

***MIT Libraries: What do we need to invest in to move toward the desired future state? What can we do less of?***

**I. Areas in which we need to invest more resources to be successful in the future. Group A also included “Less Of”. (Notes from Library Council Meeting, 6/1/09)**

**Group A Investments**

- Capacity to improve software infrastructure
- Capacity to improve HR strategies
- Assessment to inform investment choices
- Curation of MIT content
- Collaboration
- Decided that this list looks like strategic directions

**Group A “Less Of”**

- Print purchasing & content management
- Service points and functions (physical)
- Administrative redundancies
- Invest in making this happen

**Group B Investments**

- MIT produced content
- Online presence
- Consolidation of Physical Collections digital preservation
- Managing digital content
- Marketing
- Better delivery infrastructure for physical and digital
- Repurpose/refurbish remaining public space
- Staff training
- Selective and targeted collaboration with internal & external partners

**Group C Investments**

- Invest in better exposure of our digital assets (infrastructure & cataloging)
- Marketing & Communication/Outreach/Awareness
- Digital Preservation
- Item access

**II. In order to do more in some strategic areas, Library Council members identified areas where we might reduce effort/resources. (Notes submitted by Library Council members after June 1<sup>st</sup> LC meeting.)**

- LESS descriptive metadata for purchased/licensed assets (i.e. just provide location information)
  - LESS space programming (i.e. fewer physical spaces for users)
  - LESS print processing
- 
- Less work on print materials
    - a. less purchasing
    - b. less cataloging
    - c. less management - stacks, preservation, weeding, etc.
  - Fewer service points
    - a. fewer service points in total
    - b. fewer staff needed to people those service points
  - Fewer redundant positions
- 
- Have fewer physical service points. Consolidate collections so that materials need to move around less.
  - Less in-depth cataloging (in favor of more quick metadata)
  - Less management - Reduce layers of management - we have up to 5/6 layers in an organization of only 200 FTE.
- 
- Acquire as few print journals as possible
  - Much less in-house cataloging and end-processing
  - Cease having a staffed service point in Barker Engineering Library, and consolidate its core collection into Hayden; store all but core collections offsite
- 
- Stop print Journal check-in, claiming and binding
  - Consolidate service points
  - Have some positions 9-10 month positions, reducing staffing at desks in summer
-

- Accept none or extremely reduced amount of printed gift materials older than 5 years (we've already cut 1 full-time gifts support position for FY10)
  - Devote less staff time to handling new printed materials -- either radically reduce or streamline what is done and slow down the flow of print.
  - Reduce public service open hours during term schedule by opening doors an hour later, or something similar.
- 

- Reduce public service/circulation points and collocate related collections, e.g., close Barker and merge with Science in Hayden.
  - Reduce effort for selecting/acquiring/checking-in/cataloguing/specialized processing of purchased, print collections.
  - Reduce number of systems requiring updating and tracking of "essential" information, e.g., Vera, Commitments, Aleph.
- 

- Eliminate (stop doing something)
- Reduce (do less of something)
- Lower our standards (do something less well)

Everything we do has value, so whatever we identify will result in losing something and causing distress to someone. For this reason, we are unlikely ever to reach consensus on what to eliminate, reduce, or do less well. In the end, SC will have to make a decision and then be prepared to take the flak resulting from moving it forward to implementation

- REALLY do the things we have considered, but didn't implement because of a lack of consensus. Return to the R2 report and REALLY implement its recommendations. Centralize Processing and MAKE the new unit eliminate, reduce, and/or lower the standards involved in the tasks they used to do without the option of delegating them to anyone else. Accept shelf-ready catalog copy from contributing libraries and not just LC. Eliminate ALL next-day checking of cataloging, and reviewing of music catalogers' work. Stop accepting gifts of print items, no matter what they are or who is donor is. Implement rules-based storage guidelines, and disallow subject selectors from going to the shelves or doing extra research to supplement the decisions generated by the rules. Accept books received from approval plans and shelf-ready books, without reviewing them, and ship them directly to their final destination without ANY reviewing, checking, etc.
- Eliminate ALL manual double-checking of work involved in getting physical items to the shelf, and all corrections that don't directly affect any access points. Live with a higher percentage of errors in the processing of print materials, and sacrifice the special handling.

- Reduce our administrative overhead by lowering our expectations with regard to performance reviews and evaluation. A more streamlined review process might allow a single supervisor to oversee the work of more individuals.
- Do some careful analysis in order to find if outsourcing really saves us. If so, I can think of several things we presently do locally that might be additional candidates for outsourcing.

- 
- Consolidate collections – reduce the number of physical places that have collections by sending more to storage and eliminating collections from one (or two) divisional libraries. We can still provide services from these locations but with the addition of card readers on the entrances, you wouldn't need nearly as many staff hours.
  - Less of things that can be effectively outsourced – we've started with YBP shelf-ready, but there is more we can do. Server support and additional cataloging are two that come to mind for me.
  - Reduce print purchased – we're working on this but I think we should start looking beyond canceling print journals. I think with some analysis, we could identify serials and monograph areas that could be cut. This would have positive impact downstream as well.

Other smaller scale ideas that came from me and my staff were...

- \* Reduce hours (save staffing hours)
- \* Reduce hours for the general public (save staff grief – some of our most problematic and time consuming patrons are not from MIT)
- \* Reduce reference services
- \* Reduce number of public (MIT and non-MIT) computing terminals
- \* Eliminate free printing
- \* Eliminate videotaping instruction session in DIRC
- \* Reduce number of video tutorials (some databases change too frequently to make it worthwhile to continually update)

- 
- Less Print - purchase and management
    - Continue to reduce print journals to minimal core (less than 500 titles for entire system). Save \$ on subscription, binding, check-in, shelving, cataloging, facilities footprint, labeling, barcoding. Save additional time accounting for and planning around the physical journal collection. If we cancel a print title - do not bind the last year. Toss all the loose issues (immediate savings).
    - Move all bound journals offsite - having single location and closed stacks will greatly reduce collection management costs, will simplify workflow in on-campus libraries.
    - Eliminate 2nd copy of theses (in process). Similar savings
    - Eliminate physical copies of gov docs (print, fiche, CDs, and maps) as separate collection. Stop receiving or catalog all materials. Eliminating an entire category of collections makes system simpler and streamlines workflow. Reducing intake

has obvious savings.

- Continue to streamline and outsource acquisition and cataloging activities for print.
- Reduce Service Points, and Increase Self-Service
  - Move monograph collections out of Barker and into Hayden. Barker can be transformed into a collections-free library space eliminating the need for a staffed service point to manage collections use. An ideal location to experiment with partnered services with other MIT academic support units.
  - Continuing to automate user services creates ability to reduce staffing at remaining service points.