

**CARLETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY**

**Minutes of a Special Meeting of the**

**LIBRARY COMMITTEE OF SENATE**

**Date:** Thursday, March 10, 2005  
**Time:** 2:30p.m. – 4:00 p.m.  
**Location:** Room 102, Library

---

**Present:** Leslie Pal (Chair), Martin Foss (University Librarian), Aleksandra Bennett (Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences), Anita Hui, Library, M.H. Ogilvie (PAM), Pamela Armstrong (Library), Xin Wang (Faculty of Engineering and Design), Michael Weiss (Science), Carl Neumann (Undergraduate Student member), Committee Secretary (Ann Newton, Library)

**Guest Speaker:** Linda Rossman (Associate Librarian)

**Regrets:** Susan Weston (Graduate Student member)

**Observers:**

**Library:**

Flavia Renon, John Warren, Trish O'Flaherty, Wendy Sinclair, Janice Scammell, Jane Fry, Wendy Watkins, Susan Jackson, Beth Ray, Isla Jordan, Colleen Neely, Laurie Campbell, David Sharp, Joel Rivard, Jeet Atwal, Joanne Cameron, Monica Ferguson, Daulton Theodore, Anant Nagpur, Gilles Monast, Paul Filotas, Leslie Firth, Melody Mastad, Judy Senecal, Julian Parady, Ingrid Draayer, Susan Tudin, Elizabeth Knight, Janet Hempstead, Janet Carson

**Others:**

Vivian Cummins, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs; Nicole Gironda, Student Reporter, Charlatan; Robyn Smith, Graduate student, Sociology; Mike Graydon, Graduate student, Sociology; Tamy Superle, Graduate student, Sociology; Carter Elwood, History; David Elliott, Law; Edward Kim, N.U.G. Architecture; Karen March, Associate Dean, OD FASS; Ann Tierney, Dean of Student Affairs; Warren Thorngate, Psychology; Alex Bawagan, Chemistry; Greg Jefford, Housing and Conference Services; Marc Phillips, History/ICSLAC; Brenda Carr Vellino, English; Rob Holton, English; Peter Fitzgerald, History; Maeve McMahon, Law; Phil Warsaba, CCPA; Rachelle

Thibodeau, Centre for Initiatives in Education; Patrick Watson, President, History Society; Luke Yaren, History Society; Mary Jane Edwards, English; Francesco Manganiello, GSA/NUC Representative Canadian Studies; Roy Laird, History Department; Stuart Prest, Vice-President Finance, Graduate Students' Association – represented Susan Weston (SLC member) at the meeting; Ross Mutton, Instructional Video Services; Jay Drydyk, Philosophy; Igor Ivanovic, Systems and Computer Engineering; Robert Biddle, Psychology

### **1. Opening Remarks (L. Pal)**

In opening remarks, the Chair welcomed members, noting that this was a formal meeting of the Senate Library Committee (SLC), with the distinction that only one topic would be addressed, that of the Learning Commons. Approval of the minutes of November 25, 2004 was deferred until the next meeting.

L. Pal outlined the procedures that would be followed during this session, namely:

- L. Rossman would provide a brief presentation on the Learning Commons
- A. Bennett would provide commentary on questions and issues that were raised at the SLC meeting of November 25, 2004
- Members of the Committee would be given an opportunity to comment or pose questions on this issue
- the audience would be invited to voice their concerns and to ask questions

R. Laird, History Department, requested that the formal presentation be kept to an absolute minimum. L. Pal concurred with Laird's suggestion.

### **2. Presentation on the Learning Commons (L. Rossman)**

L. Rossman presented a slide presentation on activities relating to the Learning Commons and responded to a number of queries. Copies of the slides are available at:

[http://www.library.carleton.ca/learning\\_commons/senate\\_library\\_march10.ppt](http://www.library.carleton.ca/learning_commons/senate_library_march10.ppt)

See Appendix A for issues raised during Rossman's address to the Senate Library Committee.

Sensing that there was "an appetite for questions", the Chair stated that a presentation by Mr. Foss would not be necessary – the assumption being that the University Librarian would probably discuss salient points during the portion of the meeting that would be dedicated to questions from the floor.

L. Pal then suggested that SLC members direct their questions to L. Rossman. The Chair reiterated that questions from observers would be entertained after members were given an opportunity to speak to this issue.

### **3. Remarks by A. Bennett (SLC member)**

In opening remarks, A. Bennett (SLC Member for FASS, and the History Department Library Representative) expressed elation about the turnout for the meeting. Bennett observed that those present cared passionately about the Library. Although members and guests had different roads to travel to get where they wished to go, their destination was the same – to add two or three more floors to the building. Bennett said that the addition of two or three floors was not the optimal. Instead, it should be the minimum requirement. Bennett's view was that the optimal requirement would be a new library. Bennett's remarks generated a positive response (applause) from guests and members. Bennett then stated that “we are all on the same page, we are all on the same boat, and we are all paddling like mad – wrong metaphor. We don't have enough money.”

Bennett commented on the importance of not allowing divisions on this issue to develop among the various groups. As the FASS representative on the Senate Library Committee, Bennett's mandate was to represent all her constituencies. Bennett indicated that some constituents, not all, were very much in favour of a Learning Commons in the Library.

Bennett revealed that she did not support the establishment of a Learning Commons in the existing space. Anything that is put into the Library would displace materials that are already in the building – whether that is to the Storage facility, the dumpster, etc. What concerned Bennett was that the Task Force Report on the Learning Commons said nothing about the Library collection. The implementation of the Learning Commons would have a direct impact on the collection. Regrettably, the Task Force discussed the Library as if it were an empty shell – already to be filled with machines, people, office and instructional space and bits of equipment. Bennett admitted that there was a general inclination to have all these things, but there was simply not enough room. In truth, the MacOdrum Library was chronically space-challenged. In M. Foss' December 2, 2004 email to several of the Deans, the University Librarian began by stating: “You are all aware that MacOdrum Library is basically full with no room for collections expansion”. Bennett then referred to L. Rossman's earlier remarks that the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> floors would be packed with books. Bennett agreed that the Storage facility was badly needed, and that there was no question about that need. It will be a welcome addition, but establishing a Learning Commons in MacOdrum's existing space would be highly problematic. This initiative would see the monograph collection reduced to two floors. With this plan, the University of Ottawa would have more libraries than our Library has floors. In examining the conceptual plans for the Learning Commons it was quite clear that there was no room for collection expansion, the space was cramped, and the sight lines were poor. The latter would create issues of personal safety, as the students would be isolated on the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> levels and on the first floor in the area designated for compact storage. Red phones would be essential in these locations.

MADGIC (Maps, Data and Government Information Centre) has one of the finest collections of government documents and maps in the country and it has to

reduce its MacOdrum footprint by one-third. It comprises one-third of our existing collection and it contains primary research material of inestimable value to faculty and to students from all manner of disciplines. The Reference Collection, which was recently reduced by 25% to make way for the Page Break, also has to reduce its footprint. The Special Collections area is similarly challenged. Bennett stated that “The University Library is the heart of the institution. The University has money for building projects. What is needed is the will to spend real building money on the Library.”

Bennett viewed the Library as “a vital key to Carleton’s reputation” and stated that it could be a money-making venture. If a new library was built, students and faculty would come and they would stay. The addition of three new floors to the Library, with properly appointed purpose built space that meets the needs of students at all levels, would be instrumental in solving exiting problems. Bennett felt that the time to make the decision about the floors was now. It was incumbent upon everyone in the room to demand these new floors. Bennett believed that the various constituencies (students, staff, and faculty) should not be “stymied by or put off by what were, in essence, typical Carleton shoestring, cheap, cheap, cheap attempts to answer what was a very fundamental problem. We can’t afford to do that with the heart of our institution. That heart has to beat strongly. If there is no library we are not here, the students are not here, and that is the end of the day.”

#### **4. Question and Answer Session (Appendix A)**

At the conclusion of Bennett’s commentary, and in the absence of additional questions and comments from SLC members, observers were invited to pose questions and/or share their views on this topic. See Appendix A for details.

#### **5. Motion**

During the formal proceedings of the Committee, M. H. Ogilvie informed Members that at the last Senate meeting, the Senate requested that the question of the Learning Commons be placed on the agenda for the next meeting. The President agreed to this request. In light of that, and in light of the fact that the March 10, 2005 session of SLC was constituted as a special meeting, the question for Ogilvie was whether or not the Senate Library Committee wished to make a recommendation to Senate which might guide them in their deliberations on this matter. Clearly it falls under Senate’s jurisdiction to make recommendations with respect to academic matters. Ogilvie had drafted a motion which she believed captured the consensus of the meeting.

L. Pal stated that it would be difficult to make a judgment without knowing the sense of the motion. The Chair requested that M. H. Ogilvie, without making a formal motion, provide some indication of what direction it would take. Ogilvie then stated that the motion would be in two parts, and that there was no reason why it could not, in a fictional way, be told to the Committee. Ogilvie said that part could be read and that the other part was still in her head. The recommendation would be somewhat like the following: moved that the Senate

Library Committee is opposed to the implementation of the Learning Commons Report in the MacOdrum Library building at this time and recommends that the University explore immediately physical expansion of the Library instead.

L. Pal stated that it could be presented as a formal motion, with a seconder, and then opened for discussion on it. If it turned out that there was some unease or misgivings, the motion could be withdrawn or defeated.

M. H. Ogilvie then

moved that the Senate Library Committee is opposed to the implementation of the Learning Commons Report in the MacOdrum Library building at this time and recommends that the University explore immediately the physical expansion of the Library instead. A. Bennett seconded the motion.

L. Pal opened the floor for discussion and debate on the motion. M. Foss questioned how the motion would be perceived and received, and indicated an uncertainty about its effects. M. H. Ogilvie stated that the direction of the motion did not indicate an opposition to the Learning Commons or an expansion of electronic services within the Library or the expansion of student services under the Dean of Student Services. All that was being said was that in terms of the priorities, the physical expansion of the Library should be our main priority. The whole concept of the Learning Commons and its implementation should be delayed until we have a larger library space. That was the intent of the suggestion.

Alek Bennett viewed this motion as kick starting the grass-roots movement - the movement from below that would finally help Mr. Foss to focus attention on the Library. We have tried many other things and it hasn't worked. M. H. Ogilvie stated that Senate, in its wisdom, could do something entirely different. Senate only ever, under the legislation, makes recommendations to the University Administration. If there is concern about there being brakes, there are brakes that are procedural that are already in the system. Ogilvie's intention was to suggest a motion that might express the views of the Senate Library Committee.

L. Pal questioned whether strategically this motion was the best route. The Chair also noted that a question was raised earlier about why now, why September. Pal stated that the reason, basically, was that there has been a change in the higher administration - a change in personnel and a change in focus, to some extent - which has raised the Library as a matter of priority. There is more money flowing to the Library in terms of budget dollars, and there is also this attention being paid with respect to the Learning Commons. The Chair believes that the Learning Commons, however we may view it, is an indication, a signal of interest. Maybe it is too much interest for some people, not the kind of interest that some would like, but it does signal for the first time that some attention is being paid to the Library. The other way to view this is that if you move ahead with the Learning Commons you actually build an argument for expansion of the Library. In a sense, you could flip this around

and see the Learning Commons as an action-forcing mechanism down the road to enhance the Library and as a first step towards investments in the Library. M. H. Ogilvie stated that it was not clear to her whether the increased attention was toward the Library or to the Learning Commons. Ogilvie reminded Members of earlier remarks made by Peter Fitzgerald, History Department, i.e. by starting to build the Storage Facility it looks as if a decision has already been made about Library collections. That is what concerns Ogilvie and others. Ogilvie stated that the point of the motion is that if we are agreed that what we really need to address is the floor space in the Library, this is the time to deal with that issue.

Alek Bennett reiterated M. H. Ogilvie's comments about "many brakes" further up the line, and stated that the Administration, if it wished to place brakes further up the line, would make them. The Senate Library Committee, which has in its care the academic life as it is represented here in the Library, would be addressing its responsibility by this proposed motion.

M. H. Ogilvie, directing remarks to the librarians, in particular, commented on the tremendous amount of work, the creativity and the imagination that had gone into this initiative. Ogilvie was not necessarily opposed to the implementation of a lot of this kind of thing, but was very concerned about the future of the collection. It was quite possible that some of this could be implemented, even if we were able to put a brake on it. M.H. Ogilvie expressed the hope that much of the work done would see fruit, but stressed that a decision about priorities should be made.

Anita Hui requested clarification on the motion. M. Foss questioned whether it would help to qualify the motion by linking it to the level two Learning Commons. Foss stated that level two couldn't happen in this building without adding more space.

L. Pal enquired about the Library master plan. M. Foss stated that the concept plan is there. The University Librarian and others are trying to organize a session with Senior Administration and the architects to see where it might go from here. It might help to tie the motion more directly to the middle level Learning Commons. M. H. Ogilvie stated that she "could not comment on that" as she "had not had a chance to read the Report because it was only available 48 hours ago."

Alek Bennett believed that the motion would help to focus the Administration's attention on the Library in a fairly arresting way. "We are not rolling over. We are saying that this does matter, and the sentiment of this meeting very much has been that it does matter."

M. H. Ogilvie stated that it was not just the sentiment of this meeting. Ogilvie's experience was that concern on this issue had been expressed by a number of faculty and students.

M. H. Ogilvie commented on the speed with which the architect's plans for the Learning Commons were rendered and questioned why they couldn't produce plans for the expansion of the Library as quickly.

In response to a question from L. Pal, the University Librarian stated that the mandate for the architects was to re-configure with the existing space. Carl Neumann stated that the motion should be re-phrased to emphasize much more strongly the need for the expanded two floors. One way to do that would be to suggest that the Administration instruct the architects to plan for an expansion of the Library and that nothing more than a pilot project for the Learning Commons be undertaken until such time as it is clear that the Library would be expanded to make room for it.

L. Pal viewed this as the thrust of the motion. In response to a question from L. Pal, M. H. Ogilvie reiterated that she could not comment on the Learning Commons report because she had not read it, given that it was released only two days ago. M. Weiss suggested that the wording of the motion be reversed.

The Chair called the question.

**It was MOVED (M.H. Ogilvie, Aleksandra Bennet) that the Senate Library Committee recommends that the University immediately explore the physical expansion of the Library and is opposed, therefore, to the implementation of the Learning Commons Report in the MacOdrum Library building at this time.**

**The motion carried.**

**Results of the vote:**

**L. Pal – No**

**M. Foss – Abstained**

**Aleksandra Bennett - Yes**

**Anita Hui – Yes**

**M. H. Ogilvie – Yes**

**Pamela Armstrong – Yes**

**Xin Wang – Yes**

**Michael Weiss – Yes**

**Carl Neumann – Yes**

**Susan Weston (Graduate Student member) was absent.**

## **6. Adjournment**

At 4:45 M. H. Ogilvie moved that the meeting be adjourned.

#### **4. Questions and Answer Session**

Appendix A is a summary of the issues that were raised during guest and member presentations. It does not include discussions on the Ogilvie/Bennett motion.

#### **Summary**

##### **What has the Library proposed for the third floor? (M. H. Ogilvie)**

L. Rossman, while referring to the plans, identified locations for the following: staff areas, Special Collections, Computer Systems, study space (group or private) and the MADGIC Department (Maps, Data and Government Information Centre) – maps, book stacks and staff.

##### **Is that a reduction in floor space for maps and government documents? (M. H. Ogilvie)**

L. Rossman stated that the plans for the third floor show the space exactly as it is today. The architect's drawings reflect no change in the area for maps and include stacks for two-thirds of the government documents collection and one-third for future growth. The MADGIC Department was asked to reduce its government document collection by one-third.

L. Rossman commented on the architect's recommendation to move all the books presently in the collection to the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> floors and stated that key to implementing this plan would be a new elevator to the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> floors.

##### **What will happen to the serials? (M. H. Ogilvie)**

L. Rossman informed M. H. Ogilvie that all serials would be shelved in compact shelving on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor. The 1<sup>st</sup> floor would also include a huge study area, additional shelving, the Interlibrary Loans Department, an "Other Media" section (microfilm/microfiche) and extra student seating around the perimeter. With this scenario, the assumption was that there would be fewer serials in the main Library collection and that some titles would have been relocated to the Storage facility.

##### **L. Rossman was asked if microfilm/microfiche material would be transferred to the Storage annex.**

Anita Hui (Collections Development and Gifts Librarian) reported that not many microfilm collections have been identified for relocation to storage.

**What percentage of the existing collection will be discarded or displaced by the Learning Commons and this new master plan? (Roy Laird, History Department, faculty)**

M. Foss identified the architectural drawings as a concept plan, and indicated that no decisions had been made on what space would be changed and what space would be reconfigured if there was ever money in the future for two or three more floors to be added to the extension.

**What percentage of the existing collection would have to be moved in order to put this plan into effect? (Roy Laird, History Department, faculty)**

M. Foss advised R. Laird that 20,000 science journal volumes would be moved. That was the basis upon which the plan was designed. The space on the left hand side of the screen would hold all but 20,000 volumes of the journals that are presently housed in the building.

**Why do we need a Storage facility if the entire existing collection can be shelved on two floors? What will go into the Storage facility? (Roy Laird, History Department, faculty)**

L. Pal asked if this question could be held in abeyance, as the Committee was still engaged in discussions about the Learning Commons.

Following Bennett's presentation, the question and answer session resumed.

R. Laird stated that A. Bennett had spoken to many of the points that were of concern to him.

M. Foss discussed the proposals that would be feasible for fall 2005:

- the IT Support Desk on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor of the Library outside the student computer labs would be integrated into an expanded Reference Desk on the main level;
- most of the machines in the student computer labs would be used to replace many of our EON machines which are not full service workstations;
- initiate a laptop loan program;
- refurbish the open study area, on the third level of the extension, with comfortable furniture;

and

- increase signage and publicity

To implement this plan would not require the removal of walls, the relocation of books, the loss of staff offices or the removal of carpets. The University Librarian stated that the concept plans that were introduced at the special meeting of the SLC were just that - concept plans. Based on comments expressed throughout the meeting, M. Foss believed that there was consensus for the addition of two or three extra floors. Although Foss agreed with and understood the wishes of the assembled members and guests, he stated that he would be pleased with a “commitment” from University Management to have these extra floors within the next three, four or five years. A session with the architect and Senior Administration to address these very issues is planned. No decisions have been made yet to fund a reconfiguration of this building. We have the concept plans, but that does not mean that the plans will be accepted, or that the Library will follow that path.

R. Laird commented on the headline of an article in the Citizen that stated that “Carleton Was to Get a Three Million Dollar Makeover”.

Initially, M. Foss was not aware of a recent article on this matter. Upon learning that it was an article from last year, Foss stated that a notional amount of \$3,000,000 was set aside as a number to invest in the Learning Commons reconfiguration. The final decision about actual funding has not yet been made.

**What about the Storage facility? (Roy Laird, History Department, Faculty)**

M. Foss informed R. Laird that the Storage facility was being built for \$2,000,000.

**How much does it cost to put a new floor on the Library? (Roy Laird, History Department, faculty)**

M. Foss reported that it would cost \$5,000,000 to put an additional floor on the Library. R. Laird then stated that two million plus three million would equal five million. Foss stated that one floor would not be enough, and that \$10,000,000 would be required for two floors. Laird commented that one floor was a start. A. Bennett noted that the ice hockey pads cost \$15,500,000. L. Pal intervened and said that it was unfair to challenge the University Librarian on other spending plans that were not undertaken by him. Bennett apologized. Foss stated that he had no control over what was allocated for the Library building.

Peter Fitzgerald (History Department, faculty) agreed with most of the earlier remarks made by colleague, A. Bennett, but disagreed with the statement about welcoming the addition of the Storage facility.

Fitzgerald recognized that this facility would take pressure off the Library in terms of its space problem. That was precisely what worried Fitzgerald. Of all the things under discussion today that was the only one in which there was a commitment for funding.

**Was the addition of the storage facility not in itself already a way of deciding that the construction of two extra floors could be put off indefinitely because we can use that facility for the moment? (P. Fitzgerald, History Department, faculty)**

M. Foss stated that three levels of service were identified in the Task Force report; a Volkswagen, Chevrolet and Cadillac version of the Learning Commons. What Foss had previously discussed was the Volkswagen version. The middle version (Chevrolet) was not viable within the existing space. If there is an interest on the part of the University to have something more than a very, very basic Learning Commons (for space and facilities) then there is no option but to add more floors.

**What happened to the books that disappeared from the area now occupied by the Page Break? Are they still accessible? (Observer - name not provided)**

Laurie Campbell (Gifts Librarian) reported that the books that were removed from that area were Reference materials.

There were three options for the dispersal of this material:

Option #1

Part of the collection would be relocated to the various floors in the Library.

Option #2

Reference serials, for example Historical Abstracts, are now available online. If some years weren't covered in the online version, the print copies were first relocated to the Floor 1 and then they were later placed in compact storage. The vision was that there would be coverage, whether it was print or electronic.

Option #3

Some material was dumped because it was dated or falling apart.

L. Campbell thought that there was some confusion about this initiative and the last project, which was the serials weeding project. During the latter, journals were placed on trucks outside the Page Break and offered to students, faculty and staff at no cost. A very small percentage of these journals were claimed. Due to space constraints, unclaimed items were given to CBEC, donated, or designated for discard. Campbell admitted that the Storage facility was a band aid solution but the Library was in a tight corner. Campbell then expressed appreciation to the Reference Services staff, Mr. Foss and L. Rossman for their efforts in responding to this challenge. Campbell also commented on the need for a balanced perspective.

M. H. Ogilvie stated that most of the individuals present were in agreement about the need for more electronic access for students and faculty research.

Ogilvie expressed surprise about how little was being said about faculty research. While indicating sympathy for the students, Ogilvie reminded those present that a university's reputation is based on the quantity and quality of its faculty and its faculty research. Ogilvie appreciated L. Campbell's remarks and stated that clearly an enormous amount of work, thought and skill had gone into this process. Ogilvie expressed concern about using the Library for other purposes when there is such a desperate need for book space.

**Who will have jurisdiction over the student services that will be part of the Learning Commons – the University Librarian or the Dean of Students? (M. H. Ogilvie, SLC member)**

M. Foss stated that the governance issue hadn't been dealt with yet. The kind of presence that the student support services would have would be primarily occasional and based on referrals. The University Librarian, as Building Authority, must approve any activity that occurs in the Library.

**What is the impact going to be on the book space in the Library? Could the University Librarian clarify why two numbers are floating around, i.e. 20,000 and 60,000? (M. H. Ogilvie)**

M. Foss stated that the number 20,000 was the initial estimate on the number of volumes that would be represented by digital equivalents of science journals. Last summer science journals were identified, title by title, on the basis of what was available digitally and could be replaced.

The Collections Committee and the Storage Committee focused on the criteria for determining what materials could be moved to Storage. The number 60,000 is an estimate of the foreign literature collections. There are approximately 50,000 titles in the Spanish collection alone. These items would be suitable candidates for Storage. M. Foss reported that some of the materials presently housed in the Library were collected for programs that are no longer offered by the University.

Mike Graydon (Ph.D. Student, Sociology) offered an endorsement of the Library, identifying the Interlibrary Loans Department and the Page Brake as critical to his success. Graydon stated that it seemed that there was a need to improve things in the Library, while long-term social changes in terms of how students seek information were also addressed. There is a clash of cultures. The old guard is going and the new guard (with its computers and online resources) is coming to the fore. Graydon understood that the Library would like to create a space that would 1) appeal to students, aesthetically, and 2) provide them with assistance in building the necessary skills. Graydon was comfortable with that goal, but was concerned about the limited shell, very limited shell, in which to address broad-based social and socializing learning changes and infrastructure needs. Graydon commented on the speed with which the process was taking place, and stated that more space and more time was required to ensure that the establishment of a Learning Commons was done well.

**Who is driving this initiative? (Mike Graydon, Ph.D. Student, Sociology)**

In response, M. Foss stated that one of the reasons for the September 2005 date was to try things out. Dealing with different working cultures is a challenge. Trying to define how these cultures can be brought together effectively to help students is equally challenging. Experimentation is in order. The implementation of the Learning Commons would provide an inexpensive way to gain experience. The impact on the building would be minimal. This approach would also ensure additional time for long-range planning. Hopefully, by next September, firm decisions will have been made about what will happen to this building in the long-term.

**How many monographs do we usually acquire in the course of a year? (A. Bennett, SLC Member)**

20,000 (A. Hui, Collections Development and Gifts Librarian)

**If you multiply 20,000 by 5 where will we be in 5 years time? (A. Bennett, SLC member)**

Bennett predicted that critical materials would be transferred from the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> floors to the Storage facility, an action that would be costly and that would likely require a turnaround time of 24 hours. Bennett commented on how little was now known – even the fundamentals of a budget. Bennett was not impressed with last-minute budgetary decisions - a very poor way to treat the Library and an ineffective approach for Library staff who are expected to effect these changes.

**What is being done to take into consideration graduate student input and their needs? Superle stated that graduate students require journals as they are issued, not six months later. (Tamy Superle, Ph.D. Student, Sociology)**

Anita Hui stated that print copies were not discarded until the electronic copy was available.

M. Foss reported that the Library was constantly adding new electronic journals, and few print journals as most of the latter were available in digital format. That is, by far, the preference. The Library currently has nearly 12,000 electronic and 3500 print journals - almost three times the number that the Library owned during its peak in the late 80s.

**Where, in this process, do graduate students have an opportunity to provide input? (Tamy Superle, Ph.D. Student, Sociology)**

M. Foss informed T. Superle that the Senate Library Committee included a graduate student member.

Stuart Prest, a member of the Graduate Students' Association, stated that Susan Weston, the Graduate student member on SLC, was also a member of

the Learning Commons Task Force. Prest noted it would be difficult to give a graduate, as opposed to an undergraduate, perspective on this issue, since their learning experiences are very different. Representing graduate members in a project of this nature would be a challenge. When you have a small shell and a project that divides that space, you will have perceived winners and losers. Some students will be very pleased with this model – those that support collaborative learning schemes. Others, who prefer a quiet library environment, will not be as enthusiastic. Prest stated that the Steering Committee should be very careful when considering the impact of this experiment on 1) graduate students versus undergraduate students, 2) Ph.D. versus Masters' students and 3) the various disciplines.

Conscious of the time and mindful of the number of individuals who wished to speak to this issue, L. Pal encouraged observers to be brief and succinct in their comments.

**Is there a campaign in place to lobby the University for money to build the additional floors? If not, why not? (Robyn Smith, Graduate student, Sociology)**

M. Foss stated that in his role as University Librarian he could not start a grass-roots campaign. The University Librarian is able, within the structures of the University, to promote this idea and had done so for many years. It would be helpful if there was support elsewhere that was reasoned, understandable and that was brought to the attention of Senior Administration, not through the Library, but from some other source – through the Deans, the Graduate Students' Association, etc. To obtain that kind of support would be wonderful. What seems to come to the Senior Administration is alarm and rumours – not a reasoned plan.

Patrick Watson, President, History Society, commented on digital versus print journals from the perspective of a student of History. Some of the older print journals and books were essential to his research. As potential candidates for storage, Watson was concerned about the red tape that would be required to retrieve items from the Storage facility.

**Has the Task Force and the Senate Library Committee seriously considered the impact on upper year and graduate research in the discussions about the Learning Commons? (Patrick Watson, President, History Society)**

M. Foss advised Watson that the Task Force had not examined those issues. The University Librarian reassured Watson that the Library would not move journals in the Humanities and Social Sciences that are 1) heavily used 2) date back to volume 1, issue 1, and 3) not available in digital format. The same rules would apply to books. The process has been to isolate titles that are simply not used and have probably not been used for very good reasons. Foss stated that Watson should not be concerned about not having access to materials required for research purposes. Watson indicated that he was still worried. During a recent project two titles that were signed out by him had not circulated for

years – one for six and the other for four years. Watson thought that they might be candidates for storage.

Anita Hui (Collections Development and Gifts Librarian and SLC member) advised Watson that the History books would not be transferred to the Storage facility unless they were part of the Spanish and German collections. Hui also commented on the Library's commitment to provide a speedy turnaround time for retrievals.

R. Laird (History Department, faculty) commented on the Learning Commons Task Force Report, noting in particular that it seemed to have very little to do with the Library. The emphasis seemed to be student services and high tech and that there were only two references to the noun "book" in the report. Laird wondered why the student help services, which are vital to under prepared first and second year students, couldn't be united in the University Centre.

**Wouldn't that be the obvious place to unite these services? Did the Task Force consider an alternative location for the Learning Commons or was its mandate specifically to force it on the Library? (R. Laird, History Department, Faculty)**

L. Rossman informed R. Laird that the mandate of the Learning Commons Task Force was to locate the Learning Commons in the Library. Rossman spoke about the many, extremely successful examples of Information Commons' and Learning Commons' that are located in other libraries. Rossman reported that the Task Force was asked to locate the Learning Commons in the current shell of the Library. Together with the concept plans that were displayed earlier and the recommendations that were emphasized, a way was found to create the space necessary for the Learning Commons. As M. Foss and A. Bennett have said, it may not, in terms of the building itself, be optimal. The optimal answer would be two or three extra floors.

R. Laird then suggested that the Committee make a recommendation to have it located elsewhere.

**Is the laptop loan program for use just within the Library or for external use as well? (Ross Mutton, Instructional Video Services)**

M. Foss advised R. Mutton that the loan program was for internal use only.

**Is the Task Force looking at the Library with an holistic approach? The only time that approach seems to be used is when it is convenient to add a band aid solution, i.e. the Storage facility. Have you, as University Librarian, made an effort to integrate with other sectors of the University? Have you argued from an holistic point of view? (Francesco Manganiello, GSA/NUC Representative Canadian Studies)**

M. Foss informed F. Manganiello that an overture was made to the Faculty of Public Affairs and Management. They have great ideas about the expansion of their facilities and their faculty.

**Is there any clout with that? (Francesco Manganiello, GSA/NUC Representative Canadian Studies)**

M. Foss advised Manganiello that there were some factors which worked against the partnership idea proposed by him, specifically the way that the budgeting system is done within the University. For the past few years, the Library has been its own Resource Planning Committee. Each year, the University Librarian, like the Deans of the various faculties, the President, the Vice-President, Research, etc., pleads his case to the Financial Planning Group. Foss is asked to identify the dollar amount that is required for his budget unit. Partnerships in that process are precious few, as everyone is competing for the same dollars. Attempts to make linkages with other budget managers have happened, but in an informal manner.

L. Pal, speaking as the Director of the School of Public Policy and Administration, stated that there was student representation on their Management Committee. Pal assumed that this was true in other units. A natural alliance can occur. Resolutions taken at that grass-roots level percolate up to the Dean or faculty level through meetings with chairs and directors. The Dean can be enjoined to bring those concerns to the higher administration. In a sense, the channels of a fairly robust communication about the importance of the Library already exist. They simply need to be utilized.

Mary Jane Edwards (English Department, faculty and a Friend of the Library) commented on the effects of cherry-picking a collection. You split the collection. You split the works that graduates, undergraduates and faculty eventually use for research purposes. Edwards assumed that compact shelving would be used on the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> levels, and questioned how all the books from the library could be placed in that space. Edwards suggested that the Library have the architect provide a concept of a three-floor addition to the Library.

J. Drydyk (Philosophy Department, faculty) viewed the idea of a resolution to split the Learning Commons from the Library as a bad tactic. It would be a diversion. Drydyk respected Foss' attempt to fix things and to push the envelope as far as possible with available resources, but was of the opinion that fixing things in the short term was not a positive step. Drydyk also observed that Foss had a mandate from both students and faculty to find the "big solution" and that accepting less – the duct tape model - was not an option.

K. Avramsson (Librarian, Reference Services Department) informed SLC that a number of friends working in environments in which the Learning Commons was a combination of IT and Reference Services, had told him that IT should not be merged with the Reference Desk. Avramsson was not interested in answering IT questions, and was concerned that the proximity of these two services would result in IT questions being directed at Reference Desk staff, and reference questions being directed at IT staff.

M. Foss said that this model had worked successfully at other institutions and that as long as the stations were staffed in a way that was consistent it was possible to minimize those problems.

P. Armstrong informed guests and observers that the libraries that have been successful have separated the IT Desks and the Reference Desks and have provided clearly marked signage for each service.

L. Rossman said that there would be two separate, adjacent desks for these services.

**Why does the report propose an expansion of hours? (?)** This individual believed that students did not feel that it was necessary to extend the hours.

L. Rossman informed the observer that results of the focus groups that were conducted revealed that students supported the extension of hours during specific times of the year, for example during exams – a trend that has been adopted at other libraries.

**Can't some of these ideas (extended hours, circulation of laptops) be implemented without a Learning Commons? (same observer)**

L. Rossman stated that the Library would be looking into, in a very serious way, elements of the recommendations that were put on the screen earlier in the meeting.

M. Foss informed the observer that

- the Learning Commons could attract money
- the University was prepared to invest in a Learning Commons
- the University was prepared to “beat the bushes” for donors.

Igor Ivanovic (Systems and Computer Engineering) stated that the laptop loan program would create a need for additional space.

**1) What criteria are used for discarding books? (I. Ivanovic, Systems and Computer Engineering)**

**2) In terms of lobbying, have you considered going from library representatives to Deans, to University Administration? (I. Ivanovic)**

Anita Hui responded to question #1 by identifying the criteria used in determining whether titles should be discarded or transferred to the Storage. Well-used materials, “core” journals, gifts to the Library, and MADGIC materials are retained. If there is an increase in the popularity of an item in the Storage facility, that title is returned to the main Library. Hui invited observers to contact her or the appropriate subject supervisors for details on this process – a process that does include consultation with faculty.

Carter Elwood (History Department, faculty) was pleased to see that the Senate Library Committee was engaged in this type of discussion and debate, but wished that it had preceded the construction of the PAGE Break.

**What is the fate of our limited archival collections, such as the Batchinsky Collection? (C. Elwood, History Department)**

M. Foss informed Elwood that discussions about this material had not yet taken place. The architect has built in an area on the third level to house all of the materials that are currently maintained in Special Collections.

**Is there any weeding of Special Collections taking place at this time? (C. Elwood, History Department)**

No. (M. Foss)

**To whom should we speak or where should we send emails about our views on this issue? (Tamy Superle, Graduate student, Sociology)**

M. Foss suggested that T. Superle speak with departmental staff, the Chairs and the Deans.

L. Pal agreed with Foss and also reminded Superle that there were faculty representatives on the Senate Library Committee. As Chair, Pal is required to submit an annual report to Senate. If there are sufficient representations that flow through the faculty representatives that are then tabled at the Committee, Pal is bound to represent those views in some summary format to Senate.