Architecture Library Task Force
Meeting Minutes – Draft
December 16, 2014

Present: Don Linebaugh [HISP FACULTY]; David Do [URSP STUDENT]; Maria Beltran [PHD STUDENT]; Yelena Luckert [LIBRARIES]; Christine Henry [HISP STUDENT]; Brian Kelly [ARCH FACULTY]; Valerie Sherry [ARCH STUDENT]; Austin Raimond [ARCH STUDENT]; Cindy Frank [LIBRARIES]; Powell Draper [ARCH FACULTY]; Gary White [LIBRARIES]; Hiro Iseki [URSP FACULTY];

Agenda:
1. Discuss schemes from the libraries' fiscal point of view.
2. Discuss structure and content of the report we have to write.

1. Schemes from Libraries fiscal point of view
Gary White and Yelena Luckert assessed the four schemes listed in the “Big Themes for Assessment by Library Team” document.

**Scheme A:** Books go to McKeldin, periodicals go to McKeldin, reserves on kiosks in School
This was seen as the most agreeable from a Library budget perspective as it would save the most money, especially in terms of labor costs.

**Scheme B:** Collections dispersed throughout Architecture Building.
This was seen as most impractical, and presents issues of security, as well as constant monitoring of book locations around the building.

**Scheme C:** Books remain in the library – limited collection with 24/7 access to the School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation community.
This was seen having cost savings also, but not as much as scheme A. However, it keeps the books in the building which is agreeable to some constituents.

**Scheme D:** Books move to new space, shared with Art History Collections – Physical presence as a Bridge between The Architecture Building and Art-Sociology Building.
This scheme is not practical in the near future from the Library’s point of view due to the huge costs associated with construction of a new building/space/gateway. However, future capital campaigns on campus could incorporate this.

**Impressions and discussion**
Discussion about future use of kiosks throughout the building for certain course reserves continues to be a viable option along with any of the schemes, or iteration of any of the schemes. Kiosks are important because they continue to keep the books at hand.
Gary White provided an update on the process of the Architecture Library versus the Art Library. Art has a much larger collection (approximately 100,000 volumes vs 30,000 volumes for Architecture, although those exact numbers need to be verified), and there is currently no space in McKeldin for the Art collection. Dean Steele has described a multi-year process for the Art Library to transition to being housed in McKeldin.

Discussion of the size of the Architecture Library collections proceeded with questions about folios, stacks and development of a discreet collection with in McKeldin that serves the School. A smaller collection (potentially 3,000 volumes) here in the School could serve the learning process of the design discipline of architecture.

Gary White suggested that an implementation of card-swipe access to the existing library could be accomplished fairly quickly, along with installation of a self-check station for patrons, to both keep the collections and allow time to assess and incorporate outcomes that address spaces, culture, and services, while allowing the library to reduce costs, and test the model.

2. Structure and content of the report
After discussion of components of the report, Don Linebaugh made a motion as follows:
The report should be to-the-point and recommend that Scheme C, the professional model Library be implemented in two parts; part 1 – convert to card-swipe access and self check out, with limited public hours; and part 2 – assess collections, determine appropriate locations for collections, plan for space changes, respond to other needs pointed up by the charrette.
The motion passed, by acclaim.

An appendix for the report should have the following items:
• Task force process description;
• Statement of priorities from each of the communities involved;
• Matrix from Charrette;
• Description of the schemes A – D with library financial analysis;

Next steps
Cindy will draw up a draft of the report as a statement of the recommendation, and email the task force, for editing over email.

The task force will offer to meet with the Dean of Libraries and Dean of the School of Architecture, Planning and preservation when the report is delivered to them.