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In the Fall of 2014, Deans Cronrath and Steele established a Library Task Force to address faculty and student concerns that arose following the announcement of the closing of the Architecture branch library due to budget cuts. The Library Task Force, consisting of students and faculty from the Architecture, Historic Preservation, PhD, Real Estate Development, and Urban Planning programs, and several people from the Public Services Division of University Libraries, met throughout the Fall 2014 semester. The task force focused on issues surrounding budget cuts that the Library and School are facing, and explored ideas on how to balance the needs of the various School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation programs to have access to books, services, spaces, and technology that the library currently provides and could provide, with the clear budgetary issues facing the library.

The task force conducted a literature review to assess current trends in branch library culture and 21st-century librarianship; students on the task force conducted an empathy study by interviewing a sampling students and faculty from each program represented within the school; the school community was invited to take part in a SWOT (strengths/weaknesses/opportunities/threats) survey; and the task force hosted a charrette to gather a range of creative ideas from students, faculty, and alumni from the University community. A website was developed to publish the results of the literature review reading list, a summary of charrette proposals and the task force meeting minutes http://www.lib.umd.edu/architecture/meeting-minutes/home, to maintain transparency of the process.

The various activities of the task force, particularly the charrette, generated a range of solutions with varying impact on the budgets for both the Libraries and the School and in the delivery of library services to the School's faculty and students. Documentation of the entire process, statements from the programs, the matrix of proposals from the charrette, and the various proposals are included in appendices to this report.

As an outcome of this semester's work, the task force recommends an immediate transformation of the current architecture branch library into a professional library with card swipe access for the School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation community. At the same time, an assessment of the collections and available spaces should be completed in order to reach the best balance of library resources and services and space needs of the School and programs.

Immediate Actions:
• Collections remain in the library;
• Library will remain open limited hours to the public to satisfy Public University requirements;
• Staff will remain at the circulation desk during these limited public hours;
• The librarian remains with the library;
• 24/7 access (keycard swipe for example) will be provided to the School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation community;
• A self-check-out station(s) will be installed for patron use; and
• The system of reserves on kiosks would continue.

Spring 2015 Actions
• Collections, space, and technology assessments will be conducted by faculty, students, and librarians using information gathered thus far in the process;
  o Collections will be assessed and appropriate location determined with a goal of reducing current stacks footprint.
  o Spaces within the library will be assessed as to appropriate new uses that fit various School program needs.
• Investigate the creation of a collection and study area within McKeldin that is specific to the School’s collections; and
• Renovation to the current library space to meet new technology needs and space uses will be examined and budgets developed.

The task force believes that this solution best integrates the wide-ranging set of interests, needs, and wants among all the programs of the School, the Library and the University for now and for the future. We thank you for the opportunity to study and engage with this important task.
APPENDIX A

Library Task Force Process Description

The Library task force was convened by the Dean of Libraries Patricia Steele and the Dean of the School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation David Cronrath in August of 2014.

The task force met every two or three weeks throughout the Fall 2014 semester, starting on September 2, 2014.

A website was established to publish the meeting minutes and any information necessary for the work of the task force. 
http://www.lib.umd.edu/architecture/meeting-minutes/home

The task force then built a reading list focused on physical spaces, the librarian, transformations in library use and services, and the Needs Assessment Report from 2012; these articles were also placed on the website.

Architecture students began an empathy study, surveying and interviewing their classmates and the faculty. Students from planning, preservation and real estate met with and surveyed their classmates about the library as well. Results from these studies are attached as well.

A SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) survey was conducted by placing SWOT charts around the building and online for people to fill in. This information was summarized and is included as a separate appendix item.

Brian Kelly proposed a Design Charrette to engage as much of the School community as possible to have input into the future of the library.

Observations are brought forth from the Library Needs Assessment Report and discussed by the task force. The big issues are as follows: technology, services, collections and spaces.

November 14 was established as the Library Charrette day. HISP students and faculty had an out-of-town conference but agreed on the date, with intention of sharing observations in writing, and getting some representation.

Goals and objectives of the charrette encompass: spaces, finances, services, technology, collections, and cultures.

Background information includes definitions, feedback from the SWOT survey, feedback from the empathy surveys, plans of the building, a fact sheet from the 2012 Needs Assessment Report, gate counts, the articles on libraries that were shared with the Task Force, and staff budget.

The Charrette took place with approximately 200 participants.
Photographs of design solutions have been posted to Flickr in the Library Charrette Album: [https://www.flickr.com/photos/mappimages/sets/72157649306676376/](https://www.flickr.com/photos/mappimages/sets/72157649306676376/)

The Charrette material was kept displayed until the following Monday evening, so that those who could not attend the event could provide their votes on ideas.

After the charrette, the task force proceeded with the following:

- Evaluated which ideas got the most votes as a snapshot gauge of interest, which ideas are actually feasible, which ideas represent Big Vision proposals, and what might work in the short- and long-term.
- The precinct captains (facilitators and spokespersons for the charrette teams) were asked to summarize the proposals that they presented to the assembly at the end of the charrette based on a template developed by the task force.
- A subset of the task force reviewed the precinct captain summaries and organized them into a matrix. This is included as a separate appendix item.
- Simultaneously, the library representatives made some budget assessments based on some schemes from the Library’s point of view.

The task force put together a proposal for the future of the library, incorporating feedback from the Charrette, the Needs Assessment Report, SWOT information, and empathy studies.
APPENDIX B
Program Values of Architecture, Urban Planning, Historic Preservation and Real Estate Programs were stated as follows:

Historic Preservation perspective – Historic Preservation users simply need to know where the books are and how to find them, which is to say either the ARCH library or McKeldin works fine in terms of the collection location. Students and faculty are most concerned about getting more access to the National Trust collection, particularly more evening hours. The kiosk system works well and should be maintained and expanded. Preservation students have observations that are included as a separate document in the appendices.

Planning perspective - The planning faculty is fine using electronic library resources, and going to McKeldin for books. Colleagues in the Center for Smart Growth are okay going to McKeldin as a resource. URSP faculty like the idea of the kiosks with specific books and journals to support URSP courses and research.

Real Estate Development perspective – This program is made up of professional faculty, who work full-time during the day, and realistically have very little time to walk to McKeldin. Clinical faculty need access to materials for teaching. Currently over 70% of the Graduate students in real estate development work full or part time and need resources to be immediately accessible. Priorities for faculty include: physical presence, access to journals, concierge service, limited hours/service, with the concierge service being the most critical. RDEV students do primarily field and real estate data base research, rather than classic library; there biggest needs are spaces for group work, and personal dedicated spaces to study, as well as support from library staff on short notice.

Architecture perspective – Historically the print collection housed in the Architecture Branch Library principally served the Architecture Program students and faculty. The School and the University Libraries established this collection jointly and over time both entities have collaborated to grow the collection into one of the finest of its kind in the mid-Atlantic region. Architecture values the physical presence of books because browsing is part of the design teaching-learning process. To date, digital technologies have not sufficiently permitted browsing at the same level of sophistication and success as one would encounter with physical print materials. Large format folios, which often require special handling, are highly valued as sources of referential images for architectural design because of the resolution of image, scale, and tactility of these sorts of documents. Removal to a remote location would significantly curtail their use. A core collection of books and journals is important for teaching and learning. Though the National Architectural
Accreditation Board no longer specifies a minimum number of volumes on architecture related matter as a condition for accreditation, access to information is particularly important. The ability to move freely between design studio space and a core professional collection is highly valued by the Architecture Program students and faculty members. A significant portion of architectural scholarship is supported by books and journals, which remain largely un-digitized at the University of Maryland and in other collections worldwide.

Further observations are included in the appendices.
APPENDIX C

Notes on Meeting with HISP students Nov 3—discuss future of architecture library

- More concern about access to Hornbake, since a lot of the collections they use are there; would be great to have a couple of evenings where Hornbake collections were open past 5pm
- Think that it is good to have the kiosks in architecture school for studio, and wonder if that is possible for HISP classes as well
- Think that blending the collection with McKeldin collections would make for more interdisciplinary interaction
- Would like a group work space in the current library space—desks for group work, as well as individual spaces like study kiosks
- The most valued part of the current library is the space to study, particularly the large table that looks out onto the green
- Would also like to have a room that they could sign up for and do presentation work—like Cindy has described creating in the library
- Would love to have an all-grad student lounge, perhaps in the old slide library; it could be an area for informal interdisciplinary interaction, informal group work, etc. Right now they use the 8 or so chairs that are directly outside of 1111, but they are at a premium and it would be great to have more chairs and tables in groupings to meet before class, etc.
- Were not aware of many of the services currently offered by the architecture library; would love to know more about the special collections and how they can be accessed; if the special collections stay in the architecture building, would like to see a small exhibit (real or virtual) that highlights some of the resources there
- Would like to have access to the library space 24/7 with card key
Arch Student

Food
"I don't think the school needs an outside source of food within the building"
"I'm tired of eating lunch at my desk"
"Could we open a café within the library?"

Summary: Small call for a café or coffee resource within the space.

Arch Library Vs Mckeldin

"Proximity is helpful"
"Mckeilden is overwhelming large, having the smaller architecture library helps me feel comfortable."
"Having the architecture library is very convenient, Mckeldin would not be convenient at all."
"I think if the library closed that would be very unfortunate."

Summary: Overall consensus that Mckeldin is too far away and that its size is overwhelming to large for our smaller collection.

I use/don't use the library for...

"The books are useful for diagraming"
"I used the library last week"
"I use the library 2-4 times a week, I don't always check out books but I study there all the time"
"I use the library a couple times a semester"
"I use the library for printing, quiet time, and for researching"
"I use the library [the books] for my studio projects."
"I mostly use my desk, the classrooms, and the laser cutter."
"I used the library to write papers."
"I've used the library for my arch history classes"
"I use the tables within the library to study"
"I [Graduate Student] use the library now more then in undergrad"
"I only check out about 2 books a semester"
"I mostly use the library as a reading room"
"I use mostly databases and book requests"
"I never used the library"
"I use the library to do precedent (Past building) research"

Summary: While many students work at their desk, they use the library as a more quite retreat to read and to locate primary documentation for research and diagraming.

Digitalizing/Digital Access

"I'm confused, if everything being digitized?"
"While digitalizing would be great we would still need the physical books on a regular basis."
"I consider a physical book a more trust worthy source document then something online"
"google doesn't have enough images/the right images"

Summary: Students understand the accessibility of digitized documents but have a greater trust for the physical books.

Benefits
"I found source documents within the books that I couldn't find online or on databases"

"The library provides a quite breakaway space that contrasts with studio which can get loud."

"The staff within the library have always been really helpful"

"When I am getting a book, I often look through the books around the one I found, I like that the library provides that unique opportunity"

"The library provides a more private space"

"The large windows in the library make the space feel really comfortable."

"The library is a vital part of our education"

"Cindy is an amazing resource"

**Summary:** Students say the library provides a quite place to study which isn't available anywhere else in the school. Students identified the chance encounter of discovering other beneficial book next to the one you were looking for. Students really love the large windows which make the space feel really comfortable.

**Concerns**

"Moving the library might affect our enrollment.. I wouldn't have considered UMD without the arch library"

**What the Arch school needs...**

"I think the school needs a more quiet communal chill space [lounge space]"

"I think the school needs to better intergrate the the social nature between all the architecture programs"

"The building need a place for more quiet uninterrupted study"

"We should use 1111 for what it was originally inended to be - a social space [lounge space]"

**Summary:** Students expressed a need for a communal lounge space and several students brought up the fact that 1111 was originally identified for the purpose.

**The Arch Library needs...**

"Add more books"

"The Library is great how it is"

"The library could use some more study spaces"

"The library needs more lounge seating"

"The library could use more social spaces" - "More group spaces within the library" - "...smart boards, computers" - "To be more self directive"

"The reduced library hours due to the closing have been an issue, it should be open in the morning"

"It would be nice to have swipe access during off hours" - "the books always tend to be misplaced"

"The library needs faster/functional computers and printers, the current ones are too slow"

"The library could have better signage"

"The library needs longer hours"

"Library needs an easier system for finding books"

**Summary:** Students expressed need for more seating (mostly the lounge type) and more group and individual study spaces. . Students also suggested the need for a more robust tech (computers are too slow)

**Non-Architecture Students**

"Non-architecture majors don't use/know about the arch library - we should advertise its exisance."
"Making the library books more universal [more then just books on architecture] might bring in outside students"
"The building feels like its mostly for architecture students."
"There were a lot of people studing in the hallways due to the reduced library hours"

Summary: Library could benefit from re-branding to attract outside students

Student Habits

I I I I "I'm mostly in the school starting at “9am”
"I like working within the school of architecture"
"I learn a lot from both the school and my peers”
"I use computer softwares a lot for my studio work”
"I like to work with people in the great space”
"The PC lab is gross, dark and has no windows.”
IIII "I do most of my work at my desk"
III "I do most of my research with my laptop"
I "I use the kiosk which has books from the library”
"The library is really important to me”

Students do most of their work at their desks but identified the kiosk as a great library resource.

The library should be...

"Shift focus away from static library to more dynamic spaces”
"Redesign interior - Fun, tech, couches (Think Google)”
"Move non-critical books to mckelden but keep our primary collection within building"
"The library has the potential to be a very homey comfortable space”
"why not just staff the library with architecture volinteers”
"Should be more like Ohio State - A machine for collaboration”
"New graduate students should be shown the library”
"the library should be DIY - do it yourself”
"Could the research GA’s from architecture give tutorials or be incorperated”
II "What about a mini library within studio?”

"If the books need to move, we should at least keep our most used Arch books within the building”

Summary: Suggestions should be read independently
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme #</th>
<th>Brief Schematic description</th>
<th>Collections</th>
<th>Library Space</th>
<th>Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1-Beltran Team 1</strong></td>
<td>In classrooms</td>
<td>Books in McKeldin</td>
<td>Collaborative spaces</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary/inter-level interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-Beltran Team 2</strong></td>
<td>All in McKeldin</td>
<td>Books dispersed around Arch Building</td>
<td>Quiet Spaces</td>
<td>Library skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3-Beltran Team 3</strong></td>
<td>Dispersed throughout architecture school</td>
<td>Some in McKeldin, some in Arch Library</td>
<td>Gallery Space</td>
<td>Professional library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4-Chamy “Zero Costs”</strong></td>
<td>In McKeldin</td>
<td>Arch library + around school</td>
<td>Food/Cafe</td>
<td>Student labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5-Chamy Bldg as Library</strong></td>
<td>On mezzanine and in great space</td>
<td>Library could have distance learning rooms</td>
<td>Informal spaces/lounge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6-Ramos Google Office</strong></td>
<td>All in McKeldin</td>
<td>Bridge between art and architecture; Books dispersed around school</td>
<td>Computers/Technology/3-d printers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7-Ramos Decentralize</strong></td>
<td>On mezzanine and in great space</td>
<td>Dispersed throughout building; some to McKeldin</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary/inter-level interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8a-Grzywa Meet n’Learn</strong></td>
<td>Library could have distance learning rooms</td>
<td>Keep books in Arch Library</td>
<td>Library skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9-Grzywa Bridge</strong></td>
<td>Bridge between art and architecture; Books dispersed around school</td>
<td>Bridge between art and architecture</td>
<td>Professional library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10-Bell Super De-Centralized</strong></td>
<td>Dispersed throughout building; some to McKeldin</td>
<td>Dispersed throughout building</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary/inter-level interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11-Bell Unstaffed Resv</strong></td>
<td>Course reserves room in library; rest to McKeldin?</td>
<td>Keep kiosks</td>
<td>Library skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12-Bell Digital Media Center</strong></td>
<td>All in McKeldin (except rare books); keep kiosks</td>
<td>Books to McKeldin</td>
<td>Professional library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13-Frank Human Element</strong></td>
<td>Each program has own space and books; some must go to McKeldin</td>
<td>Most to McKeldin; smaller dispersed collection</td>
<td>Student labor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14-Frank Spaces</strong></td>
<td>Most to McKeldin; smaller dispersed collection</td>
<td>Bridge between art and architecture</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary/inter-level interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15-Draper Gateway 1</strong></td>
<td>Bridge between art and architecture</td>
<td>Materials &amp; technology lab; Books to McKeldin</td>
<td>Library skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16-Draper Materials/Tech</strong></td>
<td>Bridge between art and architecture</td>
<td>Bridge between art and architecture</td>
<td>Professional library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17-Draper Collaboration</strong></td>
<td>Tba-stay or go?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18-Raimond</strong></td>
<td>Pared down reference collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX E Matrix of Solutions: Architecture Library Charrette
APPENDIX F
SWOT Summary from posters around the building.
November 11, 2014

STRENGTHS

• Where else in the DC Metro Area can one find such a comprehensive collection in situ (to architectural education)?
• A significant, large, robust, topically varied collection appropriate to the field of architecture, preservation, urban design, planning, development, and landscape architecture.
• Books. Physical books to reference. Shelves of them to wander through and pick at randomly. The wealth of physical books, right in this building.
• Not having to go to McKeldin, and all that it entails.
• Equipment rental and beautiful working place by the window to work with physical books.
• Really need a quiet study space in Arch. Building. With scanner
• Class reserves.
• Place for private study, instead of an empty classroom.
• Precedent research – invaluable collection which is great to have in one place.
• Place to lounge (collaborative space to lounge)
• The ability to physically look at documents, images, publications of architecture rather than on a screen. This resource is available within our building which is critical because we need to be able to do the research during and around class hours.
• Being able to go in looking for 1 book and being able to find 5 other books on the same subject w different information.
• Quiet zone in hectic studio.
• Placemaking – a clearly defined public space in the building and larger community. Acts as an intimate library were you know your librarian/staff. Arch Library is to McKeldin as local store is to Walmart.
• Good access to great resources; friendly willing staff who enjoys helping the students.
• Cheap color prints; great arch resources; easy to grab books.
• Extensive collection of Library materials is critical important to my educational experience.
• Our extensive research could only improve if the architecture library is easily accessible.
• An attractive space that invites uses to enter, find resources, and remain in this well lit (natural day-light), reasonably furnished space.
• Immediacy of the collection to the users of the collection.
• Spontaneous use by both faculty and students in direct association with studio-design education.
• Immediacy of collection allows the best opportunity for individual student discovery of material that is inspirational to design work (this cannot be
predicted, or always guided by faculty, but is commonly “found.” Only a robust and immediate collection supports this important aspect of design education. As Picasso said, “Do not seek, find.”

- The warmth, attentiveness, and support of the last several and continuing library staff, most especially the “public face” persons, Patti Cossard and Cynthia Frank.
- The excellent record of acquisitions, particularly that effort overseen by Patti Cossard.

WEAKNESSES
- Perception of being outdated or outmoded.
- Not big enough. No place for quiet/group study.
- Hard to find books you’re interested in, in the endless shelves.
- Hours – not open!
- Not convenient for arch students to grab books (a Lot)
- No quiet place to look up/research materials
- Computers slow. (They are the worst) Literally the worst.
- Lack of reason to draw a larger UMD/MAPP community – could strengthen ‘reason for being’
- Not enough professor involvement – help students discover the importance of Books/Folio/Visual resources Library has to offer. We won’t know it’s there w/o a little direction.
- The spontaneous trips my class have taken to the architecture library finding and checking out materials would be considerably less likely if a majority of the materials were moved to McKeldin.
- The collection long ago outgrew its space. Consequently, some materials that could be more ideally located in the “Architecture” Library are located elsewhere, primarily in McKeldin.
- Little or no documentation-follow up and integration of the Visual Resource materials with the Library resources as was a goal of the 2012 report prepared by School faculty and library staff.
- No strategy for fully introducing architecture students to the various topical themes and depth of material in the collection.
- No robust integration of intellectual resources with a comprehensively structured and highly integrated curriculum of architectural study.

OPPORTUNITIES
- New computer lab.
- Additional meeting space for students
- Study rooms for small group work.
- Private study cubicles for students wanting noise free space.
- Food outlet that is better than the vending machine.
• Space could become a large collaborative “war room” for professional community charrettes, for interdisciplinary collaborations, a “think & do” lab that has the physical parameters to accommodate large scale activity or future as-yet-thought-of methods of creating.
• Place with lots of books? Doesn’t necessarily need to be manned...like an extension of the studio kiosks. Maybe with rotating items monthly/ bi-monthly?
• Couches for napping
• Lounge upstairs with study group areas downstairs.
• Quiet places for students to study. There are not any places in the arch building that are quiet.
• Private study areas (old offices?)
• Group study /lounge area?
• Studio Drawing tables for the freshmen/sophomores
• Lockers for soph. and ARCH 242 supplies
• Swipe access
• Placemaking – could be strengthened as a social and community hub.
• Free printing.
• Coffee shop (with three checks beside it)
• Café
• Therapy space
• As a MAPP resource “Media Room” VRC?
• Swipe access for students/faculty
• Integrate the kiosks?
• Studio book collective. The collection is still available at McKeldin, but to supplement the lack of immediate access in the architecture building there could be a shelf placed in each studio with open access books. Professors and students could contribute to the shelf, and by doing so give up their book for open access free sharing. No one would actually own the books, so they could not be stolen in the normal sense of the word. Regardless, everyone’s student/studio experience would be enriched, and over time we could develop a rich collection, albeit a small one.
• Could keep the Arch Library space for swipe-in collection.
• Longer hours of access to the architecture Library access is also highly desirable for research, independent study, group work, etc.
• Invest in a more grand arch. Library. This will attract more students to apply to the undergrad and grad programs. Therefore, we will generate more funds, opportunities and growth.
• Expanded hours of access due to technology allowing self check-out.
• Envision an expanded Architecture-Art Library.
• Utilize envisioned Architecture-Art Library as a Fund Raising Opportunity to establish the economic basis for Capital Investment allocation by the State and the University (1/3 to ½ the cost).
Re-think the combined use of the existing Visual Resources Collection Space – plus the Library resources to meet those “needs” or “preferences” that are inconsistent with research-study “library/information access” uses.

- Complementary use of print material and digital information.
- Digital access as an initial research tool – leading to more in-depth print material study/research.
- Greater integration of curricular subject foci with library-information resources.

**THREATS**

- Despite being imbued with technology, it feels like a dinosaur in the building.
- Taking it away!
- Affect architecture department reputation? Impact on attracting new students. – I second this. 3 more endorsements.
- Is it going to affect accreditation?
- I would not attend this school without a library – agree!!, Check! Already suffering enrollment.
- Paying staff – perhaps keep the space staffed by one or two TA’s and make swipe access like labs.
- We have MAPP TA’s in TSC, why not the library?
- One of the reason why I chose to apply and come to the Master of Architecture Program at university of Maryland over Pratt and Northeastern is because it has an architecture library. The library is easily accessible and is very critical to my extensive research. By closing the architecture library, it will make my research more difficult and hinder my learning experience. In addition, my fellow classmates from my undergraduate school (not from university of Maryland) know that we are closing the architecture library. It will deter them from applying to University of Maryland. Instead they will apply elsewhere.
- Removal of a substantial portion of the print materials to McKeldin or any other off-site location.
- Ideology that print materials are a thing of the past to be entirely replaced by on-line digital access to materials.
- View that centralization is more efficient and economical than decentralization: the single big library vs. multiple branch libraries. Branch libraries bring the material to the users. Centralization is efficient for the staff, not efficient for the users.
- Over reliance on statistical data such as gate counts, numbers of books checked out, numbers of books re-shelved as an indicator of value of use. This is highly misleading, as the nature and frequency of use is related to types of courses. Lecture and seminar courses require specific, narrowly focused research by the individual. Whereas, studio courses that account for roughly 1/3 architecture credits require far more diverse utilization, and disguise actual numbers of users because multiple students utilize shared references in studios ranging from 5 to 45 students.
• Inattentiveness of faculty to the collection and its management.

• Zealous enthusiasm for change at any cost.

• Library staffs lack of appreciation for the importance of the idea of “precedent” and “type” as a basis for architectural-urban comprehension and design work, and hence a devaluation of documented resources.

• Library staffs lack of appreciation for comparative study of various examples related to a subject to gain understanding, particularly true of side by side comparisons of visual material.

• Inability to track down resources, whether checked out to individuals or to studio kiosks.

• Expansion of Socialization and Collaboration Spaces at the expense of Library-Research-Study spaces that are largely individual and require quiet and non-distracting space for work (as distinct from spaces like the highly collaborative “great space.”)

• Loss of staff support.
APPENDIX G

Big themes for Assessment by library team.

NOTES on Matrix:
1. 12 of the 18 schemes acknowledge a need for more interdisciplinary interaction between the School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation (School) Programs.
2. 11 of the 18 schemes thought at least some of the books should stay in the building.
3. 12 schemes advocated for collaborative spaces; 12 schemes advocated for computers, 3D printers and other technologies; 10 schemes proposed lounge space; 7 schemes each had a gallery and quiet spaces; and 8 proposed a café.
4. 5 schemes acknowledged the role of library skills such as better integration of library resources, and teaching students library skills.
5. The current library mezzanine is included in proposed repurposing of the library space.
6. Library skills included an acknowledgement by the team that the library is intimidating, or that students were not sure how to use it.

Scheme Analysis
A. Books go to McKeldin, periodicals go to McKeldin, reserves on kiosks in School
   a. Regular reserves staff in McKeldin deals with course reserves, need to transfer books to the School kiosks every semester
   b. Student and/or faculty monitoring of kiosks
   c. This meets the requirement for public accessibility to the collection since we are a public university
   d. Collections in Architecture may be integrated into rest of McKeldin stacks or maintained as a separate collection?
   e. Leaves the current Library space available to the School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation
      i. Furniture, carpeting, paint expenses to refurbish the space
      ii. Provides the opportunity to create quiet study space, group study space, lounge area, maker space with technology equipment, 3D printers etc., potentially a café (run into a wall on the café before),
      iii. Culturally, provides spaces to the School community that all programs would be more likely to use.
   f. Still need librarian services for research, teaching students library skills, embedded, or in McKeldin, with office hours in School?

Library analysis: 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.

B. Collections dispersed throughout Architecture Building, What about Reference, Periodicals?
a. Secure Shelving placed throughout building with some kind of swipe access and self check out stations
b. Shelving placed throughout building, with Library gates at exterior doors, and self check out stations
c. Shelving placed throughout building and it is a non circulating collection
d. Leaves the current Library space available to the School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation
   i. Furniture, carpeting paint expenses to refurbish the space
   ii. Provides the opportunity to create quiet study space, group study space, lounge area, potentially café (run into a wall on this process before), maker space with technology equipment, 3D printers etc.
   iii. Culturally, provides spaces to the School community that all programs would be more likely to use.
e. Presence of Library staff in this scenario
   i. Cost of Shelving
   ii. Any Librarian interaction? By appointment, imbedded, office hours?
   iii. Shelf maintenance, collection growth?

*Library analysis:* This was seen as most impractical, and presents issues of security, as well as constant monitoring of book locations around the building.

C. Books remain in the library – limited collection
   a. Library open limited hours to the public to satisfy Public University requirements
      i. Requires some type of staffing
   b. 24/7 access (keycard swipe for example) to the School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation community
   c. Current collection would be weeded, to reduce footprint even more.
   d. Periodicals go to McKeldin, opens up space here for some collaborative spaces, quiet study spaces, gallery spaces, café, informal spaces, technology.
   e. Culturally, provides spaces to the School community that all programs would be more likely to use.
   f. Presence of Library staff in this scenario

*Library analysis:* 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.

D. Books move to new space, shared with Art History Collections – Physical presence as a Bridge between The Architecture Building and Art-Sociology Building
a. Leaves the Library room available for other uses: collaborative spaces, quiet study spaces, gallery spaces, café, informal spaces, technology and other uses by the School.
b. Requires significant fund-raising, campus input, master planning etc.
c. Establishes a gateway to this side of campus
d. Allows for various staffing/professional model library scenarios as mentioned in above.

Library analysis: 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.