

Williams College

Library Space Planning for the 21st Century

*Jay K. Lucker, Consultant
December 6, 2000*

The following report summarizes the consultant's observations, analysis, and preliminary recommendations regarding current and future library space requirements for the libraries at Williams College. Data included in the report has been gathered from a number of sources and activities including:

1. Reports and statistics for the Williams College Libraries.
2. Minutes of meetings of faculty committees concerned with space planning.
3. Consultant meetings with the staffs of the Williams College Libraries and Chapin Library.
4. Consultant meetings with the Stetson-Sawyer Space Planning Committee, the College Library Committee, and the Chapin Library Committee.
5. Extended walk-through of all library space including Sawyer, Stetson, Schow, Grundy's Garage, and the Center for Environmental Studies.
6. Focus group meetings conducted by library staff with faculty and students (See Appendices A-C).

This study was aimed at developing a set of long term space requirements for the Williams College libraries that would enable the College to evaluate a number of possible approaches to meeting these needs within the context of the campus master plan and considering all of the factors impinging upon academic library space planning at the beginning of the 21st century. The report is arranged by addressing a number of questions that seem most relevant and most critical to the intersection of issues dealing with academic libraries, scholarly publishing, information technology, and liberal arts colleges for the next 25 years and beyond:

1. The major factors affecting academic libraries in general with regard to the publication, storage, and dissemination of information as they plan into the future.
2. Some major factors affecting library space planning at Williams College: campus master space plan; near future building priorities; relation of the library to academic programs; current and potential future impact of library cooperation on space and services.
3. The goals and desired end results of a long-term space plan.
4. The physical problems, constraints, and limitations of existing library space. How do these affect the quality of service and user access?
5. The qualitative and quantitative changes required to support library services and collections for the next 25 years.
6. Possible approaches and solutions to library space needs and how these are affected by the existing campus geography.

PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS – GENERAL

1. There is a continuing and critical role for the library as “place.” The library provides a secure, comfortable, and supportive atmosphere for students with many elements that cannot easily be replicated in dormitories, student centers, laboratories, or classrooms. The library also serves as a meeting ground for faculty, staff, and students making it the “intellectual commons” for the campus and should be as warm, comfortable, and as inviting as possible.
2. For the foreseeable future, academic libraries will continue to acquire and maintain print collections as well as provide access to electronic information. While the amount of electronic information being published is growing exponentially, there also continues to be significant growth in the total number of books published each year. Retrospective digitization of existing printed materials will be limited by cost, potential use, and copyright restrictions and will most likely be focused on serials rather than monographs. For undergraduate liberal arts colleges like Williams, printed books will continue to serve a major role as information resources.
3. In the immediate future, electronic publishing will have its greatest impact on scholarly journals, reference works, abstracting and indexing services, and government publications. Libraries will continue to exploit and expand online access to information both locally and through state and regional networks. Faculty will develop and use electronic texts and electronic workbooks that will, in part, replace printed materials. They will require space in which to work collaboratively with librarians and other specialists.
4. While scholarly journals, especially in the sciences, engineering, medicine, law, and the applied social sciences, will be moving toward electronic publication and distribution, libraries will be under serious economic pressure to support their collections. Publishers will try to maintain and even increase profits through metering of use and through highly restrictive licensing policies. Libraries will have to make difficult decisions as to whether to subscribe, whether for print or electronic versions or both, when to rely upon interlibrary loan and document delivery, and how and where to archive both print and electronic formats. Inevitably, libraries will have to cooperate in the collective storage, digitization, and group access to both current and retrospective files.
5. Ubiquitous access to electronic information is essential from both within and outside the library. Access to catalogs, databases, and the Internet should be available throughout the building: in reading areas, group studies, instructional spaces, offices, and at all library service points. To use information effectively, library computers also need to provide users with access to word processing, graphic and numerical programs, and high speed printing. As buildings are expanded and renovated, and as was done in Sawyer Library in 1992, careful attention should be paid to how power and network connectivity is distributed with the expectation that there will be growing use of personal devices as well as library-supplied machines. Provision should also be made for cable television and satellite feeds. Wireless connectivity is currently available and as the speed and

capacity of this type of access improves, will have the potential of replacing hard-wired networks. It may, therefore, not be necessary to provide connectivity to every table, carrel, and lounge seat in a building but there needs to be sufficient wiring, conduit, and cable to cover both fixed and portable equipment needs.

6. In the years immediately ahead, libraries will take a leading role in the teaching of information skills as information literacy becomes fully integrated into all aspects of the curriculum. There will be an increased focus in teaching on collaboration and on problem-based learning. Students will be taught how to identify, evaluate, and use information not only while they are in college, but as lifelong skills.

7. Libraries should continue to celebrate the book as object especially for materials with historical and/or institutional value. Rare books, manuscripts, and artifacts with intrinsic value need to be preserved and displayed with recognition of their form as well as their content.

8. There is an increasing need for space for group study and for group access to electronic and multi-media information. Collaborative learning has become a major aspect of many academic programs and the library is an ideal location for responding to this development.

9. The academic library of the 21st century needs to reflect the increased interrelationships between and among library, media, and computing services on the campus.

10. The administrative and functional organization of the college libraries has been undergoing many changes over the past two decades and will continue to evolve as their parent institutions, higher education, scholarly publishing, and information technology undergo further change. Library space needs to be redesigned to reflect the way that library staffs work now both individually and collaboratively as well as with the public. Space should meet organizational needs rather than the organization being configured to fit into available space. Equally important for staff are issues of physical environment, ergonomics, wiring and connectivity, privacy, and ambience.

11. Library buildings must anticipate the growth in volume of electronic information as well as other media and mediums: video, multimedia, satellite-transmitted, and teleconferencing.

In sum, what the liberal arts college library of the 21st century needs to be and do:

- Integrate information literacy throughout the curriculum.
- Take a leadership role in training students and faculty in the use of new technologies as they impact library resources.
- Provide access to worldwide information.
- Provide access to expertise required by patrons: in person and online.
- Provide access to equipment needed to access specialized forms of information.

- Provide access to older printed and other historical materials.
- Be a place for study, reflection, and learning.
- Provide for group study and group access to technology and media.
- Link the college with cooperative information networks.
- Provide a wide range of online services – local and remote.

PLANNING ISSUES – WILLIAMS COLLEGE

There are a number of issues and factors, some obvious, some undecided, and most complex, that influence long-term library space plans at Williams. The following list, while probably incomplete, is intended to stir thought and discussion.

1. The new Coordinating Committee for Strategic Planning will be looking at a number of issues affecting library space plans directly or indirectly: student center upgrade, course load reduction, increasing the number of faculty, and building project priorities including Stetson. There are also continuing discussions on the curriculum that will likely affect library programs, particularly instruction.
2. The nature and direction of planning for an academic office building is obviously critical to library space especially with regard to Stetson. This project has a higher priority as compared to overall library space needs but, clearly, whatever changes are made will influence the way that the library uses Stetson in the future. One significant piece is whether the 1956 addition, with its low ceilings will be demolished and if so, how this would affect the older portion of the building, the size and possible redistribution of Chapin Library and Archives space, access through and around the building, and a possible link with Sawyer Library.
3. What is the future configuration of OIT space in a renovated Stetson or Sawyer? Where will Audiovisual Services be located? Can it be located and arranged so as to integrate more effectively with the library and information services? OIT has a vision of increasing its space in Stetson by adding offices, storage space, multimedia workstations, a project room for collaborative faculty and staff projects, and a dedicated teleconferencing facility. If this comes about, how do these changes affect library space needs including 24-hour access? These questions seem independent of the issue of whether the administrative relationship between OIT and the Library changes.
4. What are the potentialities for cooperative access and physical storage of older collections for Williams with other partners? Boston Library Consortium? Five Colleges? Other? The JSTOR project presents an opportunity for libraries to consider sharing the long-term retention of printed journal volumes where there is a strong infrastructure supporting electronic access. The fact that JSTOR is library managed rather than publisher managed enables libraries to assume long-term viability. Do all libraries need to maintain complete (or incomplete?) back files in print? Could a dedicated, secure, and environmentally appropriate space serve multiple users?

5. If Williams participates in a cooperative journal access project, how does this affect the concept or possibility for use of additional offsite storage for other parts of the collection? Journals are the most efficient materials to store remotely since the unit of delivery is an article rather than an entire volume and articles can be delivered electronically on demand. Are there other Williams' collections that could be stored outside of Sawyer and Stetson? Grundy's Garage does not appear to be viable as a long-term storage facility for the library. The building environment is not satisfactory for the preservation and security of library materials and it would be prohibitive to upgrade the space.

In 2025, the College libraries are projected to hold around one million printed volumes – journals, monographs, government documents – plus a significant quantity of archival and manuscript collections and other materials. Experience has demonstrated that the most effective use of offsite storage is for older issues of journals, especially scientific and technical; government documents, and low-use college records. Lower use monographs could also be considered especially if the library was able to include tables of contents in its catalog so as to provide users with more detailed information on what is in a particular volume. The size and location of an offsite facility and whether it was shared with other libraries, involves issues of construction cost, collection density, method of shelving, delivery, and staffing.

7. The College does not have a formal Records Management Program. Rather the Archives collects permanent records on a case-by-case basis with no storage facility for short-term inactive records. An expanded program would require additional staff but could save valuable office and storage space on campus, create a structured workflow for the College's documentation, and thus make more efficient use of staff time. On other college campuses these programs administer a large volume of material that needs to be stored for varying periods of time until it is either transferred to the archives or discarded. Inactive records would be best suited for offsite storage since access is restricted to the originating department.

8. Given student computer ownership at around 85% and the number of public workstations on campus at around 250, what is the best way to distribute college-managed stations? Should there be additional computer labs and, if so, where is the best place to locate them?

PLANNING GOALS

The Stetson-Sawyer Space Planning Committee drafted a set of planning goals of which the following seem especially pertinent to a library space plan:

- Retain and enhance Stetson's architectural significance and historic role as a library.
- If feasible, improve connectivity between Sawyer and Stetson.
- Resolve storage quality and capacity issues of Sawyer, Chapin, and the Archives.

- Improve quality and quantity of work, study, teaching and display spaces with an emphasis on flexibility.
- Improve internal relationships among services.
- In Stetson, maintain/restore the large public spaces in the 1923 building.

In a meeting with the library staff, a number of additional features of an expanded and renovated library environment were identified in answer to the consultant's question as to what should the library be/have to make people want to come.

- Welcoming with a highly visible entrance.
- Library service points that are visible and approachable.
- An ordered environment with students and faculty visibly engaged.
- Access to technology that is fast and comprehensive.
- A variety of reading and study spaces including individual seating, group studies, and collaborative space.
- Quiet individual space away from traffic.
- Access to collections.
- Library is tied more intimately to the curriculum; need to promote research and exploration.
- Marketing and promotion of library services.
- Attractive and comfortable furniture, design, and use of color.
- An "intuitive" building – self-directing – with good signage and visible service points.
- A sense of flow within the building.

ASSESSMENT OF EXISTING SPACE

The inadequacies (and good features) of Sawyer and Stetson have been identified through a variety of means: Report of the Sawyer Space Planning Committee, May 1999; consultant meetings with the library staff in the fall of 2000; reports submitted to the consultant by various library departments; a series of focus group meetings with faculty and students. The following is a summary of the most critical issues identified; more detailed space needs for the several library departments appear in the following section on space requirements.

General

1. Both Sawyer and Stetson are overcrowded and require additional space for collections, readers, and services.
2. The division of collections and services between the two buildings is inconvenient and confusing for users and makes staffing and service delivery for Sawyer collections and services more complicated and costly than would be in a single, integrated facility.

3. Archives and especially Chapin Library are underutilized because they are less visible and less accessible than Sawyer Library.

4. Access to collections stored in Stetson is difficult and complicated not only for Archives and Chapin Library but also for Sawyer Library staff needing to retrieve material for users from their offsite storage area in the Stetson stacks.

5. There are a number of functions and services that are lacking in either building: “grand reading room”; student lounge in or near the library; group studies; faculty carrels/studies.

6. A 1998 Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners report on environmental conditions in the Williams College libraries showed that neither Sawyer nor Stetson have climate control systems that are up to current library and archival standards. These systems are, therefore, unable to provide environments that will ensure the longevity of the libraries’ collections. Stetson stacks, offices, and reading areas lack appropriate temperature and humidity controls to preserve the valuable materials stored therein. Sawyer’s HVAC system is also not providing consistent, non-cycling, year-round temperature and humidity levels.

Sawyer

1. While there are empty shelves sufficient for containing collection growth for approximately six years, the stacks are overcrowded because the aisles between the stack ranges are narrower than permitted by current building codes. If all stack aisles were widened to the current requirement of 36”, the loss of capacity would use up all of the available stack capacity. The density of stacks on all floors makes the interspersing of readers and collections impossible, compromising the quality of user space as well as easy access to materials.

2. The quantity and distribution of seating does not match up with the way that students currently use or would like to use the library: insufficient number of tables where patrons can spread out work; insufficient comfortable lounge seating except on the main floor; a general lack of comfortable study chairs; too many carrels in too little space and poorly located adjacent to main traffic aisles especially on the upper floors.

3. Patterns of use of library facilities and collections have changed since Sawyer Library was built and renovated. Collaborative and group work have become much more common. The library lacks enclosed or open spaces for students and/or faculty to work together. Librarians also work closely with users at public computer workstations, which therefore need to be planned for such joint work.

4. Workstations will have to be designed based on the way students work within the curriculum. Multimedia use will grow. The need for high quality resolution screens, video and audio capabilities is going to grow. Students will need to be able to move seamlessly among media and text at the same workstation. Other technological

requirements will include scanning, color printing and audio and video capture and editing capability.

5. The building is difficult to understand and difficult to navigate. The main door is below grade and leads into a stairway. There is no sense of “entry”; no sense of coming in to a place of knowledge and learning. The building lacks an area found in most academic libraries that serves as an “agora” or town green. The split of the building at the ground floor creates a series of internal problems and difficulties in access and circulation.

6. Handicapped access is convoluted and staff-dependent. A single elevator for staff and patrons forces a compromise between access and security. The elevator is increasingly unreliable and a second elevator for the public should be added.

7. The space associated with current periodical and newspaper reading is neither discrete, nor sufficient nor comfortable.

8. The separation of the reserve function from the circulation desk produces an inefficient use of staff and a major inconvenience for users. The separation of acquisitions/serials from cataloging does not optimize the interdependence of these two departments.

9. It is difficult to get material and supplies in and out of the building, as there is no loading dock or receiving/mail room.

10. The arrangement of collections including reference, periodicals, and monographs is not self-evident and is further complicated by the stacks on the mezzanines.

11. There is no obvious or suitable space for faculty and students to interact.

12. There are infrastructure problems involving airflow, temperature, and humidity; lighting (fixed lighting does not match up with stacks and furnishings; task lighting is inadequate; stack lights have individual overhead switches); roof and drain leaks.

13. There are no public restrooms on the first (main) floor.

14. Sight lines on the main floor, especially from the circulation desk, are blocked by the massive central stair core. It is difficult for staff to see what is happening and to direct patrons to various services and offices.

Stetson Hall

Both Archives and Chapin Library lack adequate space for existing collections much less for anticipated future acquisitions. The stack space used, formerly occupied by general library collections, is poorly designed for the kinds of materials currently there especially the large number of folios, maps, manuscripts, and archival boxes as well as instruments, photographs and prints, and paintings. The collections would benefit not only from an

appropriate physical environment but better security, shelving that is specific to these collections, and the consolidation of currently diffuse storage areas. Security, fire, and life safety systems need to be brought up to current standards.

Archives and Special Collections

1. Reading Room is grossly inadequate for readers especially those who have to consult large collections in a variety of formats. There is also insufficient space for staff, equipment and reference collections. The location and available staffing make it difficult to provide adequate service for the Whiteman Collection which is located in offices many floors distant.
2. Only one staff member has an office.
3. Because there is no dedicated space for accessioning incoming material and processing collections, the reading room is used for these purposes, further reducing the functional capacity of the reading room and compromising the security of the collections.
4. There are a number of collections that could/should be on open shelves that are not because of the lack of space.
5. Lack of sufficient secure display space prevents the Archives from exhibiting on a semi-permanent basis portions of the collection that are of acknowledged interest (e.g., Williamsiana artifacts.)
6. The seminar room that could be used by both Archives and Chapin is being used for storage and processing by Chapin. In any event, it lacks projection capability for computer and/or audiovisual display.

Chapin Library

1. The Great Hall, designed as an exhibition area, now also serves as a reading room but has become inadequate for handling either function, as collections and use have grown. Lighting is inadequate. There are not enough reader spaces and those that exist are too small. There are no network connections for library-supplied or laptop computers and copying and playback facilities are not available in this space. Security is compromised by the size of the room and lack of staff.
2. Space for the reference collection is so limited that a majority of the material is shelved in closed stacks.
3. There is no space dedicated to the processing of incoming materials.
4. The public areas of Chapin are not handicapped accessible.
5. There is no dedicated office space for the professional staff.

6. The study (west room of the main area) should be restored as a meeting room.
7. The security, alarm, and fire suppression systems need to be upgraded.

SPACE REQUIREMENTS

The following is a summary of the consultant's findings and recommendations regarding current and future space needs for the Williams College libraries. It is based on meetings with all library departments and on space utilization data supplied by the libraries. The quantitative space requirements outlined in this section are primarily incremental to the space currently occupied by the libraries in Sawyer and Stetson. The assumption is that each program area will have a base square footage more or less equal to its current allocation, with additional or incremental space noted. The location of some functions could change as and if the building is renovated and expanded.

Circulation

Current location at the point of public entry is good both in terms of contact with patrons and supervision of the security system. Supervisor's office and staff work areas have good proximity as does the scattering room.

There is a need for additional space behind the desk for staff and shelving and for book trucks. Need a larger work area for staff. The stack aisles in the scattering room are too narrow and additional shelving and a staff workstation are required in this area. Security gates are too close to the desk and the swinging units are no longer code compliant. Desk does not meet ADA requirements, as there is no portion at wheelchair height.

It would be a more efficient use of staff if the reserve function were incorporated into the circulation area. Ideally, these services should be at the entry level to the building rather than a floor above. Need a better location for student time cards that is not so clearly in public view, possibly in the scattering room or elsewhere near the entry.

Additional space: course reserves require 24 DFS = 480 sq.ft.. Expand desk area, work space, scattering room; add supply closet = 400 sq.ft. Total: 880 sq.ft.

Research and Reference Services

Librarians at reference desk are visible and accessible to the public. Central location on main floor close to entry and circulation desk. Reference collection shelving is adequate in quantity although aisles are too narrow. Service desk is well positioned and well arranged. Good proximity of desk to public workstations. Traffic patterns are complicated by the location of the stairs, the desk, and the new book area.

Librarians need individual, enclosed offices. Department lacks appropriate space for meetings and projects. Sight lines and traffic flow between and among reference stacks,

current periodicals, and research help desk is confusing and circuitous. Location of instruction rooms is not optimal. Government documents and microform collections are remote from the desk and staff.

Additional space: expand offices and work area = 450 sq.ft. Reference stacks should have 36" aisles = c. 200 sq.ft. Total = 650 sq.ft. This includes 150 sq. ft. for additional staff member.

Instruction

Instruction will remain an important service provided by the library, particularly if information literacy becomes more closely associated with the curriculum as anticipated. There are a number of different approaches to instruction that need to be recognized in planning. Individual instruction takes place at the Research desk, throughout the Reference Area, and in the office of librarians. Group instruction requires rooms with computer projection, network connectivity, and furniture that can be reconfigured for different purposes. One computer instruction lab should be included for hands-on instruction with capacity for 16 computers and an instruction station. A second room, also with computer projection, network connectivity, and an instructor station should be included and should have a capacity of 25 users. Note: one or both of these rooms should be on main floor if possible. These rooms require an additional 1,200 square feet.

Interlibrary Loan

Current space is adequate but location could be more convenient for patrons. Ideal location would be convenient to mail and receiving room with good access to stacks and an elevator. Unit has a dedicated photocopier as well as an Ariel workstation but could benefit from access to a second photocopy machine during peak times. Does not have to be on the main floor.

Audiovisual Collections

If the reserve function is merged with circulation, this could become a "media library" with collections, staff, and individual and group viewing facilities. Currently, much of the collection is in closed stacks, combined with reserves. Most of the audiovisual materials could be moved to open shelves.

There are five viewing rooms on an upper level with large screen TV's that can be used for group viewing but this area is not handicapped accessible. Need one room of this type on the same floor as the collection.

The current location is good and there is space for growth if reserves move. Staff and service space is adequate. It would be desirable to move the LP and audiocassette collections from the upper to the lower level. These collections could be placed in compact shelving. The catalogued music books and scores (M's) should remain in this area.

Acquisitions and Cataloging

Currently these departments are on separate floors. It would be beneficial to have them adjacent to develop efficiencies in workflow and staff utilization and so they could share copiers, fax machines, supplies, storage, and shelving. Shelving could be designed to facilitate material flow. Departments need good access to the mail/receiving area and loading dock.

Staff office and workspace is adequate for the current staff size. Need additional shelving for cataloging, for gifts in process currently in Stetson, and for bindery processing (6-8 DFS) and a supply closet. A storage space for bindery boxes and book cartons would also be desirable; this could be associated with a new mail/receiving room. Total additional space: c. 300 sq.ft.

Systems

Current location is good but space is inadequate for current and future needs. In terms of adjacencies, this area should be near or have good access to (1) public workstations in reference; (2) circulation; (3) technical services.

Space requirements include: office with table and six chairs; workroom with two workstations, an assembly/repair area, and a server area; and a separate, adjacent storage room. This requires a net addition of 600 sq.ft. to current space.

Administration

Current office space is adequate but this office does not need to be located on the main floor.

The library lacks a general storage area for shelving, furniture and supplies = 500 sq.ft. Sawyer Library lacks a loading dock and adjacent mail and receiving room. This area would also include space for bindery and book carton storage = 500 sq.ft.

The Staff Lounge is adequate in size but its location next to an instructional room may not be ideal in the long term because of traffic and noise.

Readers

Using an FTE student population of 2,000 and a campus-wide goal of having open seating for 45% of that number, the total number of open seats required in Sawyer, Stetson, and Schow is 900. With about 190 seats in Schow, there should be around 700 spaces for general seating in Sawyer and Stetson.

Presently there are 518 seats in Sawyer, distributed as follows:

Individual carrels

326

Two-tiered carrels	40
Carrels with narrow aisles*	35
Seats at tables	63
Lounge seating	53

*These carrels are, for all practical purposes, of very limited use because of problems with access and circulation.

The number of reader spaces currently available in Stetson is probably under 10 and does not materially affect the total.

The proposed number and allocation of reader spaces developed by the library staff and the consultant appears below.

Assignable carrels	150 for seniors writing theses 100 for other students
Reference	32 @ tables for four
Current periodicals and newspapers	20 @ lounge seats; 8 @ tables for four
New book area	6 @ lounge seats
Group studies (wired and with easily movable furniture)	12 for 4-6 people 4 for 8-10 people 3 tutoring rooms for two
Grand reading room	100 at tables
*Faculty Research Rooms	2 rooms with 8 carrels each (with extra lockers for more people)
Archives/Chapin Reading Room	24 at tables
Student lounge/Café	30 at tables; two group studies for 4-6 (perhaps outside of library)
*Computer Lab	25 workstations

*Multi-purpose Room (for College programs, e.g., readings, lectures, meetings)	50 at flexible seating
Open seating	150 at tables, carrels, and lounge seats

*Not counted toward the goal of 700 seats.

Assuming there are 483 usable seats currently in Sawyer (518-35) and assuming that the Special Collections Reading Room(s) will be in Stetson, the amount of additional reader space required to meet the above program in an expanded Sawyer can be calculated as follows:

Total number of seats required	700
Less 24 in Stetson	<u>-24</u>
	676
Currently in Sawyer	483
New seats required	193

At an average of 30 square feet per reader, these seats would require an addition of around 6,000 net square feet. To this should be added the Faculty Research Rooms (800 sq.ft.) the Computer Lab (1,000 sq.ft.), and the Multi-Purpose Room (1,000 sq.ft.). Additional space is also required for carrels with audiovisual and computer equipment (800 sq.ft.) Total new reader/public space: 9,800 sq.ft.

Collections

This section outlines the projected space required for collections in Sawyer and Schow for the next 25 years. Collection space for Chapin and Archives is included in the program requirements for these areas that follow. Collection growth projections are based on a combination of current and recent history and estimates for future growth that factor in such variables as electronic publishing, budget support and inflation, and new programs. Shelving capacity is based on generally accepted standards for college library as follows:

Monographs	7 volumes per linear foot at 85% capacity
Bound journals	5 volumes per linear foot at 85% capacity
Paper documents	20 items per linear foot at 85% capacity

The 85% capacity represents “working capacity”, the point at which library stacks are considered “full” since further additions will require constant shifting and re-shelving.

Schow Library

Currently available in Schow is 8,800 linear feet of empty shelving. This does not include the reference shelves but does include all areas that currently have shelving or have been designated for future fixed or compact shelving.

The annual projected growth in Schow is 2,100 monographs and 1,300 bound periodicals per year. The projected capacity of Schow over time is, therefore:

Available shelving	8,800 LF
Annual growth	
2,100 monographs	300 LF
1,300 bound periodicals	260 LF

At 560 LF/year the stacks have a capacity of about 15 years. This is probably a conservative estimate, given the growth in electronic journal publishing in the sciences.

Sawyer Library

Currently available in Sawyer is 22,700 linear feet of empty shelving. This is based on an actual shelf count. The total does not include shelving for the reference collection or for current periodicals.

The projected annual growth for Sawyer collections is 15,000 volumes per year of which 13,000 are monographs and 2,000 bound periodicals. These figures are net after withdrawals. The projected capacity of Sawyer over time is, therefore:

Available shelving	22,700 LF
Annual growth	
13,000 monographs	1,860 LF
2,000 bound periodicals	400 LF
Government documents	125 LF
<u>Audiovisual materials</u>	<u>65 LF</u>
Total	2,450 LF

Using these projections, there is space available in Sawyer for around nine years of growth from June 2000. However, a more realistic period of growth is six years since the

bottom shelves are nearly impossible to read and use of many of the top shelves would be dangerous due to the placement of lighting fixtures.

One factor that would reduce the time available would be if Sawyer collections currently shelved in Stetson stacks were returned to Sawyer in order to provide additional shelving for Archives and Special Collections and Chapin Library. There is about 5,300 LF of material on levels 6-9. Their incorporation into Sawyer would reduce growth by about two years.

Sawyer stack capacity does not take into consideration the insufficient stack aisle width throughout the building. None of the aisles meet the current code requirement of 36". In a May 1999 study it was reported that aisles range in width from 23.5" (65%) to 26" (4%) to 32" (31%). In order to provide 36" stack aisles throughout the building, space would have to be found for 150,000 volumes. Assuming the proportion of bound periodicals to books is 1:4, this would require approximately 23,000 LF or all of the currently available free shelving.

Assuming that the College is required to have all stack aisles meet current code requirements of 36", the amount of collection space required for Sawyer and Schow collections for the next 25 years is as follows:

25 years x 2,450 LF	60,000 LF
10 years of Schow growth	5,600 LF

Using the proportion of journals to books as 1:4, the 65,600 LF of materials would require 32,600 net square feet of new library space using standard (fixed) shelving. Additional collection space for microforms and media would bring this up to 33,000 NSF.

One additional collection related space requirement would be increased space for the display of current periodicals. Currently around 900 titles are displayed in the periodicals reading area and 300 titles are sent directly to the stacks. In order to display all 1,200 titles, an additional 200 square feet of display shelving would be required.

To summarize the additional space itemized in the previous section:

Service and staff	4,630 sq.ft.
Readers	9,800 sq.ft.
Collections	33,200 sq.ft.
Total	47,630 sq.ft.

At 70% efficiency (net to gross) this program space would require about 68,000 gross square feet of new library space.

Stetson Hall

The following section summarizes space requirements for Archives and Special Collections and for Chapin Library. It is difficult to compare program requirements with current space utilization because a number of spaces like the Chapin Exhibition Hall and the Archives Reading Room are used for multiple purposes. It is also hard to compare collection space requirements with available space because the shelving currently being used, is for most categories of material, inappropriate and, therefore, not efficiently used. One assumption that is possible is that the current overcrowding in the stacks could be relieved by having Archives and Chapin expand into all of the stacks (levels 6-9) now being used to shelve Sawyer collections (c. 7,500 LF).

Archives and Special Collections

Exhibit space (semi-permanent and rotating shows) 10 standing cases	500 sq.ft.
Reading Room 12 readers at six large tables, 4' x 8' Open shelf collection - 800 LF Reference desk Copier/scanner workstation 2 Public workstations Two microform readers Three listening/viewing carrels Alcove for yearbooks and student periodicals with lounge seating	1,200
Seminar Room 25 seats; computer and media projection; area for displaying original folios and other large format pieces	600
Offices and work space Archivist office Oral historian office Assistant Archivist office Records Manager office Accessioning/processing workroom with three workstations for students and interns, two processing tables, 75 cu.ft. of shelving	1,400
Collection growth Books and videos: 15 LF/yr. X 25 years = 375 LF Archival and manuscript collections: 300 cu.ft./yr. X 25 years = 7,500 cu.ft. (assume use of compact shelving) (*in addition to existing stack space)	4,000*

Chapin Library

Exhibition Hall	existing
Additional exhibit space (not including space in meetings rooms, lobby, or reading room.	1,500
Reading Room 12 readers at six large tables Reference collection – 7,000 volumes Viewing and listening carrels Staff desk	1,200
Offices and workroom Enclosed offices for 4-6 staff Project staff area for two Processing workroom Photocopier and scanner	2,000
Seminar Room 25 seats with computer and audiovisual projection	500
Collection growth 25,000-35,000 printed volumes (3,500-5,000 LF) 40,000 manuscript pieces (200 LF) Prints, posters, maps (100 drawers) Ephemera, A/V material (300 LF) (*represents the additional space required beyond that currently occupied; lower square footage if compact shelving used for books and manuscripts)	1,400-2,700*

Archives/Special Collections and Chapin Library – Potential for Shared Space

- Reading Room – two discrete reading and reference areas divided by a shared reference/information desk and service core with some adjacent staff offices.
- Audiovisual carrels and microform machines.
- Seminar rooms one of which would double as a conference room.
- Processing workroom.
- Conservation Lab.
- Exhibition space.

APPROACHES, SOLUTIONS, CONSTRAINTS

1. The impending construction of an academic office building and its potential impact upon Stetson gives the development of a master library space plan some imperative. Even though there is capacity for limited collection growth in Sawyer, there is a direct

connection between long range plans for renovation and expansion of that building and what happens to and with Stetson. The most critical questions that affect library space planning and that evolve from looking at Stetson as a component seem to be:

- Is it possible/feasible to have a direct, public link between Stetson and Sawyer? If the two buildings can be connected, how does this affect entry and security in both buildings? What services are best located in the link? There are a limited number of ways of connecting the buildings:

An above ground link between the main Sawyer and west Stetson entrances might block cross campus traffic and create a building mass that is hard to envision.

A connection under the courtyard might be possible but could encounter serious structural as well as aesthetic problems. A linkage at this level does not connect to the main floors of either building and only produces additional problems relating to traffic flow for which Sawyer and Stetson are now both infamous.

There could be a link behind Sawyer connecting to the north side of Stetson but this could present problems of secure entrance to both libraries. The issue of a single, secure entrance to both buildings is complicated by the adjacency of faculty offices with traffic flowing from the office building(s) into a connector. Use of the faculty lounge in Stetson as a “grand reading room” would be severely hampered if this space were outside of the Sawyer security envelope.

- If the two buildings cannot be effectively connected, what is the best distribution of services and collections? While a case can be made for Archives and Special Collections sharing space in Stetson, can an equally strong case be made for an alternative where archives moves to an expanded Sawyer with Chapin Library remaining in Stetson perhaps along with the College’s rare book collection?

2. How to obtain additional space for Archives/Special Collections and Chapin Library within the Stetson building?

- Remove the 1923 stack core and replace it with compact shelving and other storage units for types of collections needing specialized housing. Perhaps the new stacks could be relocated so that the necessary offices and reading room can be located contiguous to the collection.
- Remove the 1956 addition.
- Build an addition that links to Sawyer.
- Build an addition to Stetson that would improve access to and connectivity of library functions (e.g., making Chapin Library handicapped accessible; providing direct access to the stacks) without connecting to Sawyer.
- Use offsite storage for the records management program.
- Some combination of the above.

3. Sawyer has a number of critical space problems beyond long-term collection growth:

- Access to Sawyer at the level below the main floor is far from optimal. The doors lead to a stairway that leads to the circulation desk. There is no sense of entry. Handicapped access is poor. An entry at the level of the main floor would create a number of improvements, both aesthetic and functional.
- The absence of a loading dock and mail/receiving room creates problems with delivery of incoming material.
- Service points and collections on the first floor are crowded and traffic patterns and paths are convoluted and not self-evident. The separation of reserves from circulation is problematical.
- The building is difficult to navigate, compounded by the division of the lobby.
- The balance of carrel, table and group seating is out of sync with current needs and patterns of use.

4. Some possible approaches to the issues outlined above:

- Create a new entrance at the level of the main floor; connect the lower floor across what is now lobby space.
- Combine circulation and reserve.
- Bring microforms and government documents (at least most recent materials) to the main floor.
- Consider joining acquisitions and cataloging in a single area, possibly on the second or third floor.
- Consider relocating administrative offices and systems.

5. Collection storage:

- To what extent can compact shelving be used to address current and future collection growth needs? If all existing stacks in Sawyer basement were converted to compact shelving, the net increase in capacity is about 10,500 LF or 4.2 years growth. Are there other areas that could support compact shelving even if this entailed some structural reinforcing?
- Is offsite storage a possible solution to long-term space needs? Grundy's Garage does not appear to be a viable solution. If low-use college records are stored offsite, it would be preferable that they are in the same location as books and journals to maximize staffing, delivery, and access. If Williams engages in cooperative storage of back issues of journals and does not have to store these items locally, what could effectively go into offsite storage?

6. The space projections do not provide for additional staff. What is the possibility for adding staff and where would they go? This is especially important in Archives/Special Collections and Chapin.

7. Other issues and questions:

- What is the best future use of the Faculty Lounge in Stetson?
- Is there a need for a 24-hour study facility? What should it include? What is its relationship to the computer lab specified earlier? Where should it be? Does it fit into the concept of a student lounge/café? Does a 24-hour space in Schow affect consideration?
- How can a long-range library space plan address issues of audiovisual services both within the library and throughout the campus?
- Need for improved signage in both Sawyer and Stetson.
- If there is library expansion, are there other campus functions that might be effectively included? Writing Center? Language Laboratory?
- What is the impact of OIT expansion in Stetson on library services and space needs?
- Art Gallery and/or space to display student and faculty work in library?

APPENDIX A

COMPOSITE STUDENT FEEDBACK FROM OPEN MEETING ON LIBRARY SPACE AND FACILITIES, November 13, 2000

Attendees: 10 students, including Bethany Sayles from the Library Committee; Roger Bolton, Eric Beattie, Sylvia Kennick Brown, Dave Pilachowski, Bob Volz

Dave Pilachowski led a discussion that was loosely organized around the following talking points:

What do you like most about Sawyer Library?

- Good service. Can get material in the Library or via ILL.
- Good variety of seating. Keep the monkey carrels: they're enclosed, comfy, and are memorable to any visitor.
- Views from Sawyer—especially south and east—are wonderful. Keep them.
- The courtyard between Sawyer and Stetson is a nice place. Don't choke it off.

What things would you like to see improved?

- Sawyer is uncomfortable to study in. The stacks and monkey carrels cut up the horizontal space and make one feel closed in. The close stacks, and the floors being underground, make the place feel stuffy.
- The chairs are uncomfortable; we need more upholstery.
- There's not enough desk space in the A/V carrels.
- The traffic pattern is crazy. Reserve is too far from Circulation. The materials that are circulated for the shortest periods of time are located the farthest from the main building entrance. Some of the most used spaces are the most difficult to reach. Books on the mezzanine are so difficult to find that the collections there may be under used.
- When you're on the 2d and 3d floors especially you can't distinguish where you are on the floor. Would it be possible to differentiate east vs. west by type of seating, color, etc.?
- The ventilation system is noisy, as are the doors (especially the stair well), and the computer fans on some of the upper levels.

If given totally free hand, what would you like to see in expanded library?

- Have an entrance leading to the first floor.
- Larger, more centrally-located, computer lab, with better incorporation of a full range of technology: scanners attached to the network and to zip drives, color printing capabilities, etc. (several comments were made in this area)
- More group study rooms. (several students spoke on this topic)

- Extend Friday and Saturday evenings an hour or two. Create a 24-hour area; would not need access to collections but to places to study and computer lab. (several students spoke to this)
- Student and faculty art exhibition area. This was termed a “way to humanize the library.”
- Sofas and comfy chairs, a more relaxing atmosphere. A place to take a nap.
- More natural lighting, incandescent, lamp lighting, even if only in specific areas.
- Plants.

What is unique about Williams and how should that be reflected in the libraries?

- Group interaction. There’s a need for more, and a variety of, group study rooms. White boards could be included in these rooms, and perhaps also in other locations for serendipitous use.
- Student-faculty interaction. Students attending the meeting tend to meet faculty at the Baxter snack bar and in Goodrich. Could this translate to the Library?

Ideas from other libraries?

- Comfortable seats in attractive spaces to which students and faculty would be drawn.
- Working fireplace.
- Improve lighting to create warmer, more intimate spaces. Compliments on Schow lighting.

Use Chapin and Archives? General Comments? How should they interact with Sawyer?

- The Chapin collection is wonderful.
- The marble stairs leading to Chapin are great.
- More technology is needed in Chapin and Archives: scanners of all sizes, etc.
- The closed stacks are dingy and outdated. Tear them down and start over again.

Other things that came up...

- Office Services: make Office Services more visible for student use. Baxter?
- Schow: noise/echo level was mentioned several times, also the apparent lack of general newspapers.
- An environmentally friendly renovation: in the materials and methods used, making the Library more energy efficient. Use of solar panels on the roof possible?
- More frequent turn over in the Sawyer lobby exhibitions.

APPENDIX B

COMPOSITE STUDENT FEEDBACK FROM OPEN MEETING ON LIBRARY SPACE AND FACILITIES, November 15, 2000 in Goodrich Hall

Attendees: 13 students, including Clare Murphy from the Stetson/Sawyer Planning Committee, Eric Beattie, Wayne Hammond and Dave Pilachowski

Dave Pilachowski began by thanking Clare Murphy for contacting students and encouraging them to attend the session. The discussion was loosely organized around the following talking points:

What do you like most about Sawyer Library?

- Like the interior courtyards, which bring natural light into the building.
- Keep the monkey carrels: they're fun and are memorable to any visitor.
- Outside sheltered walkway is appreciated.

What things would you like to see improved?

- Most present did not like the facade of Sawyer
- Building hard to navigate and find what you are looking for
- The entrance to the building makes no sense - go down and then face a stairway and have to go up.
- Upon reaching the main floor, there are no clear signals about what is or should take place - studying, conversation, browsing, etc. Everything is jammed together and different activities are poorly defined.
- Similarly, the main floor is not attractive and should be opened up.
- Need restrooms on the main floor.
- Building has an industrial feel. Carpet disliked
- Furniture is not comfortable; it is hard to relax and to stay and concentrate for the kind of time (4+) hours that students need to put in. Green chairs are noisy and not that comfortable; ugly.
- Better variety of seating needed and group rooms were desired by all attending.
- Most seating is adjacent to main traffic routes, making it hard for people studying to maintain concentration.
- Update computers.
- Stacks are claustrophobic and lighting to read call numbers is poor.
- There is no place to sit down and browse books when selecting them. [DP mentioned the more customary stack layout of interspersing seating and stacks.]
- Add a computer lab. Jesup is a relatively long way for students and they would prefer a lab (beyond what we have now) in Sawyer. One with 24 hour access would be ideal.

If given totally free hand, what would you like to see in expanded library?

4. Do a better job of fitting the building in with the landscape - it looks like Sawyer and some other buildings are dropped onto the campus without adequate attention to exterior plantings.
5. Pay more attention to aesthetics inside and outside of Sawyer.

Ideas from other libraries?

- Like the meeting rooms in Schow; they always seem in high demand
- Put lounge and table seating in attractive areas with views so as to bring the outside into the library.
- Arrange collections more logically, like the newly expanded Los Angeles public library (public libraries seem to be better at this kind of grouping of materials than academic libraries).
- Have dense collections of books downstairs and keep upstairs more open and available for readers.
- More attractive floor coverings; had used a library with wooden floors.
- Many of the students' remarks compared Sawyer unfavorably with Schow, in terms of space, arrangement, comfort, and facilities.

Use Chapin and Archives? General Comments? How should they interact with Sawyer?

6. Several of the students use both collections and appreciate them.
 - Like the ambience of Chapin and the original part of Stetson. Preserve the character of this section of the building. Eric commented that we would work hard to do so.
 - Liked the vision of shared spaces for readers, with less confusion about where to go for what kind of collection. Wayne and Dave both commented on trying to bring the collections more to the attention of users, including using the Lounge as a joint reading room for Chapin and Archives IF we can relocated the stacks and put offices and other facilities in the right configuration.

Other issues that came up...

7. **OCC** - move it to Baxter. It makes more sense to the students to be there than in Stetson.
 - **Ecologically friendly project** - several students recommended that the project use good recycling practice and energy efficient materials.

- **Building Committee** - want students to remain involved with the project when it goes beyond planning into the design phase.
- **Back of Stetson** - tear down all but the 1923 building. Build office space that is new and dynamic.
- **Stetson Lobby** - dead space; put in comfortable, attractive seating.
- **Parking** - do away with the small parking lots all over campus and make the center of campus more pedestrian friendly.

Submitted by Dave Pilachowski and Wayne Hammond

APPENDIX C

COMPOSITE FACULTY FEEDBACK FROM INDIVIDUAL SESSIONS ON LIBRARY SPACE AND FACILITIES, November, 2000

Participating faculty: Sabrina Hamilton, George Markus, David Kechley, Molly Magavern, EJ Johnson, Peter Grudin, Leyla Rouhi, Alan White, Darra Goldstein, and casual comments made to the interviewers by other faculty members during this period
Interviewers: Dave Pilachowski and Sylvia Kennick Brown

8. What do you like most about Sawyer Library?

- The instruction program, with hands on exercises, and having rooms where such sessions can take place.
- Similarly, more concerned with being able to reserve a room once or twice a semester for instruction rather than having all class sessions in the library.
- Can use maps to find books.
- Browsing in stacks and ready availability of copiers.
- Know can direct students to come here to write and research.
- Refers students here for help.
- Sawyer is well laid out, and materials can be found easily.
- Pleased with the accessibility of the reference desk.

9. What things would you like to see improved?

- Navigation: Sawyer is very difficult to navigate, and not logically laid out. The circulating collection is on three floors that are interrupted by two floors. There is lots of traveling up and down to get to where you want to be. (Most interviewees were emphatic about difficulties in navigating Sawyer.) In contrast, Schow is much easier to navigate, especially the current journals area.
- Aisles are too narrow: It's difficult to pass someone, and impossible to read call numbers on the bottom few shelves due to shadows.
- Stack layout: Stacks are not logically laid out. In addition, the circular staircase forces a peculiar stack layout; linear stacks are easier to negotiate intellectually.
- Main circular staircase: The main staircase is grim, and confusing when trying to find the lower floors.
- The library entrance: Entering the library by traversing a rather empty lobby, going up stairs, being faced immediately with a 'barrier' (i.e. the security system), and then a large desk, is a progression that is not understandable as a library entrance. As one faculty member enters the library, she finds herself asking, "Where are the books?"
- Nooks and crannies: There are not enough nooks in which to read in comfortable chairs near the materials relating to one's discipline.

- Lobby & exhibition space: While the exhibitions are good, they are lost in the lobby space that tends to function primarily as a cold and uninviting passageway.
- Building materials: Both the rubberized floor covering and the carpeting look dingy and dirty.
- Returning materials: It is difficult to return large stacks of books to the library since it is hard to park nearby. At present, borrowers can use the Stetson book drop. (2 similar comments were made)
- Seating: The window seats on the south wall are too narrow to be of much use. The look of all seating should be updated.
- Reserves and A/V: Decouple reserves and A/V. The closed stack nature of Reserves and staff retrieval is not appropriate for videos, as long as the latter can be protected. Have more videos and be able to browse them. (Video browsability was mentioned multiple times.) Place Reserves closer to Circulation. (They are currently two floors away from each other.) Put visual resources—art books and various video formats—physically closer together. Have a separate media collection for all formats. Have some input from the Music Department in the planning (which, it has been claimed, never happened when Sawyer was designed and built).
- Create better assistance for understanding the layout of scores and miniscores when searching FRANCIS. Users of materials in that stack area are referred to the Reference Desk which is two floors away.
- Make the Reference desk more visible. The desk appears to be “shunted off to the side, as if they’re peripheral.”
- Have the WCMA (college art museum) slide collection catalog available on-line so that so that students will be aware of this collection. [note: investigate a link]
- Noise: Noise of students socializing, especially on the main floor, is bothersome. Also the noise from the Sawyer air conditioning equipment, when it is operating, is offensive and carries widely in the neighborhood.
- Sawyer looks cute and cozy--described by one person as “daycare center 1970s”--but not like a serious place in which to study.

10. If given totally free hand, what would you like to see in expanded library?

- A new main entrance that leads immediately to services and collections. Also “you should walk **up** into a library.”
- Be able to support technology well: color copiers, slide scanners, high-end technology. Be able to have additional on-line storage for people making heavy use of images. (Multiple comments were received in this area.)
- More active instruction program that focuses on benefits, and works with faculty on identifying “dead times” when they can attend workshops.
- Well-placed smaller stairways rather than the large grim central staircase.
- Ways to display student art, though not necessarily a gallery.
- Comfortable browsing area for new books and journals. Tables in the area and clusters of seats where people may converse, also den-like areas with incandescent

lighting. (Currently this space is too crowded and the lighting too stark.) Make the New Books area a destination, not a transit area.

- Faculty copiers on multiple floors. (This individual was not aware of the second copier near the Reference Office). Comment stands that there is no faculty copier on top two floors.
- Small seating areas, some with views and natural light, and others in dark corners for variety. Intimate seating areas placed in or near the collections of various disciplines. (Discipline-related seating was seen also as a way of promoting serendipitous meetings between faculty and students interested in that particular area.)
- Discipline/language/area rooms that contain collections pertaining to that area/subject (such as the Middle Eastern reading room at Harvard).
- A better connection between Stetson and Sawyer. A link or links, rather than a contiguous connection. Take advantage of views to the north. Also create a complex with the potential new classroom building.
- Seminar rooms near the collections. (Mentioned by three faculty members. This was seen as a way of tempting students to browse or use the library collections, or as “an excuse for students to be in the building at least two times a week.”)
- Named rooms.
- Office space, perhaps a cluster of offices, for faculty members.
- The library, or a portion thereof, open for 24-hour access.
- Sensitivity to building materials, colors, etc. One faculty member especially likes the use of wood in libraries.
- A more international-looking building. One possibility might be to include the names of a wide variety of philosophers/artists/authors (Chinese, Arabic, etc.) in the decoration of the building as a mirror or foil to the friezes on Stetson.
- If not included in a foreign language area in Stetson I or II, areas for foreign language periodicals and newspapers, as well as reference areas for encyclopedias and dictionaries in the various languages.

11. What is unique about Williams and how should that be reflected in the libraries?

- Each discipline has its own way of doing research and the library needs to convey that to students. Text-based, visual, and lab oriented courses require different skills.
- Personal interaction is important. Make interaction possible in the library while preserving spaces for in-depth concentration. Create places to get drinks, snacks (not meals), and to talk.
- Working in groups. Create group work spaces. Perhaps host the Math/Physics workshop?
- One individual bemoaned the lack of intellectual seriousness exhibited by students, and would like to see the libraries promote intellectual endeavor.

12. Ideas from other libraries?

- The best ones seem people-friendly, easy to get around, and have public service desks close by.
- Nice large reading room with large wooden tables and lamps. (Wesleyan)
- Central reading room that says “we’re all in this together,” creating a sense of communal intellectual enterprise. (Stanford)
- Reference collections (near the reading room) that surround a circular reference desk making it easy to approach to ask for information. (Stanford)
- Create comfortable space to work.
- Linking buildings via underground space into which light is introduced. (U. Michigan Law Library?)

13. Use Chapin and Archives? General Comments? How should they interact with Sawyer?

- Most interviewees haven’t used either facility.
- Mentioned that these facilities are relatively hard to find.
- It’s important to have material represented in FRANCIS or a web page.
- Students never mention these libraries as an issue or a resource. The faculty member expects this is because little is known about them.
- Feels Chapin is an under-utilized treasure.
- They appear “marginalized.” The option of a connector between the libraries is interesting.
- Likes having special collections in Stetson. Enjoys having the various displays and reading rooms along his path.
- Would support anything that would promote primary research. That undergraduates can enter these libraries and have access to these types of materials is remarkable.

7. Other things that came up...

14. Music Dept has collections of scores that it loans. David Kechley is interested in having us take these materials on. He will talk with the dept. to see whether they agree. If they want to pursue this, we will need to find out how much material is involved. Also, the Willeke Collection came up as something that it is doubtful the Music Dept. will want once the curator (currently a faculty member) leaves.

15. Video Use – Sabrina Hamilton uses them heavily and limits by material type. Will be glad once we broaden keyword searching to include LCSH and more.

16. Summer Hours - Molly Magavern commented that as someone who coordinates certain summer student programs, she is concerned about the 4:30 closing time. From her perspective, summer research and other academic programs for admitted students will only grow. That will result in even more demand for summer library hours. The question is not study space as much as it is being able to get to library materials. Molly suggested that I raise this issue with the Provost for her read on summer programs (and to raise the staffing situation).

- **ILL** – Alan White would like to see better turn-around in ILL service. Was curious whether shuttle service might improve retrieval time. (The possibility of joining a consortium was mentioned as a way of potentially improving service.)
- **On-line texts** – Alan White would like to see more texts on-line for those who research from their offices.
- **Schow vs. Sawyer collections** - Alan White also had questions about certain titles that are located in Schow rather than Sawyer. Aristotle's commentaries in physics are presently in Schow, and he thinks that works like these are used more by Div. I and II faculty members.
- **Caution** - When expanding Sawyer, think about the possible impact on the Music center.

November 14, 2000