workflows to accommodate the increased reliance on self-serve, holds, retrievals, and cross training. The new workflows have been described and units realigned. Reporting relationships are in the process of changing as we have just created new job profiles and are posting the ongoing staff changes for the fall when we are closing the old service points. This change affected 29 staff members plus student assistants.

Freed up librarians to have more time to work in their offices. No changes to reporting lines, staff numbers, etc.

ILS staff still reporting to Head of ILS services and now focus solely on processing of requests and take referrals from new service desk when needed. Circulation and Reference units were combined and reconfigured to form Public and Research Services. Staff were assigned roles and divided into two highly collaborative teams based on expertise and strengths. The On-Stage team (17 staff) works the front line service desk and the Backstage team (7 staff) focuses on all the required back-end patron processing of books, equipment, library accounts, and fines.

Librarians and staff spend fewer hours at the new Research Desk because there are more people sharing the workload.

Librarians had more free time for the extra assignments they have been given due to a hiring freeze.

Librarians no longer serve on the desk. Now serve in consultation role. Staff serve on frontline.
Loss of one professional health science librarian in main library, loss of one professional health science librarian in college of medicine, and loss of one health sciences support staff in main library. Remaining health sciences professional duties now split between main library services for allied health areas (no specific service point) and college of medicine Learning Resource Center with dual reporting to libraries and college.

No increase/decrease in FTEs, but existing support staff and graduate academic assistants (library school graduate students) now report to more than one supervisor in some cases and are cross trained in both sets of disciplines.

One open professional position was moved elsewhere in the library. One of three support positions remained in the ed school. The other two staff were moved to other areas of the library affected by resignations in those other areas.

One reference librarian works desk hours between traditional business hours with support staff and student assistants. Student assistants work desk evening and weekend hours.

Originally (five years ago when we launched the transition), this was a very major service initiative at our institution. A lot of time went into the planning and implementation for librarians and support staff. First we articulated what service offerings should be provided at the service desks, then competencies were established for the librarians and support staff to deliver. Some new positions needed to be designed and advertised. A full training program was delivered prior to the service change and on-going training is an established practice. Some staff did have reporting relationships and unit structures that changed. However, in this most recent shift (the last four libraries), staff needed training but there were no re-assignments of units or reporting structures.

Overall this has been a highly successful merger. The Media Center has become a fairly busy “hub,” yet remaining staff (including student workers) do not appear to be overwhelmed by the amount of work or the variety of collections serviced.

Reporting relationships changed for most staff across the organization. Most of the former public services librarians work in one of the new departments: Liaisons to Departments, Labs, or Centers; Instruction and Reference Services; Specialized Content & Services; User Experience; or Information Delivery & Library Access. Many librarians moved offices and have dual reporting lines to one or more departments.

Research Center adopted a single reference librarian and single work-study information student (answering phone and providing basic directional and catalog help) model staffed by nine bibliographers, two part-time reference librarians, and two other librarians 70 hours weekly, abandoning outdated staffing (four people) model that traffic no longer required. The Research Center includes two meeting alcoves: One is used for student-initiated, half-hour appointments with librarians (thirteen scheduled hours weekly) and the other is staffed eight hours weekly by Writing Center student tutors.

Science librarians will be brought together from the science annex, math-physics library, and geological sciences library, and will be based in the new science library. Support staff will manage circulation and stacks and will assist patrons in locating materials in the science annex. One librarian position was lost to retirement/attrition following the consolidation of the biology and chemistry libraries in the annex. One staff position has been reassigned elsewhere in the library. Consolidation of support staff would allow for elimination of a vacant position in the case of a future resignation or retirement.
Some librarians who had previously volunteered to work the reference desk declined to continue to do so when we moved in with circulation staff. I believe it was because they did not want to be responsible for or learn about circulation procedures and tasks. Nor did they want to be the "person in charge" which often happens when you’re the only one or one of a few faculty/staff in the CSP space and the student employees look to you for answers. Consequently, we had to rely on long-time circulation staff with little or no reference skills to staff what is the busiest service point in the entire library.

Staff continued to do work related to document delivery/ILL, but without responsibility for check out, and from an existing behind-the-scenes location.

Staff from the consolidated service points (Circulation/Reserves) have had to cross train and to adjust to a new model for desk staffing. Stacks management staff, who were in close proximity to the circulation desk before, have had to adjust to being more physically distant from the circulation desk. Approximately 20 staff were affected in one way or another. Prior to the consolidation, several units were combined into an Access Services department. So there was some change in reporting structure but not because of the service point consolidation.

Staff had basic training in question answering and when to refer; collections librarians had training in reference desk procedures and virtual reference etiquette; all had to maintain a little more cooperative relationship with each other. Staffing at Circulation enabled 8–midnight IM coverage; reference desk hours trimmed to leave more time for reference and collections librarians to develop relationships outside the library walls and develop new tools for information dissemination (learning objects, research guides [web], virtual services).

Staff were not impacted; student employment was reduced.

Staff who didn’t previously report through the Access Services department now have a dotted reporting line through them.

Support staff went into layoff status and were hired to fill other positions within the University Library.

Ten librarians and staff now do all of their reference time at the Learning Commons Desk or from their offices.

The change was fairly seamless.

The consolidation of media with music media has brought about cross training of staff from each of the two formerly separate centers. Some reporting relationships changed, and a new manager of our adjacent Sharon Fordham Lab was hired.

The librarian no longer supervised staff although this changed recently with other organizational changes. One support staff was reassigned to a vacant position in another science library and the other support staff was transferred to a vacant position in the circulation unit of the main library.

The new 24/7 space is staffed by student assistants from IT and supervised by staff from IT. There is a joint group of IT staff and library staff (primarily staff from Circulation and Reference) who collaborate and help determine the services needed and provided, the training needed, and the configuration of the physical space. A security officer was hired to be in the space during the overnight hours.

The staffing impact was the ability to redeploy student assistants to a very busy service desk in the media department.

The subject specialist moved to the Main Library. The two support staff were transferred to different branches.

The teams of Access Services were reorganized to accommodate the change in service points, including consolidating branch library staff into one team, creating a new service desk team, and establishing the stacks team as a separate team (the stacks and circulation teams had been one team previously).
Two staff positions overall were added; since they were new it didn’t impact on assignments or reporting relationships.

Two support staff were reassigned—one to Circulation and one to Receiving. Both took about 80% of their former responsibilities with them. Reporting relationships changed for both staff members. The one who moved to Circulation also helped form our 24/5 team for third shift.

We had three staff serving the service desk. Two (paraprofessionals) retired and the third staff (librarian) moved into the new department; one library assistant still reports to the librarian within the new department in order to provide stacks maintenance.

Example 1: New Technology

New/emerging technology has the potential to enhance library services. QR Codes, GIS applications, Skype, student course-centered software such as Blackboard, collaborative sites such as SharePoint, Basecamp, or Google Sites/Documents, and cloud-based computing solutions such as Amazon EC2 are just a few examples with library applications.

10. If the availability of new technology had a significant impact on the decision to reconfigure this service, or if the new configuration permitted the application of new technology, please briefly describe that technology and the impact it had. If this did not have a significant impact, please enter NA for Not Applicable. N=52

26 responded NA.

Collaborative use of QuestionPoint software to manage and provide our chat and email transactions as part of a consortium of providers, including 24/7 access to chat research support. Changes to our website leveraged access to the Chat Qwidget and increased the number of chat interactions dramatically.

Development of the adjacent Sharon Fordham Lab, containing software applications to enhance use of new technology and media in teaching and learning, ties in closely with expertise and resources in the merged Media Center collection.

Digital Media was becoming more widely available in the library collection (licensed streaming video, for example). Library computers and loaned laptops could “play” digital media at any location in the building, reducing the need for a dedicated “media center” space. Use of the microforms collection was decreasing, due in part to greater availability of online journal backfiles and more full text online. NOTE: The Libraries’ heavily used Technology Lending Service (laptops, iPads, ebooks, MP3 players, etc.) is also serviced from the main circulation desk now, along with Course Reserves. This is a busy service point at which staff need to be trained in a wide variety of functions.

For the most part our new media services provided access to only existing technology (e.g., DVD) but the long range plan was to create a unit in the library that would eventually offer digital media production services using more sophisticated media production equipment and software.
Hope to make the Kenan Science Library a center for high-end e-science applications, but this has not yet been developed to any significant degree.

In a small way we have continued to add to the variety of electronic devices that we circulate, this allowed us to create a separate service point only for devices.

In general, the Transition to Online program (last eight years) has enabled staff to provide reference services virtually/online and has allowed users to find many materials online and perhaps more independently, i.e., these materials no longer have to be housed in a space adjacent to the desks. In addition, services can be provided remotely through other social media/software so librarians don’t need to be scheduled on the desk as much. Remotely through Meebo/Screenr/email.

Increased digital resources made having an onsite collection of printed materials less of an imperative.

IS&T used thin client technology to install 200 computer stations over three floors in the library and removed their outdated PC-based basement computer lab with 128 computers elsewhere on campus and 48 PCs in the library drove the opportunity to reconfigure service points. The library used a subscription to appointment.com to provide web-based, student-initiated appointments with librarians, including text description of need.

LibraryH3lp as first line of answer after experiment with Meebo had partial results due to lack of continuous hours. LibGuides enabled added layer of virtual presence.

Multi-media technology and new equipment were added to a more traditional information commons area.

New audio and media technology allowed us to serve users more efficiently and the new space supported this. And the new space allowed us to enhance and improve the backroom functions that support direct users’ services.

Not sure if this can be considered "new technology" but the increase in online journal subscriptions had an impact on the reconfiguration.

Providing better access to technology for students has been an important goal in changes to service delivery. The move to the provision of applications via the cloud by our central IT department has meant that laptops are even more pervasive and places to sit, work, collaborate, and recharge are essential. This has informed the redesign of our reconfigured spaces and the purchase of furniture and equipment. We are beginning to use mobile technology for service delivery as well. Presentation practice spaces and videoconferencing were also introduced to support instructional programs.

The availability of online content is not new or emerging, but it was a factor in the space configuration described above.

The downward trends in circulation patterns was a major factor in our decision making, coupled with the advances in self-service options and the expectation for these user enhancements; i.e., self sign out/in and fines payments.

The establishment of the virtual service point was facilitated through greater use of RSS feeds, LibGuides, and Moodle course management software.

The new configuration allowed for time to implement new technologies. Skype enabled consultations without having to meet face-to-face. Use of online tutorials and web pages increased. They are transitioning to cloud computing. Services are moving from face-to-face to online.

The only technology impact on this decision was the ability to provide significant amounts of current and archived health sciences literature electronically.

The significance of the impact is unknown, but there is a new department devoted to the exploration of many of these aspects, which is our User Experience department. This group is working with and offering instruction sessions to
patrons about QR Codes, Apps that can be used to support academic work, use of blogs and wikis, and devices like iPads, Kindles, and Nook e-readers. This group is still in startup and experimenting with these emerging technologies. GIS services were existent prior to the reorganization, however, they are now aligned within the Specialized Content & Services department, which is also responsible for supporting distance education through educational video capture services. GIS, images, video, and music are now joined in this Specialized Content department.

The TFDL will be a very technology-rich environment when completed. For the initial opening of the Learning Commons we had an increased use of self-serve checkouts, newly implemented RFID tagged materials, self-sorter for book returns, a newly revised booking system for collaborative workrooms where students could select the room being booked (to accommodate variations in technology), increased wiring and electrical outlet access, large displays and mini-Mac servers in each of the collaborative workrooms to encourage collaborative work, TeamSpot software in collaborative workrooms to further enhance the integration of student technologies with Learning Commons technologies. We also introduced two touchable devices. Other signage and media walls were not fully implemented because of missing mounts, these will be fully implemented in the fall. Students’ use of space substantial increase over old facility. Some problems with abuse of the booking system that will be reviewed this summer. Expect to see more significant impacts next fall when the facility is fully implemented.

This is anecdotal but by spending less time at a desk, librarians likely do have more time to explore and implement new technologies such as QR codes and chat. We have implemented those but it wasn’t necessarily part of the decision to reconfigure the service.

We implemented self-checkout in both the science/engineering and the social science/humanities libraries. So far, the self-checkout hasn’t made a huge impact.

We were able to move to a model of hosted, streamed content and away from formats that may no longer be viable.

While not new, the availability of e-journals and electronic communication methods allowed the closure to move forward.

While not part of the physical renovation of the first floor, part of the renovation funding went to the development of a new media studio (five high-end media PCs and 14 iMacs loaded with state-of-the-art media software). Currently the lab is located in the library annex building (attached to the main library building) within the Media and Reserves unit. Our next renovation project will see the media studio and a technical support staff member move to the second floor of the main building to enhance its profile. It will also be located nearby other service units and their staff so they can assist students with the content/planning of their media projects.

Example 1: Collaboration and Outsourcing

11. If an opportunity for collaboration with a partner outside the library had a significant impact on the decision to reconfigure this service, please briefly describe that opportunity and the impact it had. If this did not have a significant impact, please enter NA for Not Applicable. N=52

39 responded NA.
Ability to combine services into one desk with partners from Student Success and IT.

Because of attrition in the libraries and the college of medicine, the opportunity to share the costs and services of the remaining health sciences librarian arose. The impact has been an increased workload on the health science librarian, but better and more efficient collaborations and resource sharing between the libraries and the college of medicine.

Creating the space and services offered new opportunity for collaboration with the business school.

Major collaboration with Information Services & Technology (IS&T) provided opportunity to reconfigure reference service. IS&T’s interest in installing a new thin client based computer service that improved their software management was an important factor in library renovation.

Subscription to 24/7 chat service.

The Education Library was already in the Education School, so it was assumed the collaboration would continue. The facility is now managed by the school but staffed by the library, which leaves library staff more free to concentrate on services rather than building maintenance, etc.

The library collaborated with the Graduate School of Library and Information Science on this change in service model.

The library partnered with Academic & Research Technology, a department within campus IT.

The opportunity for the libraries to collaborate with the university’s IT department, the provost’s office, and student government helped make this a reality. The initial funding was shared among all groups and ongoing funding is shared between the libraries and the IT department.

The provost’s investment in reshaping library spaces was critical to the success of the Research Commons project and to all of our reconfigured service points. Partnership with university IT, Classroom Support Services, and Capital Resources Planning was also key. They provided information and in-kind services to support our project and remain involved in the evolution of the spaces.

We had already been participating in a group that provided us with access to the software used to provide digital reference services. The software is configured in such a way that it allowed us to provide distributed service (service from more than one location all at once) and was a factor in helping us move to the new service model.

We had the opportunity to expand on our collaborative relationship with the campus IT unit in the newly consolidated Science Library. We had been very successful with opening a new service point with them in our main library in 2007.

We partnered with the campus IT service at a new Commons Desk so this did impact our decision to relocate the Research Desk.

12. If an opportunity for outsourcing service delivery had a significant impact on the decision to reconfigure this service, please briefly describe that opportunity and the impact it had. If this did not have a significant impact, please enter NA for Not Applicable. N=52

48 responded NA.
At about the same time that we consolidated Media and Music Media into the Media Center, we closed our Presentation Services, considering that the service was not core to the Libraries’ mission. While we did not really outsource the services that Presentation Services formerly provided, we felt that faculty and other groups that were our users were finding new modes of delivery of films and other media formats. This has freed up the manager of Presentation Services to devote time to preservation of media resources and to some support in the Media Center and the Sharon Fordham Lab.

Our collaborative partnership provides 24/7 chat support to our users, but also allows questions that we can’t get to during our regular service hours to roll to a national queue for support as well. This variable allows us to manage multiple types of reference (in-person, phone, and chat) all at once while knowing that some users can get support from external service providers.

Transferring responsibility for student printing fully to IS&T (by bringing them into the building) and away from information students and reference staff was a favorable outcome. Library previously had inadequate 25 IS&T computer stations that were driving approximately 25% of campus printing on inadequate and inadequately staffed printers demonstrating that the library was a logical place students were looking to for this service. Lines were continual.

We phased out our Billing Services unit of the Access Services department. Users can now pay their bills online using a credit card or they can go to the central billing office on campus to pay fines in person. We also provide reference assistance 24/7 via a chat service; ~75% of the online coverage is outsourced to librarians not affiliated with the university. Librarians now have more time to devote to scholarly communication, outreach, and instruction.

13. Please make any additional comments on the factors that drove this service reconfiguration. N=13

Availability of most journal literature in electronic form made closing these science libraries easier.

Budget reduction combined with maximizing deployment of staff and other resources.

Information commons model of providing a suite of services in the library a major factor. Commitment made to continue providing a librarian as prominent walk-up reference service in Research Center among the services. Observation of student interaction with offices throughout campus, such as Writing Center and Educational Resource Center, drove adoption of appointment model. Information Services & Technology (IS&T) added a staffed IT Help Desk and moved the main student and faculty account printing facility into the library, Print Center. The library Copy Center became the Scan/Copy Center incorporating formerly IT scanning service.

It was mostly a desire to improve services to our user community and respond to their needs, while creating a better space for the collections and service delivery.

Just to state again that the change in this service provision was initiated to improve service to the user and also did create opportunities for support staff and librarians in terms of promotion into more senior positions.

MIT has just entered into new strategic partnerships with Harvard University, the HathiTrust, and the Ivies Plus Borrow Direct network, which will shape some of our services in the future. These partnerships were not the driver for our reorganization or reconfiguration of services, but are in line with the goals of our reorganization.

Need for remodeling for aesthetics.
Our previous service model was costing us approximately $2000 a week in staff time. By moving the service to a new location and using existing staff, we were able to reallocate that staff time for other activities and use existing service points distributed across the libraries to provide a high level of service to digital reference users.

Student input and need helped drive this service reconfiguration.

The fact that these collections were shrinking, could be downsized, or could be stored more efficiently helped to make this merger do-able. The volume of hard-copy course reserve has shrunk steadily through the years, as e-reserve grows in importance. We have been steadily weeding our microfilm collection as more material becomes available digitally (keeping in mind, of course, the importance of microfilm from a preservation perspective, for truly archival collections). We are able to store our growing media collection (CDs, DVDs) on compact shelving.

The service point was on the opposite side of a large lobby from the unit that supervised the students staffing the desk. This made it difficult for the student supervisor to monitor performance at the desk.

The service reconfigurations were driven by our commitment to meet the needs of our students and faculty by providing technology rich, collaborative spaces where informal learning is enabled. We have partnered with colleagues in the Graduate School and Undergraduate Academic Affairs among others to deliver programs and services in these spaces with the goal of fostering interdisciplinary connections.

This change was driven by a change in focus of the school to research and scholarship, by financial issues resulting from the economic meltdown, by the opportunity for greater collaboration between the school and the library, and by advancing technology.

**Example 1: User Participation**

14. Did your library involve users in the planning, implementation, and/or assessment of this service reconfiguration? Please select one answer in each row. N=50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you answered “Yes”, please briefly describe the methods that were used to engage users.

**Planning Process**

But only by virtue of counted numbers in decline.

Consulted informally with patrons.

Design charrette; focus groups; surveys; Graduate and Professional Student Advisory Committee.
Discussion with the University Library Committee and users of the Media/Microforms Center.

Discussions with dean and faculty.

Discussions with students.

Feedback from the Library Student Advisory Committee.

Focus groups with ed school constituents; a liaison group within the ed school; planning was done by the school.

Focus groups with faculty concerning use of media in courses.

Focus groups, direct discussion.

Focus groups, surveys.

Focus groups, surveys, individual conversations with department chairs and faculty.

Identified barriers to physical and virtual access (LibQUAL+® survey).

Implementation Planning Team used focus groups to engage with students and instructors and to learn more about their expectations of the new facility.

Informal interactions to judge user needs and/or perceptions of the change.

Interviews, surveys, focus groups.

Meetings with the academic department chair and library liaison (faculty member).

Staff simulated possible locations and desk configurations using the help of students.

Student Government was a champion and supporter of this project. Student comments from surveys influenced the planning process.

Student input at meetings.

Student involvement in renovation plans via in-house and online surveys and focus groups.

Survey, focus group, ethnographic observation of students’ use of building.

Surveys, focus groups, user forums.

The Faculty Committee on the Library System and other groups were engaged with the planning of the new organization.

We did extensive research and data analysis of user data in our initial review of our service desks. We did not ask our users what they wanted. Instead we looked at their use patterns and what questions were being asked.

We discussed plans with the student library advisory board and also conducted focus groups to discuss service desires and spatial issues regarding the service consolidation project.

We invited faculty in the media arts to have input on the services that would be offered.

Worked with faculty to design services and space.
Service Implementation

Business school funding grad student workers.
But only by virtue of counted numbers in decline.
Focus groups with faculty.
Focus groups, informal feedback from faculty.
Interviews, surveys.
Plans were adjusted based on faculty feedback.
The school helped with moving the collection and furniture, and managed/paid for construction.
Use of LibQUAL+® data helped to drive service desk changes as well as comments received via planning process.
User forums.
Users’ comments were analyzed and their priorities were acknowledged (LibQUAL+® survey).

Service Assessment

Assessment of services is part of user surveys.
Chat users have an opportunity to provide input via a brief survey after every transaction.
Collecting data on usage after implementation and anecdotal accounts from users; surveys of use planned for this year.
Desk staff passed out comment cards to users post-implementation.
Discussions with students.
During a library service desk team building and training day, student assistants and other users were asked to role play and provide feedback about the nature of service they desire in this type of arrangement. In addition, once the desk project is complete in Fall 2011, users will be asked to provide feedback about the level of service and the physical space (aesthetics, traffic, etc.)
Evaluations of library instruction and consultations; the space is included in annual library user satisfaction survey.
Feedback from the Library Student Advisory Committee.
Focus groups.
In year one, no formal assessment, yet. It will involve faculty and students.
Interviews, surveys, analysis of transactions and other use of services.
LibQUAL+®.
Ongoing self-assessment, comments from the staff, favourable feedback from users.
Our new User Experience department runs regular ethnographic studies to learn about user needs and share these needs with the rest of the organization for service design. We also now have a dedicated assessment librarian who will share the data from various community feedback streams.
Patron surveys.

Prospective. Intend to assess and modify services as needed once they are fully implemented.

Statistics gathering.

Survey (spring and fall).

Surveys.

Surveys; observation and focus groups (we had an ISchool student whose job was to do regular observation and reporting on use in the Research Commons).

This space is included in assessment efforts such as surveys and focus groups that look at services and technology provided, service, and physical space.

To evaluate new services desk structure.

User comments and feedback.

User feedback now coming in through LibQUAL+® regarding our reconfigured space, service points, and overall service quality.

User survey.

User surveys.

We continued to collect data on questions asked to ensure the desk staff we put at our different sites are adequate for the customers needs. We also do an action gap survey every year at each of our public service sites which looks at 1) what service dimensions users value most, 2) which of these they feel we do the best, and 3) where we need to most improve. This data helps us to target those areas that are highest priority and where we have the greatest “gap” in service quality.

We created a media faculty advisory board to provide feedback and consultation on the operation and development of the new department.

We have analyzed our government documents reference transactions (documented by LibStats).

**Additional Comments**

Implementation is ongoing and assessment is continuous, formative as well as summative. We do informal “check-in” with students using the space and make adjustments.

Most of the changes to service were on the operational and organizational side. Our community is surveyed every three years so our next survey will happen in October and likely ask questions about this.

Ongoing implementation, Student Advisory Council Terms of Reference currently being completed for new group to be formed in fall.

We administer surveys about services ongoing: LibQUAL+®, CountingOpinions.
Example 1: Assessment

15. What criteria did/will the library use to assess how well this service delivery reconfiguration met its goals? N=39

All service points (virtual and physical) get good usage; users report satisfaction with services (when questioned in subsequent surveys); staff report satisfaction with mix of duties and cross training.

As noted previously, we logged and analyzed questions for several years after the initial reconfiguration (the one that happened in 2005–06) and also have conducted the action gap survey at least once a year since then.

Budget savings and anecdotal evidence.

Contact initial focus group faculty for further discussion. Assess circulation data, as well as acquisitions data concerning move to hosted streaming.

Criteria will be developed in consultation with faculty and grad students.

Discussions with students.

Feedback from front-line staff and management. We’ll also watch for comments in our next (roughly biennial) iteration of the LibQUAL+® survey, next due in 2012. With the recent hiring of an assessment librarian, we have begun to do more focused surveys of users, and could conceivably test user reactions that way (though nothing is currently planned).

Feedback from users on our standard survey tools.

Get feedback from users (survey, other methodology); quantitative results from Desk Tracker statistics (use increased in part because of better visibility); staff report more appropriate referrals.

Given the nature of the change, there will not be any formal assessment.

How well our users are being served.

Increase in questions asked and overall use of service. Staff satisfaction with reconfiguration, student satisfaction with reconfiguration.

Increased usage.

Informal discussions with users.

LibQUAL+® survey results will be used in the future. Feedback from users is currently being used.

Maintaining or increasing the number of audiovisual transactions through the circulation desk.

None to date.

Potential criteria will include quality of service measures (for example: “Did you receive a satisfactory answer to your question?”), as well as efficiency measures such as service wait time.

Primarily just anecdotal evidence from staff at the remaining desk and librarian interactions with primary patron groups during reference interactions/research consultations.

Research Center staff continues to collect reference transaction information. Adoption of student-initiated appointments by students determined successful. Satisfaction of librarians with appointments also successful.
Still too new to assess.

The 24/7 space is included in assessment efforts such as surveys and focus groups which look at how well we are meeting patron needs in the areas of service provision, services and equipment, and physical space.

The library vacated the space in the timeframe specified by the university. Soon after closing, user complaints were virtually non-existent.

The new configuration should meet the information needs of patrons.

The reference librarians are able to answer the majority of government documents questions; the government documents librarian will be able to continue providing government documents instruction; the department has several librarians trained to handle more difficult and complex research.

Use: data indicate significant increase in gate count at this service point. Time on task: data indicate that students who use the Research Commons spend significantly more time in the library than students who use other areas. Collaboration: increased collaboration with Graduate School & Undergraduate Academic Affairs in support of student success at all levels.

User and staff feedback and assessment. Salary savings.

User and staff satisfaction.

User feedback, staff savings, user engagement with facility.

User satisfaction. Use of services. Contribution to library-wide discussion of services.

User satisfaction and ability to access and use the Media/Microforms collections. Reduced operating expenditures/ greater efficiency.

User satisfaction. Number of complaints.

User surveys.

Users are asked to rate satisfaction and importance of various library services in the annual library survey; the responses can be tied to particular libraries. Classes rate satisfaction with instruction on evaluations. One-on-one consultations are also rated.

We are comparing our LibQUAL+® data from 2011 to previous years to assess our service delivery reconfiguration. We will conduct additional surveys/focus groups as needed based on what we learn from LibQUAL+® data.

We are in our first year of using a Balanced Scorecard model for assessment. Each department developed objectives, targets, and measures. Many of these assessment goals were focused on determining changes to service quality or benchmarking the needs of the community.

We have not yet conducted a formal assessment but the anecdotal evidence in terms of support from faculty and students and much positive feedback tells us that the new department was well received.

We participate in LibQUAL+® so some comments from that survey may address the consolidation.

We will examine statistics and data related to these services, feedback from service providers received during listening sessions, and feedback from chat users via the online survey. We are still determining other mechanisms for gathering additional feedback from our users.
16. Please briefly describe up to three benefits that resulted or that you anticipate from this service reconfiguration. N=46

24/7 space available for students. Safe environment with security officer present for late night studying. Increased availability of computers, software, and study space.

A “one-stop-shopping” experience for users. Increased cross training for staff, thereby broadening skills sets to anticipate a wider variety of user needs and requests. An opportunity for a new library service desk redesign to create a more aesthetically pleasing experience for users.

A much more visible media services unit that is perceived as a benefit to supporting teaching and learning. A more efficient e-reserve operation for media. Added study rooms dedicated to the viewing of media.

Access to users by resource improved. Able to offer longer hours of service with the same number of staff. Back room operations much better.

Better ability to answer a diverse range of question (including technology help requests and university-centered needs). More interaction between service providers, enhanced communication. Central location near entryway allows for instant help to people entering the building.

Better, more efficient use of available staff. Consolidate service point: less confusion and shuffling between for patrons. Opportunity to train/retrain staff (faculty and support staff and students) cross departmentally (reference, circulation, reserves).

Better quality reference transactions with students. Appointments allow higher profile for library reference with faculty and administrators aware of this appointment service. Writing Center approached library about providing tutoring service in reconfigured Research Center.

Clarification of service expectations for staff working at service points across the libraries perhaps providing for some more consistency where possible as well. Distributed mechanism for providing chat and email reference allows more people to support these services at one time, thereby improving our ability to provide timely responses and to support more chat transactions despite increased demand. Increased capacity of previous service providers to take on other high priority work identified by the organization.

Consolidation of service for patrons in a highly visible location. Improved communication between Reference, Circulation creates learning opportunities for staff and improved service for patrons. Reference librarians/liaisons have more interaction with faculty and are able to see the books they select in circulation.

Convenience for users. Melding of audiovisual collection requests into existing workflow. Transfer of one staff member to 24/5 schedule.

Easier for students to locate service point. More efficient use of librarian and staff time.

Freeing up librarians’ time for other duties. More standardized policies, procedures, practices. More consistent coverage.

Freeing up staff time and creating more flexibility to schedules.

Having experts from other areas of the library is beneficial to the general reference librarians. Also, because the Main Reference Desk is on a different floor than the Government Documents Department, it is helpful for the Government Documents librarians to know more about general library resources.
Identification by users of most highly valued services. Implementation of new technological solutions to user need, e.g., specialized discovery tools, RSS feeds, e-learning environments. Implementation of “embedded librarian” approach emphasizing placement of library expertise “in the flow” of teaching and research in the liaison program.

Improved aesthetics, improved service flow for both areas, improved service for patrons as we were able to split checkout areas.

Improved utilization of staff. Improved space for users. Increased accessibility to and availability for some materials (e.g., revised policy allowing music CDs to circulate now).

Increased access to electronic health sciences content. Improved collaborations with college of medicine. Improved student understanding of main library services and resources.

Increased visibility and use of services and spaces for graduate students. Improved spaces and technology for collaboration among undergraduates and between TAs and undergraduates. More community visibility: demands for use of space for university conferences, symposia, colloquia, and poster sessions.

Increased visibility of media collection leading to greater access. Service point is on the floor with circulation and reference allowing for increased service support for media. Greater awareness among collection development librarians to address new opportunities for hosted streaming.

Interdisciplinary knowledge increased, staff recognized the expertise of others, discipline-specific silos were diminished. Users benefited because service hours were maintained/extended and users spent less time finding the service desk. The reconfiguration freed up more time for librarians to provide other priority services, such as teaching, outreach, collection development, advanced reference, consultation in offices, etc.

Less confusion for users about where to direct requests. Less confusion for Reference Department members about their role in monitoring the service point. Greater confidence that users are getting reliable and consistent information in response to their requests.

Librarian embedded in facility for convenient face-to-face consultations/interactions. Additional business librarian will help handle growing demand for general support and instruction in business programs throughout the university.

Librarians able to provide individualized services to users.

Made patrons more aware of the Learning Commons services. Saved staff and financial resources.

Major benefit is users have knowledgeable staff longer hours who can answer question that come up. Users also benefit from system that refers question to most appropriate answerer and likely quickest responder. Staff benefit both from cross training (strategic use of staff expertise) and cooperative understanding of roles across departments.

Major patron services are now all available on one floor during all of the hours that the library is open. The majority of staff in Access Services are now adjacent to one another and can cooperate more fully. Over time I believe that we will realize some savings in staff time (once the microform/media/and music monument materials and services are addressed).

More economical service provision. Service provided by more highly qualified staff. Service point located in a more visible and convenient location for users.

More free time for librarians. Users directed to main service desk.

More open space on first floor. Easier to direct patrons to Reference or Circulation as required.
New opportunity for support staff, upgraded positions. Librarians are more actively involved as models and mentors to desk staff. Some renovations to accommodate the single desk area improved physical aspects.

Not having circulation services allows much more time to deal with other services. There are fewer interruptions. Unlike circulation transactions, consultation & teaching time can be scheduled. “Business” was cut in half allowing time to produce a well-received newsletter. Not having technical services functions also contributed to freeing up time even though the circulation and tech staff was moved elsewhere. Moving the collection presented an opportunity to weed duplicates and materials no longer deemed valuable.

Our single service point resulted in overall improved customer service. Why? Allowed us to provide consistent training for all frontline service desk staff thanks to merging of circulation and reference units and reallocation of duties of third unit (taking ILS off service desk). Frontline services now completely focused on immediate user needs with removal of processing from “on-stage” to “backstage”. This has allowed for better customer focus at the desk and more accurate and efficient processing procedures off desk. More desirable first floor space available for student learning and public use.

Primary benefit is expected to be cost savings that will be used to meet budget cuts for 2011–12 and subsequently reduced base budget. Operating efficiencies will also permit re-allocation of resources toward growth of e-science programs.

Reduced staff costs. Reduced facilities costs. Staff available to be reassigned to other areas.

Reduced student labor costs. More robust e-journal collection.

Savings in our casual-hourly budget for student employees. Ability to reassign permanent staff. Greater convenience for users (“one-stop-shopping” for multiple formats).

Space where the reference desk previously stood has been reconfigured for use by students and other users. Since staff are cross trained, we have a more flexible workforce.

Staff working across library service points are familiar with the collections and services offered across one or more locations and disciplines, making them better able to support interdisciplinary research. There is more of a focus on the integration of both physical and virtual service points, and providing a consistent user experience across the multiple channels that users take to contact the Libraries. The organization is poised to be opportunistic and act more quickly on emerging service priorities from the community, which we will learn about through ethnographic studies, usability studies, and other channels for patron feedback. Delivery times for access to content should be improved, and options for access to materials via traditional interlibrary loan, paging services, and direct borrowing arrangements can be simplified and consolidated.

Students using the facility who never used library. Better connections with staff in Student and Enrollment Services who will be collaborating more with us as they move into the Student Success Centre. More opportunities to take advantage of new media in the production of new knowledge.

The change resulted in a reduction of staff (retiring staff member not replaced) and required fewer student employees. Two full-time staff positions could be redeployed to areas of greater need. Media/audiovisual materials in the collection were presented to users in a more visible and integrated way.

We anticipate users will be better served because they will be able to handle routine questions more quickly at service points.

We have not done a formal assessment, but user response has been positive because non-returnables can be picked up whenever the library is open. Unexpectedly, the staff like their new location better than their old. It’s all about windows.
We provide one-stop shopping for reference at the main reference desk. We have cross trained the government documents librarian to provide social sciences and humanities reference and instruction. We are using our professional staff more efficiently.

We were able to move our librarians to other critical work (creating online learning materials/objects, creating credit courses, establishing an institutional repository service, pushing out library resources, services, and learning materials to courses using the campus CMS, assessing the effectiveness of our information resources management, etc.). We were able to move extremely competent classified staff from areas where work was shrinking (cataloging) into new areas (reference), avoiding layoffs and keeping their significant knowledge and skills in the institution. We were able to move responsibility for covering public service points to a single team/unit, resulting in greater efficiency and more consistent customer service.

17. Please describe up to three unexpected challenges or difficulties that arose as a result of this service reconfiguration. N=35

A few heavy users of microforms were initially unhappy with the new location of the reader-printers.

A minor problem related to processing of materials that were checked out at the time of the move, but no other unexpected challenges arose.

Adjusting large number of bibliographic and item records to show new location and loan rules. Determining physical location and integration of AV materials. Introducing the handling and circulation of AV equipment into Circulation responsibilities (cameras, batteries, tripods, etc.)

Agreeing on a design: the project requires many different constituencies agreeing on space for staff needs, materials, and aesthetic issues as well. Funding: building a new service desk is not an incidental cost and our analysis suggested that in order to create a truly transformative aesthetic experience, a custom, mill-work solution was required. Grant funding offset the direct cost to some degree, but funding the project is still a large challenge. Staff buy-in: it takes time for staff who have traditionally worked in different cultures (circulation and reference) to accept and buy into a new service philosophy. Combining cultures has been a challenge but training and team building has helped this process.

Because we were in transition and moving materials to the new library, we were retrieving our most heavily used materials on behalf of the users because the stack floors were not yet open.

Challenge: more staff training is needed. This wasn’t unexpected, however.

Cross training of staff. Helping staff adapt to the changes.

Due to the value of certain media in older formats (VHS, DVD), there is a need to keep a number of titles in closed media. This limits access to some degree. With any non-circulating collection (unavailable for browsing), instructing the user searching titles in this collection is critical. New demands on circulation.

Having faculty adjust to the new procedures for submitting e-reserve requests for media. Having to staff the desk with student workers and coming up with a workable staff schedule to support the new service desk. That it was harder than we expected to get a digital media production unit started.

Here are some difficulties, though not unexpected: Some patrons had a difficult time adjusting to the move of circulation services from the entrance level. Cross training staff was labor intensive and disruptive, though beneficial.
Combining the ‘cultures’ of two previously distinct units has been a challenge, though staff are rising to the occasion.

I believe we anticipated the challenges well. And as I stated, this last shift had the benefit of the four larger libraries already having made the transition.

In a situation that I inherited and with a decision already made, we initially experienced resistance from some music department faculty to the notion of sharing services and staff. It was not clear to what degree previously agreed upon decisions had been discussed with/communicated to them.

Increased demand on facilities staff to configure and reconfigure spaces for multiple events in one day. Pressure for non-research related events due to temporary closure of student union building.

Integrating branch library collections into main library was complicated and time consuming. It was difficult to maintain open communication with affected faculty. Maintaining staff morale.

Librarian resistance to student-initiated appointments without text description of need unanticipated. Accommodation of text description greatly reduced librarian reluctance with appointment model. Note: Appointment not intended as consultation, but as extension of increasing instructional role of reference transactions and less fact-based; students requiring further assistance can be referred to appropriate subject librarians.

Librarians began to feel disengaged from their customers (especially students) and struggled to find ways to stay connected. Librarians also had trouble giving up a function they really enjoyed and valued, and which had been a central part of their job (and, perhaps, the reason they became librarians) for a very long time. Hiring, training, and retaining classified staff that have the necessary skills to be effective as on-demand reference providers has been an ongoing challenge. Staff who acquire these skills often go on to get their library degrees and then move on to other institutions.

More administrative time and attention was needed, e.g., more time was spent in cross training, there was a longer, steeper learning curve for GAAs, desk scheduling was more complex. More time commitment to hire, recruit GAA students jointly, and to select GAAs who were interested in and willing to learn two different sets of academic disciplines. Staff acceptance of the dual roles needs to be reinforced continually.

More crowded for reference. Very little room to collaborate with patrons.

No unexpected challenges occurred. (5 responses)

Ongoing confusion regarding reasons for library closure. Continued need to demonstrate library commitment to faculty and students in the affected field. Need to take consistent approach to changes, especially redefinition of faculty and staff responsibilities, across service model changes that are defined by individual experiences and opportunities.

Ongoing physical repairs, additions, and improvements to the furniture, equipment, and space. Complexity of training for all the service desk staff.

Rapid changes to technology meant we had to keep investigating options until it was purchased. We had to update some parts of the technology infrastructure very soon after we renovated the space. Not all the work was able to be completed on time.

Scaling training and developing on the fly, tiered reference. Although reference desk disappeared, reference staff moved into Circulation space, still ended up with three desks/windows. Reference staff and circulation staff operate differently (some schedule and sit at desk and wait for questions, others sit at desks in open and get interrupted constantly).
Significant resistance from faculty and graduate students, who value close proximity of librarians and library collections; plans had to be presented and refined multiple times in order to satisfy concerns of key constituencies.

Some people really dislike having to juggle in-person and online chat reference. It has increased how busy some service points are which makes the work more stressful at times. This may not always be a good fit for some staff but should be taken into consideration in any future hiring activities. Chat questions do not always roll over to the national queue as expected and lead to extended wait times. We have to constantly monitor whether the software is operating as expected; since we are working as part of a consortium of users of the software we don’t always have direct control of the settings and/or direct access to information about how it is really working (as compared to how it should work). Some liaisons/librarians miss the direct contact of the reference desk and the ability to learn about user needs through these interactions.

Staff resistance to changed duties even though developed and recognized their particular strengths in providing accurate and timely service to our broad user constituencies.

The new model for the service desk, where reference is provided on call, has required many adjustments. Staff and librarians had valued the relationships they developed by working side by side together. Now, librarians and staff are in different departments, or different locations, with less opportunity for interacting with one another, making it hard to maintain relationships.

There was a lot of push back from ed school faculty and students. This was not unexpected, but the reaction was underestimated. It would have helped to have had more input and buy-in from students. Working out new workflows for ILL and returned books was a challenge. Physically moving the collection, updating catalog records, removing ownership stickers, etc., in a very short time was a challenge.

Training. Consistency of service level.

Visibility of new service point from across the room (hard to see from a distance). Difference in service philosophies between partners.

We expected some challenges given the enormity of the project. We are still working to refine our processes at the service desk given the great amount of traffic we now see at this one service point. We are exploring models for a fast check-in lane or a temporary check-in lane for equipment and room keys to help reduce lines during peak hours. Other unexpected issues include increased noise levels near service desk (we knew there would be noise but surprised at how high the levels can be at times when coffee shop is busy shouting out drink orders!) and difficulty in monitoring what leaves the building/security gate monitoring (redesign did not include attention to location of security gates—desk is no longer within ideal placement of doors to adequately attend when alarm goes off).

If you want to describe a second service reconfiguration, please continue to the next screen. If not, please click here then click the Next>> button below to jump to the Anticipated Additions, Closures, Consolidations, or Other Reconfigurations section of the survey.

Only one service reconfiguration to describe. N=31
Example 2: Description and Driving Factors

18. Please briefly describe one type of service delivery change that occurred (for example, a new service point was established; service points A and B were consolidated to form new service point C; branch X was closed and services are now delivered at point Y; a new facility was opened with service points A, B, and C). N=21

A branch library reference desk was consolidated with the circulation desk.

A new Tech Help Desk was established near the Main Reference Desk.

Branch was part of a major remodel for another building.

Chapman Learning Commons: in addition to basic information services and referrals, the staff provide technology support, tutoring, writing support, study skills workshops, peer academic coaching, access to a variety of technologies. CLC partners with other service staff in the building for academic, technical, and teaching support. See question 18 for more information about the spaces and services within the building.

Chemistry Library closed; collections and services transferred to Biomedical Library.

Circulation and Reference assistance in one place.

Closed three branch libraries and consolidated one branch library that was located in the main library building. Three branches were consolidated into the main Reference and Research Services Division. One branch was consolidated into the Health Sciences Library.

Closed a branch library.

Combined Help Desk for access and reference services.

Consolidation of media library service point with the circulation desk.

Consolidation of multimedia resources and support services into one service point.

Copy Center became Scan/Copy Center.

Education Materials Centre formerly part of Faculty of Education added as Branch Library in 2010.

In December 2009, we closed the Physical Science Reading Room (PSRR) that was housed in the same building as the university’s Chemistry and Physics Departments. Two permanent support staff positions were re-assigned elsewhere in the library system. Collections were weeded to eliminate duplication (mostly print/digital duplication), then integrated into the collections of the main library.

In the Wilson Special Collections Library, the Rare Book Collection service point was relocated in 2010 from a dedicated reading room to a reading room shared with the North Carolina Collection. The former Rare Book Collection reading room is now used as a “grand reading room” for quiet study in one wing and for instruction in the other.

Opened Learning Commons.

Our Math Library was closed and its services and collections moved to the Science & Technology Library.

Service delivery change in interlibrary loan: ArticleReach unmediated article request service that enhanced loan requesting and broadened collections availability.
The College of Applied Science and the College of Engineering merged. As a result, the library serving the College of Applied Science was closed and merged into the existing Engineering Library.

The provision of technology services to users was reconfigured with the addition of a separate desk for user technology services, the consolidation of multi-media machines to the learning commons, and the standardization of computer desktop “build” to conform to the university’s standard was put into place.

We closed the service desk for the “secured collections” (medium rare materials). The desk had previously been a “barrier step” for users who wanted access to the medium rare material (art books, books on sensitive subjects, etc.) Users had to pass by the desk to gain entrance to the collection, and check out and return materials to the desk. The desk was located with the collection on the 4th floor away from the main circulation desk on the 1st floor. We closed the secured collections desk and moved the circulation functions to the main circulation desk on the first floor. We have had many positive comments from students and faculty who say it is much easier to use and that the environment is more welcoming now.

19. Which of the following factors were significant drivers in the decision to make this service reconfiguration? Check all that apply. N=21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in service philosophy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in library staff resources</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User demands</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change to library financial resources</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical change to a building or facility</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability/application of new technology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for collaboration with a partner outside the library</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for outsourcing service delivery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other factor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please briefly describe the other factor.

Opportunity to bring facility and staff into Library and Cultural Resources Organization.

Two colleges merged into one college.

Trying to get materials to users wherever they are and whenever they need them rather than going through a mediated library staff person. Newer technology enabled ability to provide articles via email without intervention.

Opportunity to consolidate multiple service points.

Another high-profile unit in the university (VP for Research & Economic Development) was seeking space in which to expand on central campus, and this particular space was targeted by both that unit and the library as a potentially good candidate.

Availability of resources in digital form.
The Math Department needed the space in their department for other activities and was willing to work to integrate collections and services.

Example 2: Physical or Philosophical Change

20. If a physical change to a building or facility had a significant impact on the decision to reconfigure this service, please briefly describe that change and the impact it had. If this did not have a significant impact, please enter NA for Not Applicable. N=21

14 responded NA.

IS&T brought student computer facilities into library and affiliated scanning services transferred to library copy center.

Major remodel relocated the branch to another floor and location in an addition to a building that was gutted and added to.

Prior to building deconstruction and reconstruction, the Chapman Learning Commons had been a visible service point on the main service floor. After reconstruction, the entrance to the Chapman Learning Commons was farther away from the front door and was now situated in a multi-purpose building, with the library services less visible from the entrance. The Chapman Learning Commons had to rethink how its services would be delivered and how they would be marketed.

Another unit on campus wanted this space, and the library agreed that this represented a “greater good.”

The Commons was constructed in an area formerly occupied by the reference department.

The main library was renovated in 2004 with consolidation of multiple access units. We had hoped to have better collaboration between the access and reference units but this took longer to accomplish.

The Math Department needed the space that had been the math library. The staff in our library system that worked in that unit retired and we were not able to replace those positions in the same way.

21. If a change in service philosophy had a significant impact on the decision to reconfigure this service, please briefly describe that change and the impact it had. If this did not have a significant impact, please enter NA for Not Applicable. N=21

6 responded NA.

Demand for services in the sciences for multimedia resources was low so we consolidated the services and equipment in our humanities/social sciences library with expert staff. Reassigned some technical staff to higher priority duties.
Desire to provide “one-stop shopping” for customers by training staff in Reference and Access units to provide basic services in both areas to all customers.

It has been the goal of the Wilson Special Collections Library to streamline services and eliminate both the confusion for the public and the redundancy that come from having five collections in three different reading rooms which, in the past, have each had different hours, policies, and procedures. Consolidation of services for the Rare Book and North Carolina collections in a single reading room is the first very visible step toward improving the Wilson Library experience for users.

It was not a good use of time to have a librarian sit at the branch reference desk. Circulation could handle many routine questions and refer to a subject specialist if needed.

More emphasis was placed on quick reference and referrals (triage) and less on intermediate reference level service, which could now be referred more easily to the combined Art+Architecture+Planning and Science/Engineering desk. Marketing of the integrated services and installation of new equipment/software in the building created more demand. The CLC moved the “coaching corner” off the desk to allow users to have more time for the services they wanted most. The technical questions continue to increase and are more varied and more complex.

Not really a change in philosophy, but a change in ability to provide the service, leading to heavier reliance on users’ own ability to find and request materials.

Our former Head of Systems wanted to try this idea in the hopes that it would help reference librarians who were answering lots of technical questions at the desk.

Re-thinking of what services might be provided to our users (more types of technology) and, at the same time, more self-service approach to multi-media workstations.

Students were copying less and asking to scan materials.

The Doucette Library of Educational Resources has long been a collaborator with University Library. Faculty budgetary reviews recognized they could no longer afford to run the facility. Library service philosophy placing higher value on presence in faculties increased attraction for bringing this facility into the LCR organization.

The library system has always been highly centralized (i.e., only a small number of branches) and our goal has been to centralize further as conditions and resources permit. In this case, the PSRR was directly across the street from our main library—by no means “remote.” It was increasingly difficult to justify the expense of maintaining a separate reading room so close to our main facility.

The Libraries is committed to the strategy of fewer, more consolidated service points. As more material and service is delivered electronically, we take the opportunity to leverage librarian expertise to support emerging needs. The increased interdisciplinarity of research and teaching also drives this change.

There was no change. The library had wanted to integrate this collection and service point for some time but the changing space needs within the Math Department made it possible for us to initiate this.

We needed to provide a location for 24x5 access to the building as well as new group study spaces and enhanced technology services.

We wanted to provide more access and more welcoming access for these materials. Users felt that a staffed desk made them not want to browse and spend time in the stacks. We wanted to change this perception.
Example 2: Financial and Staff Resources

22. If a change in library financial resources had a significant impact on the decision to reconfigure this service, please briefly describe that change and the impact it had. If this did not have a significant impact, please enter NA for Not Applicable. N=21

12 responded NA.

Budget reduction resulted in closure of Chemistry Library.

Due to financial exigencies we had to consolidate some services to be able to reassign valuable staff elsewhere.

Endowment fund was discontinued. The budget for staffing was decreased: from 15 staff to 12.

Need to maximize available resources is forcing library-wide examination of services and practices, including in special collections.

Significant cuts to the library budget.

The Libraries sustained several rounds of budget cuts during this period—1.5% (mid-year recission), 12%, 5%, and 2.4%. We met the personnel budgets through elimination of vacant positions as much as possible, but did have to do some layoffs as well. As a result we had to realign the distribution of resources, including staff, to areas of growth and high demand.

The media library service point was being operated 80+ hours per week with one professional, one support staff, and many student employees. Loss of support staff through attrition and budget reductions across the libraries facilitated the need to consolidate student employment resources and staffing in fewer locations.

The same budget constraints mentioned in the previous example (i.e., desire to reduce the casual-hourly budget for student employees and reallocate permanent staff) came into play here.

We needed to move the staff member who was responsible for staffing this desk to another role within the library; we also were limited on our student resources and determined that we could close this service point and save on resources.

23. How did this service reconfiguration impact permanent library staff? Check all that apply. N=19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Librarians</th>
<th>Other Professionals</th>
<th>Support Staff</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing staff moved to the new service point</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing staff were reassigned within the library</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position(s) was reduced through attrition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff were hired to fill newly created positions</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of work were reduced</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other impact</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please specify the other impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Librarians</th>
<th>Other Professionals</th>
<th>Support Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brought a new librarian with strong experience to the branch leaders team.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5 FTE library staff added to LCR team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians have more time to accomplish other duties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced hours at desk.</td>
<td>Peer counseling services were provided away from the service desk.</td>
<td>More cross training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Layoffs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scanning services were added to copy service center.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Computer Lab manager has to staff an extra desk, on another floor, either with students or by covering the hours himself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undetermined possible reduction in mediated ILL, increased user delivery, some monitoring of the ArticleReach service itself, and monetary impact on copyright permissions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Please briefly describe the impact on staff, including number of staff affected, how assignments changed, whether reporting relationships changed, etc. N=16

Both of the support staff moved into vacant positions elsewhere in the library system—effectively allowing us to reduce the size of our staff by two FTE.

Chemistry Librarian retired; staff reassigned.

Consolidation of reading rooms made possible in part by staff re-organizations approximately a year earlier. There are now single special-collections-wide units for technical services and for research and instruction, rather than parallel units within each special collections department. Staff have been reassigned to the new units, and some public service staff now provide service from a location that is new to them.

Initially, librarians and support staff were assigned to the Commons Desk. Over time, this was changed to a model of IT support staff and library student employees. The desk was much busier with laptop checkout than anticipated.

IS&T transferred existing scanners for public use to the library; the library purchased one overhead scanner for student/public use and one for Scan/Copy Center staff use (primarily for ILL). Number of copiers in library reduced. Existing copy center staff manage both scanners and copiers.
Librarian hours at the Reference Desk were reduced enabling them to spend more time in subject librarian outreach. Cooperation and collaboration between Reference and Access staff was greatly increased.

Librarian now reports through the Research Support Team to Libraries and Cultural Resources. 5.5 FTE added to staff. Positive addition to cross-functional teams in reference and instruction.

One librarian retired, a support staff member left. All other staff were reassigned to other remaining services outside the branch.

Our librarians had provided all services to the Math Department and this has not changed. Since the two dedicated staff that worked in the Math Department Library retired, there was the need to assess and redesign workflows and patterns so that the other staff members could provide an acceptable service level.

Reporting relationship: student representatives report to both the Student Development Coordinator (Other Professional above) and the Chapman Learning Commons Librarian.

Reporting relationships changed for one support staff. Two professional staff moved to two other departments. Student budget was reduced.

Staff learned a new system (monitoring) and developed perhaps better sense of user requests.

The Head of the Engineering Library retired during the planning of the consolidation and the Head of the College of Applied Science Library was named the head of the newly combined library of the College of Engineering and Applied Science. One professional position was not replaced. Needs were identified in other areas of the library system and two staff positions were reassigned. One full-time staff position from the College of Applied Science Library moved to the “new” combined library along with the librarian.

Three FTE librarians were reassigned to the main Reference and Research Services Division and report to the head. One FTE Social Work Librarian was assigned to the main Health Sciences Library (reporting stayed in HSL) but retains an office in the School of SW. Four FTE staff in closed branches were laid off according to the terms of the union contract.

Three staff directly affected: one professional and two support staff. Professional and one support staff changed reporting relationship. Professional moved responsibilities from managing service desk in media library to participating in circulation services and managing stacks.

While most duties for providing technical support to users stayed the same, the reporting relationships changed. Additionally, more students were hired to work in this new service area.

Example 2: New Technology

New/emerging technology has the potential to enhance library services. QR Codes, GIS applications, Skype, student course-centered software such as Blackboard, collaborative sites such as SharePoint, Basecamp, or Google Sites/Documents, and cloud-based computing solutions such as Amazon EC2 are just a few examples with library applications.
25. If the availability of new technology had a significant impact on the decision to reconfigure this service, or if the new configuration permitted the application of new technology, please briefly describe that technology and the impact it had. If this did not have a significant impact, please enter NA for Not Applicable. N=21

14 responded NA.

ArticleReach enabled unmediated ILL requests directly to user desktop email. Enabled direct ILL service, reduced staff intervention, increased user satisfaction.

Certainly, the growing availability of collections in digital format (especially journals and especially journals in STEM areas) made it much easier to close a reading room devoted to the physical sciences.

Concurrent with service reconfiguration, special collections will be deploying single automated reader-registration software.

Learning technologies prompted the CLC to add Centre for Teaching and Learning Technology staff to the service desk. More sophisticated technologies, including wireless, generated many more and more complex questions by students. Students demanded more multimedia equipment/software for their assignments and projects and staff were recruited to respond to these needs.

One of the criteria for closing branches is the extent to which the literature has moved to electronic distribution.

Physical renovation provided opportunity to add overhead scanner for public use and incorporate overhead scanner into staff space.

We experimented with installation of Teamspot software to enable real time collaboration on multiple desktops/laptops. The success was minimal largely due to lack of training and promotion.

Example 2: Collaboration and Outsourcing

26. If an opportunity for collaboration with a partner outside the library had a significant impact on the decision to reconfigure this service, please briefly describe that opportunity and the impact it had. If this did not have a significant impact, please enter NA for Not Applicable. N=21

14 responded NA.

Collaboration: Student Development and library relationships changed somewhat over time. Centre for Teaching and Learning Technology became more significant as a partner (occupies the same building, among other factors). Central IT services were less available.

IS&T transferred responsibility for managing scanning services to library as consequence of significant physical renovation and installation of IS&T computing services in the library.
Services in the Commons are jointly provided with campus IT. A new coffee shop, owned and operated by a local vendor, is also in the space.

The Math Department initiated the change to some extent and it was an opportunity to work closely with their faculty. However, there had been a close relationship prior to the change.

The technology services provided by campus IT were a consideration in planning and has led to increased dialog, but no formal collaboration has yet developed. Library’s IT and campus IT do share a user technology online FAQ.

While the library wasn’t “collaborating,” per se, we were indeed perceived to be good university citizens by voluntarily ceding space to another university office.

Worked closely with the School of Architecture to design a space that both the library and the School of Architecture would find functional and aesthetically pleasing.

27. If an opportunity for outsourcing service delivery had a significant impact on the decision to reconfigure this service, please briefly describe that opportunity and the impact it had. If this did not have a significant impact, please enter NA for Not Applicable. N=21

All 21 responded NA.

28. Please make any additional comments on the factors that drove this service reconfiguration. N=6

Demand for 24x5 space.

Need to continue to provide access to collections and services led to integration of Chemistry at Biomed.

The availability of a lot of common digitally meant the need to use resources onsite was diminished.

The merging of two colleges drove the new library service reconfiguration.

We closed two branches very quickly in the first year of the budget cuts. We received very little advanced notice of the magnitude of the cuts and thus did a much less consultative process than normal.

We were able to accommodate the collection because of extensive weeding that had happened prior to this in the SciTech Library.
Example 2: User Participation

29. Did your library involve users in the planning, implementation, and/or assessment of this service reconfiguration? Please select one answer in each row. N=20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you answered “Yes”, please briefly describe the methods that were used to engage users.

Planning Process

Better data was available through Desk Tracker statistics/analysis.
Consultation with the faculty.
Consulted with users.
Discussions with dean and leading faculty.
Faculty of Education executive worked with LCR administration in planning.
One branch library included faculty, staff, and graduate students in a year-long planning process.
Student input at meetings.
The art librarian consulted with the art faculty (high users of the collection).
User groups were consulted during the planning process. Special meetings were set up with affected parties for communication and input. Presentations and updates were given at standing faculty meetings.

Service Implementation

Consultation with the faculty.
Consulted with users.
Ongoing assessment of the implementation through regular surveys.
Tracking of questions prompted changes in service emphasis.
User feedback on changes as initially rolled out have led to a number of important modifications.
Service Assessment

Classroom assignment to provide written assessment of space.
Consultation with the faculty.
Consulted with users.
Gathering user input on satisfaction with the service.
Questions about library service were asked on recent library survey but no specific questions about the service desk changes.
Staff hold weekly rapid fire debriefings to identify and understand users’ changing needs.
Still to come.
Triennial survey of faculty and students.

Example 2: Assessment

30. What criteria did/will the library use to assess how well this service delivery reconfiguration met its goals? N=15

Ability to meet demand from users. Ability to expand work in emerging technologies and web services where the professional staff were moved to.
Change just one year old, no formal assessment, yet. Branch services will be assessed as part of Balanced Scorecard exercise. Library plans to participate again in LibQUAL+® survey in 2013.
Consultation with the faculty.
Consulted with users.
How well we serve our chemistry users’ needs.
Increased institutional capacity to meet emerging needs. Ability to meet required budget cuts while maintaining and strengthening the public service programs. Acceptance by user groups most affected as gauged through triennial survey and other feedback mechanisms.
Informal feedback. We are relieved to report that we received only a couple “lukewarm” complaints from senior faculty about the closing of this reading room. We did make a very concerted effort to give users lots of advance warning, explained our decision, etc.—lots of attention to positive PR. We also had a very good delivery service in place when collections were in transit and/or briefly closed to public access.
Informally, the staff has paid attention to the favourable comments by students and the degree of use of the service.
LibQUAL+®: factors identified by users as their priorities. In-house tutoring and support survey: to determine effectiveness of collaboration between referral services.
Library survey comments.
Number of articles delivered and requests generated by users; growth of use of service over time.

The newly consolidated library is included in assessment efforts such as surveys and focus groups which look at how well we are meeting patron needs in the areas of service provision, services, collections, technology, and physical space.

Use of scanning services. Use of copying services.

User feedback.

We will track user complaints about access to these materials; we will track any damage to the print collections.

31. Please briefly describe up to three benefits that resulted or that you anticipate from this service reconfiguration. N=18

Ability to focus scarce librarian expertise on emerging needs. Ability to staff units with high use while making required reductions to personnel budget.

Additional space, more prominent location, added study/meeting rooms which had not existed.

Chapman Learning Commons integrated services meet user needs efficiently and effectively. New funding model permitted more targeted recruitment of staff who had the desired technical and customer services skills. Shifting the academic coaching to “off the desk” was a better fit for the Learning Commons’ mandate.

Expanded capacity in high priority services. Reduced student budget. Potential repurposing of space.

Financial savings.

Increase in permanent staff available for circulation desk service. Overall increase in hours of availability of media to users. Decrease in student employment budget.

Librarian and staff of Doucette Library receive benefit of shared resources of Library and Cultural Resources (LCR). Librarian and staff of Doucette Library strong contributors to LCR’s internal cross-functional teams.

Librarian time is used more effectively.

Library is now central location on campus for student and faculty scanning needs.

More efficient use of existing staff. Streamlined and less confusing process for library users, especially undergraduate students and other new users.

Reconfiguration of desks has freed up regular staff to do other things; to focus and develop support specific to technology questions in the form of online guides and online tutorials.

Reduction in costs. Assessed and reduced size of chemistry print collection. Assessed services.

Subject librarians have more time for contact with users. Users are more likely to get questions answered without referrals and less likely to have to wait for assistance. Better respect and communication between units.

The new facility energized the entire library. Students take advantage of group work spaces. Increased visibility of the library on campus to many constituencies.
The space within our SciTech library that is devoted to the math collection was renovated so is a nicer space and student usage of the physical space has increased.

Theoretical materials and practical/applied materials were brought together in the areas of engineering and applied science. Undergraduate students have a broader array of materials available to them in one location in the areas of engineering and applied science.

Users feel comfortable browsing the stacks. We save on staff and student resources.

Users get article faster. User gets article directly delivered to email from their own unmediated request. Library staff spend more time on more difficult ILL and/or circulation services.

32. Please describe up to three unexpected challenges or difficulties that arose as a result of this service reconfiguration. N=13

Because the space within our SciTech library is a nicer space and student usage of the physical space has increased, faculty do not see it as their private library any longer. It remains to be seen how this will evolve.

Copyright costs.

Need a bigger space (not really unexpected?) Initial demand for laptop checkout created maintenance issues.

None.

Relocating collections. Boutique services do not transfer easily.

Significant addition of glass presents housekeeping challenge. Faculty and staff in the school and architecture library decided to bar food and drinks in the new facility which has made some patrons unhappy.

Some initial resistance from librarians and staff. Cross training is very time consuming.

The influx of collections from PSRR did exacerbate the problem of collections storage in our main building, and did precipitate a fairly major reorganization requiring weeding, shifting of stacks on two floors. But again, the net result (more consolidated, less fragmented collections) is positive, from our perspective.

The more technical services offered, the more services are expected. Difficulty finding staff who have both the technical and customer service skills/attributes. Libraries never seem to be able to keep up with demand for additional and updated equipment/software.

The Tech Help Desk is in an awkward location, and questions are very low.

There are limitations to what work-study students can be expected to do in terms of hours, training, and responsibility.

There is less space available for collections, study space, and computers. It was complicated and difficult to assign new library homes for some materials, especially given that space constraints exist in other libraries as well.

This reconfiguration was initially envisioned as part of a much broader unification of all special collections reader services into a single consultation area and adjoining reading room. Concerns expressed by library users have led the library to revise plans and instead perform additional study of student and faculty use patterns and seek broader input in order to guide development of Wilson Library services.
33. In the next three years, do you anticipate that any staffed service point in your main library or that any branch that reports to the main library will be added, closed, consolidated, or otherwise reconfigured? N=59

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

Answered Yes

A new Chemistry Library is in the planning stages.

Actively planning to introduce appointment reference model to one underutilized branch library located in most heavily used classroom building on campus. May expand appointment model elsewhere later.

Fine Arts hopes to repurpose their former rare book room space in 2012. The Digital Media Lab will be reconfigured in the next three years. (They reconfigure almost yearly.) The main library anticipates closing the 3rd floor service point in Gov Docs. Staff will still provide service but there won’t be a service desk.

Gov Pubs/Maps and Law will integrate with our academic liaison group. New learning commons opens in summer 2012. We do not plan a staffed service point in the commons. Conversations are occurring now about how our service model will evolve to support the new commons.

High likelihood that circulation desk and reference desks will merge. Currently some dozen yards apart, but reconfiguration would free space for users while providing more focused staff presence for the user.

In December 2010, we hired a Director of Special Collections to merge and lead what had previously been two separate special collections operations: our Special Collections Department and our Urban Archives Department. As a part of this major reorganization and consolidation, in 2011–2012 we anticipate consolidating our two special collections reading rooms into one. This will enable us to provide more consistent, higher quality reference services and make better use of our existing staff to redistribute their work load more equitably across public services, exhibits, outreach, processing, cataloging, and acquisition. The second (closed) reading room will be reconfigured as teaching space for class visits to special collections. In addition, we are just starting to work on reconfiguring our digitization services. With the creation of a new Digital Library Initiatives Department in December 2010, we are starting to explore how to offer digitization on demand and other related services to library and special collections users. Our university currently expects to build a new main library within the next three to five years. Even if it takes longer, we may try some additional service desk configurations, as described below.

In Fall 2011 a large new learning commons will open adjacent to the main library building. This commons is connected on two levels to the main library. In addition, the new commons is managed by the library. There will be an information and advising service desk in the new commons, staffed and managed by the library.

In main library, microforms currently has dedicated service point. Staff and services associated with microforms are likely to be integrated with main research and instruction service point. We would like to consider additional reconfigurations...
(e.g., merging circulation and research/instruction desks), but the extensive renovations required for such a move are not feasible at this time.

It is possible that reference service points will be consolidated with circulation service points in one or more locations in the future.

Main Science and Social Science libraries will be consolidated in 2011.

New reference desk in renovated research library; transferred from existing location.

Our new knowledge commons area opens in the fall and we anticipate that this will result in the consolidation of other desk in the main library building. We are also examining the possible consolidation of the science libraries (consisting of three branch libraries and one library in the main library building).

Reconfigurations of the service points will be ongoing as new services are added. Since many members of our community access library materials online, our organization will have to determine the best strategy to provide service in our physical spaces, while also supporting increased remote electronic access. We have an opportunity to improve the delivery of physical materials to users by offering increased scanning services, delivery to campus office or dorms, and improving the online browsing experience. As the role of physical collections within library spaces changes, the role of the service point will change as well.

Reserves desk will close in 2011 and reserves will be supported at the circulation desk.

Spencer Research Library will be remodeling the main reading room, putting in a new desk and reconfiguring the user space.

Staffed Service Point: Plans for second floor renovation of main library. Reconfiguration/relocation of some of Media Services, physical consolidation of Learning and Outreach staff offices into one office suite nearby teaching facilities (currently staff offices are spread out between two buildings and not near classrooms), newly renovated plus additional library classrooms and meeting rooms, and increased/additional office and programming space for the University Writing Center currently housed in the library on the second floor. Branch Library: Consolidation of reference and circulation desks into single service point at the business library. This will include basic renovations to first floor to enhance public spaces in addition to redesign of main service desk.

The libraries have just initiated a strategic planning process that will very likely have an impact on services and facilities in several locations, but at this point we do not have specific plans in place.

The National Agricultural Library’s downtown branch, known as the DC Reference Center, is expected to be reconfigured in conjunction with a relocated, redesigned, and enhanced USDA visitor services space.

This summer we will close our Math/Physics branch library. Collections will be relocated to a variety of places: high-density storage facility, Engineering library, Earth Sciences library, main library. Staff will be reassigned. This is our smallest branch facility and the closure was initiated by the Physics Department’s need for space. It is widely used by students as a study space. We will move some seats to the main library but the nearby branch libraries will see more student traffic. Faculty were the primary users of the print collections. They have been mostly supportive of this change. This is all in stark contrast to the library’s own efforts to shutter this facility nearly 10 years ago.

Two traditional service points (reference and circulation) will become a single service desk in 2012.

We are beginning conversations about how to reconfigure the desks in our Humanities and Social Sciences Library.

We are considering closing an on-campus departmental library, and hope to move closer to a single service point for the Main Floor, at least.
We are CONSIDERING closing of one or more science branch libraries (consolidating collections, etc.) and reconfiguring space in those locations. We are considering a centralized telephone reference service, especially for weekends, for our units in the New Brunswick/Piscataway area.

We are discussing closing several other service points in the main library: Microforms and Periodicals, and Education Services. We are also discussing consolidating the Music and Multimedia Libraries.

We are investigating combing reference and circulation functions in the main library. We are also investigating combing reference and circulation functions in the Science Library. With staff retirements, a small (staffed) satellite reading room in an off-campus lab will probably be closed.

We are planning a multimedia center that will focus on multimedia production and tools, etc. Service and equipment for microforms will move to the lower level where the circulation/reserves desk is now. Media materials and music monuments will become self-service with some assistance given by staff from the multimedia service point. So, in a sense, we are adding a service point and we are consolidating service for equipment and particular collections as well.

We are planning on moving our photography book collection from the Center for Creative Photography to our Science and Engineering Library. This will make these books more available to our customers (as those collections are open many more hours than the CCP library had been) and will also open up the space that had been used to house these books to use as a new research center for photography scholars. The CCP’s print viewing service (where scholars could request to view prints held in the CCP’s collection) will also be moved into this same space, consolidating all of the CCP’s research/reference services in a single point.

We expect to add a small service desk next to the Auxiliary Storage Collection.

We have four branch libraries on campus. Zimmerman Library, the largest, is the first to undergo the Combined Service Point transition. A comprehensive renovation of the staff space in the next 12 months will complete the transition in that space. The circulation and reference desks in the other three branches will be following suit.

We have one remaining reading room that is staffed, in the Design College, that could conceivably close in the future. That closing could be initiated by either the library (to save personnel costs) or the college (to recoup and repurpose the space). It’s actually been considered (but vetoed) on two separate occasions in the past three years. Time will tell. We also maintain a small, unstaffed reading room for our Math Department—just a few thousand volumes representing journal backfiles (nothing currently received) in theoretical math, of very limited interest to anyone else on campus.

Again, at some point the department could ask for the space. Also, we have flirted with the idea of moving hard-copy course reserves from our Media Center to our Circulation Desk. This would make them available for checkout all hours the building is open, as opposed to the limited hours of the Media Center. Still under discussion.

We hope to expand our digital services efforts by creating a Center for Digital Collaboration.

We will be renovating one of our libraries which will result in changes in service points and staffing patterns.

With the opening of the new James B. Hunt Jr. Library in 2012/13 as an additional “main” library, the Textiles branch library (5 FTE) will be closed and its services/collections will be incorporated into the Hunt Library.

With the opening of the Taylor Family Digital Library (TFDL) services will be realigned. Most importantly, Archives and Special Collections and the Nickle Arts Museum become part of a new grouping within the TFDL called the Centre for Arts and Culture. They will share special facilities for mediated access to primary resource collections.
Answered No

I say ‘no’ but who knows what three years will bring. We have no further changes planned, but we do need to evaluate and there could be changes that come out of that process.

Not in the next three years, but we do anticipate some libraries closing in the next 5 to 10 years.

What will happen in future is not yet known.

34. If you answered “Yes” above, please indicate how many of these staffed service points and/or branches you anticipate will be added, closed, consolidated, or otherwise reconfigured in the next three years. Enter 0 if none will be added, closed, consolidated, or otherwise reconfigured. N=47

**Staffed Service Point**

39 respondents reported some change to service points; 8 reported no change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Added</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otherwise reconfigured</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Added</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otherwise reconfigured</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Branch Library**

22 respondents reported some change to branch libraries; 25 reported no change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Added</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otherwise reconfigured</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Added</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otherwise reconfigured</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

35. Please enter any additional information that may assist the authors’ understanding of your library’s experience with the reconfiguration of staffed library service delivery points. N=21

Anticipate combining access service points for more efficient service delivery and enhancing space in large branch library.

Assessment of the research commons is not yet complete. This is a new program and service that was launched in Fall 2010. While we have some data on the space and its uses, we do not yet have sufficient data on the success of service and program offerings.

At this point we have done two pilots with comibing reference and circulation functions. We have several librarians who provide service from departmental locations, e.g., political science and chemistry. We would like to expand that.

Attempting to consolidate all service points to first floor, which will be reconfigured into an Information Commons type space.

Decisions driven mostly by budget reductions and not changes in service philosophy.

From a service point of view, the new merged service point is functioning successfully. A major challenge for us has been the ongoing work of blending conflicting cultures (Reference and Circulation) and how to coexist as a team. We are planning team building activities in the next few months to help us grow and develop as a team.

Most of our efforts are focused on reconfiguring other areas of the library.

Much like our first floor renovation, we are reconfiguring and renovating these areas to make better use of our space (maximize and enhance public spaces) and in the process improve the customer service experience of our users by simplifying service points and/or making them accessible in places that are easy to find and are nearby supporting units.

The changes to Media Services will involve moving our media lab (and one full-time staff member for technical support) and the creation of two new podcasting studios to the second floor of the main library. It will be located nearby the University Writing Center which will provide collaborative content support (vs. technical support) for students working on media projects/presentations. The Writing Center and Learning and Outreach staff already work collaboratively to support student learning. This renovation will allow them to be nearby each other and nearby the new class and meeting rooms they will use to support students.

On the first floor of our main library we have two reference desks that are only a minority of the time staffed by librarians; student interns provide most of the coverage. One is for Science & Technology and the other is for Business, Humanities, and Social Sciences. There have been discussions about consolidating these two service points.
Our library organization is undergoing tremendous change due to the implementation of a new strategic plan and budget reductions happening simultaneously.

Our main library building is undergoing significant change. One-half of the book collection has been moved out to storage. The goal is to reduce print journal collection by one-half. These changes have implications for what services and what locations for them are needed.

Over the next three years, the campus Student Success Services will be housed within the main library. Consequently, space and service points are being reconfigured.

Please understand that some of the changes in question 17 are still in the talking stages.

Ranganathan’s law is certainly holding true here. The library is indeed a “changing organism.” A desire to improve user experience, as well as maximize librarian time allocation has resulted in the consolidation of three service points to a single, combined service point. However, at the same time, a new learning commons is being built to include a separate information service point with advising and other non-library activities also part of the suite of services. This new learning commons service point will be managed and staffed by the library. So, as some service points consolidate (circulation and reference), other service points are being added to reflect evolving responsibilities for the library.

Serving student demand for printing is significant. Semester limits for free printing by students were also introduced, with fee-based printing provided. Conviction that a blank desk or table no longer sufficed as adequate academic library work environment for students and that computer services for student belonged in the library and not elsewhere on campus. Either a computer needs to sit on the library desk or the student connects his or her laptop wirelessly (which the building has) with electricity provided (added to many desk locations in the building). Consistent student government engagement with Dean of Students and University Librarian over years supported expansion of library hours. Dean of students actively engaged by students in change in print policy; modifications ensued.

UBC Library has 31 staffed library service point and 14 branches/divisions that provide reference services. The two largest buildings are the Koerner Library and the Irving K. Barber Learning Centre—a multi-purpose renovated building which includes the Library, Chapman Learning Commons, classrooms, academic units, Centre for Teaching and Learning Technology, social spaces for students. The Reference Services Review Committee was formed in 2011 to review reference services for the library system. The purpose is to identify possible models that might provide services in a more accessible, consistent, cost-effective way, either by consolidation or other reconfigurations. The intent is also to reallocate scarce resources to the emerging demands for services on copyright, scholarly communications, liaison with faculty, instruction. At the same time, the intent is to maximize services that can be offered as self-serve (e.g., self-serve circulation).

We are currently exploring new public service models and are exploring whether we could benefit from either a merged reference/circulation model or one that brings them into closer proximity, or some model where there is only one service desk for access services and the reference service is not operated from a desk but some other configuration. This is now only in the discussion stage.

We continue to have more service points than most academic libraries by design. We feel that they offer better quality service.

We have been consolidating service points for 15 years, first merging circulation and a distinct reserve room (down the hall) in a 1995 renovation. Next, we incorporated service points in our periodical reading rooms into the work of the information desk. Most recently, we moved ILL to the circulation/reserve service point for staff and user efficiencies, and also to repurpose the original ILL space for a quiet reading room. Our primary purpose in consolidating service points is to avoid user confusion and offer as many services as possible from a reduced number of service points. Our new service
points are single/consolidated service points in new or newly acquired locations. Our goal is to provide a consistently positive experience for our users wherever they are working physically and virtually.

We have not yet totally closed or consolidated desks but have instead reduced hours that they are open. We will be examining this closely in the coming year and will likely close/consolidate some desks permanently.
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