Architecture Library Taskforce
Meeting Minutes - DRAFT

September 2, 2014
Present:
  Brian Kelly [ARCH FACULTY] - BK
  Powell Draper [ARCH FACULTY] - PD
  Valerie Sherry [ARCH STUDENT] - VS
  Austin Raimond [ARCH STUDENT] - AR
  Don Linebaugh [HIST PRES FACULTY] - DL
  Christine Henry [HIST PRES STUDENT] - CH
  Hiro Iseki [URB REG PLAN FACULTY] – HI
  David Do [URB REG PLAN STUDENT] - DD
  Margaret McFarland [REAL EST FACULTY] - MM
  Ross Rabinovitch [REAL EST STUDENT] – RR
  Gary White [LIBRARIES] – GW
  Daniel Mack [LIBRARIES] – DM
  Yelena Luckert [LIBRARIES] – YL
  Cindy Frank [LIBRARIES] - CF

Next meeting: Tuesday, September 23, 2014, Dean’s Conference Room [MAPP]

I. Old Business
   None – first meeting.

II. Announcements
    CF Agenda Review:
    1. Welcome and Introductions
    2. Current State of Affairs – hours, staffing, support services
    3. Goals
    4. Communication with School – faculty, students, alumni
    5. Future Meeting Schedule

III. Discussion
    CF Current State of Affairs:
    Hours: M- Th 12pm – 8pm, Fr 1pm – 6pm, Sun 2pm – 8pm
    Staff: Students and Cindy Frank (Limited services)
    If no action, the default is library will remain open this semester until January 2015
    GW Background
    Roadmap until this point – Library in transition, static to dynamic
    Late April 2014 – $700,000 in budget cuts required by June
    Primary cuts: Collections, Personnel
    Absorbing Cut – cutting personnel, close Art and Architecture Libraries
    Annual Operations cost (Arch/Art Libraries) $100,000 Each
    Budget vs. Convenience
    Tenure Lines also cut, ie. Curators, Archivists, Meta Data Librarians
Shifting Priorities, reduce duplication
McKeldin – 24/7 access, centralized service

Question to Group:
If Architecture Library remains on site, give thought to how it remains available?

Recent Timeline:
Conversations over past few years – Dean Steele + Dean Cronrath
Meeting with Faculty - August 2014
Dean Steele meets with Students - August 2014
Mutual Task force developed for detailed planning approach to decisions made
Architecture shelving collapse status – Fixed
Architecture library has lowest attendance and declining use

BK Substance of discussions regarding next steps had not made it to Faculty / Students
Process moving forward – accessible to Faculty / Students / Other Stakeholders
Create vision for evolution of Library
Balance of use/service
Nature/process for searching for image

DM Discoverability
Metadata – digital image search vs. discussion of physical collections

MM Concern about where Architecture Library is located
Concern with cutting staff
Concerned with idea of collections prioritized over people

GW Goal is to expand personnel in form of subject librarians

DM Mention of peer institutions and work to reduce duplicated services

BK Service as a topic to discuss moving forward

VS Start with needs-finding and gathering insights from stakeholders rather than starting with potential solutions. In later stages progress to solution generation and brainstorming visions for future of library grounded in stakeholder insights.

BK Renew connections to the collections that exist, decide what could be moved off-site, build Faculty awareness of collections, renew over time.
Amend Collections over time?

VS Revisit and Reframe the questions we are considering when we are envisioning Library’s future. Ie. Architecture students plan to interview students and gather information/insights from other users.

BK SWOT Analysis of Architecture Library / Branch Library (inclusive of users) [ACTION ITEM]
Could have brainstorming sessions SWOT = Strengths Weaknesses Opportunities Threats.
Suggestion: 1 – 2 people from different stakeholder viewpoints to provide resources/literature regarding future of libraries and the evolving institution [ACTION ITEM]
Emphasized importance of August’s student meeting and specific student insight: architecture school already has quintessential making environment and library resource is what’s needed
Libraries seem to be on reverse trend – effort towards creating more “making” environments

DL Perspective of Historic Preservation – important that H.P. users need to know where the books are and how to find them rather than in need of physical space

HI Planning perspective, not as strong a stake, planning fine using electronic library
Smart growth colleagues okay going to McKeldin as resource

MM Real estate perspective: All adjunct faculty, no time to walk to McKeldin realistically
Clinical faculty need access to materials to teach with
Typical real estate students work all day and need resources to be immediately accessible. Priority: physical presence, access to journals, concierge service, limited hours/service.

Agreement to gather list of needs for each program/services of each program

Proposed Deliverables List for Next Meeting:
1) Assess services [ACTION ITEM]
2) Reconnect with collections, take stock of facility [ACTION ITEM]
3) Vision/Mission aspect [ACTION ITEM]
4) Reach out to Constituencies/Gather insights [ACTION ITEM]
5) Establish priorities (per program/stakeholder) [ACTION ITEM]

Constituencies – Each to identify physical/service needs
Multiple levels of urgency for each program

SWOT Analysis/Assess and understand current situation

Schedule for next meeting(s) throughout semester
Volunteered to collate information gathered as a result of plans to develop template/format for this [ACTION ITEM]

Request for deliverable clarification

Produce a recommendation, a list of prioritized options for how we might move forward, how we might prioritize needs in order to then consider how we might leverage resources in order to meet those needs [ACTION ITEM]

Map out a draft schedule for meeting [ie. every 2 weeks starting September 23, 2014]

Will send Library use metrics to group [ACTION ITEM]

Will continue to do an hourly patron count [ACTION ITEM]

Will post meeting minutes to website in order to ensure transparent process and share progress with interested stakeholders [ACTION ITEM]

Will create a Google Doc (working document) that can be edited where each program can input constituency reporting and SWOT analysis

Needs Assessment

IV. Next Steps - [ACTION ITEMS]

[Summarize the status of each area/department.]

Each Department/Stakeholder:
1) Reach out to constituencies to gather insights regarding current and proposed library use/needs (in order to later help identify and design vision for future of architecture library) start with information gathering, hold off on proposing solutions
2) Establish recommendations and priorities list (per program/stakeholder)
3) SWOT Analysis – take stock of current facility, collections, use, service

V. New Business