NOTES from discussion of the reading

HW - Notes
- Sense that many of our services were never designed with our users in mind. Instead they were focused on collections and librarians who service the collection. We traditionally base services on technology and not what users wanted. Or, our users changed and our services never did.
- The reading focused a lot on location. Made us realize that what we are doing now with our regards to location for consolidation is not based on what our users want. The articles focus on clients but with consolidation are we?
- Ideas from the table:
  - There was some difficulty from the non-GLS folks at our tables being able to align ideas from the reading into potential. They said this could be because of their current structure (non GLS service) or they already implemented some of the changes.
  - Location:
    - Do we know if things are only available digitally vs in person how that impacts users?
    - One issue is that we serve so many different types of people. Discussed that one size didn't fit all and we must keep that in mind.
    - We also need to look at the way in which we prioritize our users.
    - We need to think of ways to provide that service even if we don't have the location we use to have (hold shelves).
    - As much as we discuss location it is more of an issue for users than we think because we don't know where else they were or where they are coming from. We just focus on the fact that they chose to be in our library.

SB - Notes
- What was useful about the reading?
  - How is this relating to libraries? After thinking about it, I could see it
  - Thinking about a specific service was helpful instead of the abstract
  - Took something different away each time re-read it
  - Examining assumptions
  - Reference/instruction
    - Already have some examples of multiple modes
    - Point of need
    - Instruction/group sessions
    - ICONs
    - Collaborations among different library units/groups
- How does it change your thinking?
  - Introduces a new vocabulary/paradigm
  - Lots of these are already on the table
  - It's hard to plan for the future when you don't know what the future is
  - What about only aligning to skill set we currently have
  - Article forces one to think about services in discreet units/arts (both good and bad)
  - Appreciated how things were

- Share thoughts & ideas about how the model for thinking about reinventing services presented in the reading applies. To what library service(s) did you consider the model applicable?
  - Example: how to manage centralize purchase requests
    - Service: = giving patrons a chance to suggest purchases, or to get materials to folks quickly
    - Thinking of service, is efficiency more important or connecting to the user
    - Connects to other services (ILL, Uborrow)
    - How does it relate to collection development strategies
    - Instruction/Reference
    - Reserves - digital reserves, more consistent language, funding models, better to have in fewer locations with longer hours, partnering with departments for new model for facilitating reserves

NW Table 5: Reading Reflections

| Read Refl 1 | Useful | Healthcare context relates to library public services |
| Read Refl 1 | Useful | Instead of focusing upon the number of students we have to serve, it is helpful to focus on effective ways of serving. Quality of contact vs. just reaching the numbers. |
| Read Refl 1 | thought /ideas | In the context of languages and areas study bibliographers, best to sit down with students first, consult on an individual level when dealing with language translational issues and such. |
| Read Refl 1 | thought /ideas | Good framework to think and talk about service. |
| Read Refl 2 | thought /ideas | Complimentary and unique to a numbers of services |
| Read Refl 2 | thought /ideas | How will this help the unique and special needs? |
| Read Refl 2 | thought /ideas | I recognize the importance of communication regardless of the changes made in service, it is the most important component of the change process. |
CK - Table 7

General reactions to the article:

The notion of the service boundary is very interesting. e.g. peer institutions and what they are doing in various areas of e-learning - lots of different boundaries as examples. Also, how do our partners on campus factor into the boundaries (and who has what expertise)? Lots of opportunities to think about individual-to-individual services. Creating new services.

What is the library doing and what are our partners doing? What do constituencies need and bringing those services (library and partner) together.

Article addresses planned services, but not point of need services. The "5th thing" could be about the unplanned needs and services to support them outside of scheduled/planned times. The "structure of the interaction" part of the article could address this aspect.

How to address our need/desire to educate people in addition to solving the immediate demand?

Model of health scenario - group v. individual: similar to library instruction? Does it have to be individual vs. group (either/or)?

WisCEL/active learning model an example of changing the way educational needs are being met.

Workshop model: we decide the schedule for meeting group needs. How do you identify people with a shared goal?

The business/health example hard to translate to library/higher education. We are not a business. Less quantitative.

Specific services:

Value of personal question/interaction/service

Chat reference: allocation of expertise. When do you bring in the person with expertise?

When do we bring a team of experts (including campus partners) together to help one person. When is that the effective/efficient model?

SS - Table 3

Reflections:

- Noted that the models meet specific emerging needs, not just adapting.
- Do we have the same expertise in user's eyes as a doctor or financial manager? Maybe we need to highlight our expertise (market/communicate).
- How can we map needs to find our predictable clusters?
  - Grouping of our services: people can be different but delivery can be clustered.
  - Match people with tasks that need to be done.
  - College Library has experienced a lack of control with merged services (e.g., Writing Center or tutoring and perceptions - partners seen as a library service within the library, but have different models of service).
- Health care is very bound to standards (uniform way of doing things). That isn't really our library culture, but could/should it be? LibGuides might be an example of where standardizing has been effective for us and users.
  - Several noted struggles with traditional culture within our organization (libraries and campus).
- Discussed motivation for using our services - economy of choice (especially for Grad students).
  - Where are our failure points?
- Social aspects of our services: certain users identify research/library usage and social structures differently.

DH

- this model seems to be more applicable to some services/departments
  - discrete services
  - perhaps where this is an overlap of locations or redundancy in how work is done
- Interaction - need to balance personalizing things vs team approach
- this seems to be about freeing up the patron to connect with anyone... how can this be done successfully while still maintaining relationships?
- disciplinary needs will continue to be an issue... how do we make sure we address these?
- very important to approach this from the user's perspective
- a challenge will be communicating with users
- need to consider "best practices in triaging"
- very important - patron feedback in the service redesign process
- we need really good communication with staff
- perhaps we need to do pilots of new services, then get feedback from users and staff
- Library services that this could be applicable
  - reference
• liaison models - you need a team  
• research data services that bring in other related services on campus

JRH

• one size fits all doesn’t work; instead one size fits most, then address the others  
• examples of one to many solutions - workshops; technical services - users in the abstract  
• getting right feedback can be difficult - circ stats don't tell the whole story  
• our services - especially related to help finding info - differ from the medical example  
  • you clearly know when you need to see a doctor and are willing to set up an appointment  
  • most of our users don't anticipate the need to contact us - want immediate answer at point of need  
  • our approach to service is mostly reactive  
• how to be more proactive?  
  • we try to design website and online resources to work seamlessly and in ways that don't require our intervention; or make getting help easy (chat button placement for example)  
  • need to address the most frequent problems - build solution and deliver consistently